

A WORKING DAY IN THE LIFE OF EMPLOYEES: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE SCALE FOR DAILY HASSLES AND UPLIFTS AT WORK

ANA JUNÇA-SILVA

UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF LISBON (ISCTE-IUL), BUSINESS RESEARCH UNIT
(BRU-ISCTE)

APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER CAPABILITIES AND INCLUSION (ISPA)
POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE OF TOMAR

ANTÓNIO CAETANO

APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH CENTER CAPABILITIES AND INCLUSION (ISPA)
BUSINESS RESEARCH UNIT (BRU-ISCTE)

RITA RUEFF LOPES

UNIVERSITY RAMON LLULL, ESADE BUSINESS SCHOOL, BARCELONA

This paper describes the development and validation of the scale for daily hassles and uplifts at work (SDHUW) in three studies. The SDHUW is a 50-item scale that measures two types of affective daily events in the workplace — hassles and uplifts — including their frequency and intensity. The SDHUW was tested for its factor structure, reliability, and convergent validity. Moreover, we tested whether daily hassles and uplifts would predict work attitudes (work engagement and job crafting) and psychological states (stress, anxiety, and depression). The scale measures five daily hassles dimensions: conflicts and unpleasant interactions, time management and task-related hassles, threats to self-efficacy and performance, failures interruptions and annoyances, and organizational and leader-related hassles; and five daily uplifts dimensions: achievement recognition and task-related uplifts, pleasant interactions helpfulness and compliments, humor and communication, time management and customer-related uplifts, and organizational uplifts. The SDHUW showed convergent validity and reliability. It correlates with positive and negative affect, job satisfaction, work engagement, well-being, job crafting, and mental health outcomes.

Keywords: Affective daily events; Daily hassles and uplifts; Scale development; Validation; Well-being.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ana Junça-Silva, APPsyCI – Applied Psychology Research Center Capabilities and Inclusion, Rua Jardim do Tabaco, 34, 1149-041 Lisbon, Portugal. Email: analjsilva@gmail.com

According to the affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), affective experiences refer to work-related daily events that provoke positive or negative emotional reactions. These emotional reactions influence employees' work-related attitudes and behavior in the workplace.

In the literature, affective events have been conceptualized as daily hassles and daily uplifts (e.g., DeLongis, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1988). Daily hassles are the little things that somehow can irritate or frustrate individuals at work (Lazarus, 1993). Examples of daily hassles are lack of supervisor support or a heavy workload. Conversely, daily uplifts are the positive experiences of daily life in the workplace, that make individuals feel good. Receiving positive feedback about one's performance or receiving support from a supervisor are examples of daily uplifts.

Research exploring events has traditionally focused on general events (e.g., unemployment) or daily life events (e.g., arguing with one's spouse) (Maybery, Neale, Arentz, & Jones-Ellis, 2007). Recently, however, research has focused on work-related daily events (Graf, Long, & Patrick, 2017). This is in response to the suggestion (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) that daily events at work are important for research and practice in organizational behavior. In addition, there has been greater emphasis on trying to understand the link between such experiences and any consequent affect that might influence diverse outcomes (e.g., performance) for organizational life (Xanthopoulou & Meier, 2014). These studies are relevant for theory development and show how important these events are for organizational daily life (Beauregard, 2014). However, to further our understanding of affective daily events, the field needs validated measurement tools that can be useful in empirical longitudinal studies.

Despite the importance of affective daily events, no comprehensive picture exists of the more common events happening at work and their specific effects. To fill this need, we aimed to develop and validate a scale to measure daily hassles and uplifts at work. In the following sections, we provide the theoretical background of daily events at work. Subsequently, we present three studies. In Study 1, we developed a scale for daily hassles and uplifts at work and examined its psychometric properties (reliability and factorial validity). In Study 2, we cross-validated the factor structure of the scale and examined its convergent validity. Finally, in Study 3, we examined whether daily hassles and uplifts may be related to work attitudes and psychological states.

This study contributes to enrich the literature by providing a comprehensive picture of daily hassles and uplifts at work. Through three independent studies, we provide an integrative approach and a basis for future research to more differentially investigate relationships proposed by AET. Moreover, this measure presents two kinds of affective daily events measures: frequency and intensity.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The AET suggests that events are proximal causes of emotional reactions. Affective events, when appraised by employees as significant, elicit pleasant or unpleasant emotions that will influence individuals' behaviors and attitudes (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). To trigger emotions, these events should be evaluated as important by the employees (e.g., because events make it difficult for them to fulfill their job requirement of satisfying customers).

The AET also suggests that stable features of the work environment, such as the nature of the work itself, make the occurrence of specific affective events more likely. Depending on the peculiar job features which prevail within a certain organization, specific daily hassles/uplifts can play an important role within different work settings.

The frequency and nature of these events might differ, depending on the work settings and the situation itself. For instance, some studies have shown that emotions are provoked by situations related to goal achievement or good performance evaluations (e.g., Pekrun, Elliot, & Maier, 2006; Schmidt, Klusmann, Lüdtke, Möller, & Kunter, 2017).

Emotions are also elicited in particular circumstances. For instance, when an employee finds that some resources (e.g., equipment) required to perform their job are lacking, or even when there has been some bureaucratic rule change but no information about it (e.g., Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Schilling, 1989; Wegge, Dick, Fisher, West, & Dawson, 2006).

Consequently, the affective daily events employees are subject to are what makes the difference in their day-to-day lives, specifically with regard to the ensuing affective reactions and resulting behaviors (e.g., job satisfaction, performance, etc.).

Daily Hassles and Uplifts at Work

Empirical evidence has demonstrated that daily life at work is filled with a variety of affective events that create daily emotional fluctuations. Affective daily events are relatively minor situations, involving stresses and pleasures, which characterize everyday life: daily hassles and uplifts (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981).

Daily hassles are appraised as being salient or threatening to well-being. They include, for instance, annoying practical problems such as having too many responsibilities (Clancy, Vince, & Gabriel, 2012). Daily hassles can be (1) situationally determined, (2) rare, or (3) recurrent, either because the person remains in the same context (e.g., workplace), with consistent and predictable demands (e.g., achieving goals), or because of the person's ineffective coping with common situations. The frequency of daily hassles occurrence depends on the specific characteristics of one's workplace.

Daily uplifts encompass experiences that are appraised as salient and positive to well-being (Lazarus, 1991) and are conceived as daily pleasures (Wagner, Compas, & Howell, 1988), that is, positive experiences like the joy derived from relating well to co-workers (Healey, Hodgkinson, Whittington, & Jonhson, 2015).

The relevance of daily events at work has been recognized (Beauregard, 2014). Some authors argued that daily events at work are an important predictor of diverse outcomes, such as employees' well-being or job performance (Graf et al., 2017). Others have demonstrated that individual and organizational outcomes are enhanced through affect, which is aroused by affective events in the workplace (e.g., Cascón-Pereira & Hallier, 2012; Fisher & Noble, 2004).

Two main studies have explored affective events at work (Basch & Fisher, 2000; Ohly & Schmitt, 2015). Yet, despite the emphasis on the importance of affective daily events, only the earlier study presented a scale to measure affective daily events. And even then, because the scale was very large, its usefulness for application in diary studies or experience sampling methodologies was limited. Besides that, the authors only examined its content validity.

It is, therefore, important to develop a scale that can be used to quantitatively measure affective daily events at work. Additionally, the measure must be suitable for different occupations and applied in diary designs, such as diary studies, longitudinal studies, and experience sampling methods. In the following three studies we develop and validate such a scale.

STUDY 1: SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND EXPLORATIVE TEST

The goal of the first study is to develop and test a scale that can be used to quantitatively measure daily hassles and uplifts in the workplace. We first describe the process of constructing the scale and then present the exploratory results of the scale factorial structure and reliability.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Data on the scale for daily hassles and uplifts at work (SDHUW) were collected using an online questionnaire. An e-mail with information about a study was sent to employees in diverse work sectors. Participants were recruited through a listserv and were invited to participate in a study on "events

experienced in the workplace.” Those who volunteered to participate received more specific information about the study and the anonymity and confidentiality of their answers. After that, they provided their consent to participate in the study, answering the survey.

Overall, 441 full-time employees agreed to participate in Study 1 (222 men and 219 women). Participants’ mean age was 27.33 ($SD = 11.35$). On average, they worked 6.6 years ($SD = 9.08$) for their current organizations. Regarding educational level, 43.5% had at least one university degree and 56.5% completed high school. They worked in education (36%), services (35.3%), and retail (28.7%).

Scale Construction

Initially, we generated a pool of 63 items to capture both affective daily event dimensions (hassles and uplifts). We started with 35 items to capture the daily hassles dimension. We based the construction of items for this dimension on studies exploring affective experiences at work (e.g., Basch & Fisher 2000, 2002; Silva & Caetano, 2013; Junça-Silva, Caetano, & Lopes, 2018; Ohly & Schmitt, 2015). All of these studies used AET as the main framework. The daily hassles most often identified in these studies were operational, organizational, and task hassles, and refusals (Ohly & Schmitt, 2015). Some were also identified as key work characteristics in the job demands-resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). However, these hassles differ from work characteristics in that they are more specific, changeable in nature, and trigger momentary affective reactions (Larsson, Ohlsson, Berglund, & Nilsson, 2017). Additionally, work characteristics have been considered as key antecedents of affective daily events, as proposed by the AET. Moreover, this scale is different from the items included in job stressor measures because it goes beyond the simple prediction of stress-related outcomes. And it encompasses items that, due to their momentary nature, cannot be assessed as enduring occupational stressors. We added conflicts and unpleasant interactions, threats to self-efficacy and performance, and failures, interruptions, and annoyances because we conducted a previous study, in which we interviewed 82 workers from diverse work sectors (educational, financial, services, and health). These daily hassles were identified by these participants on a regular basis. Moreover, research has shown that they are frequently experienced by workers who deal with people, such as customers (Wegge et al., 2006), and, therefore, need to be included in the scale. Table 1 summarizes the information used from previous studies to create daily hassles items.

TABLE 1
Information used from previous studies to create daily hassles dimensions

Daily hassles dimensions	Previous studies
Time management and task-related hassles	Basch & Fisher (1998, 2000), qualitative study;
Organizational and leader-related hassles	Ohly & Schmitt (2015), qualitative study on 218 workers
Conflicts and unpleasant interactions	
Threats to self-efficacy and performance	Information obtained from interviews with 82 employees
Failures, interruptions, and annoyances	from the educational, financial, services, and health sectors.

For the daily uplifts dimension, we aimed to address those affective experiences that stimulate positive affect, and make workers feel good. Thus, we started with a pool of 28 items based on previous

studies of affective events (e.g., Basch & Fisher 1998, 2000; Silva & Caetano, 2013; Ohly & Schmitt, 2015). We added helpfulness, humor and communication, and time management and customer-related uplifts, because in a previous qualitative study, participants identified these types of daily uplifts very frequently in the interviews (see Junça-Silva et al., 2018). Studies have shown that this kind of experience may induce positive affects in employees (Porath & Erez, 2007).

TABLE 2
Information used from previous studies to create daily uplifts dimensions

Daily uplifts dimensions	Previous studies
Achievement, recognition, and task-related uplifts	Basch & Fisher (1998, 2000), qualitative study
Organizational uplifts	Ohly & Schmitt (2015), qualitative study on 218 workers
Time management and customer-related uplifts	
Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments	Information obtained from interviews with 82 employees from educational, financial, services, and health sectors.
Humor and communication	

We asked three independent researchers to review the 63 items in terms of clarity and fit with the respective dimensions. Further, we pre-tested the item pool on 20 respondents in various occupations (education and services). We randomized the order of the item presentation in the questionnaire.

Two responses were collected for each affective event: (a) how frequently the event was experienced during the previous week, and (b) how positive or negative the event was. To measure the frequency, all items were answered on a 5-point frequency scale (0 = *never*, 4 = *almost every day*). Other studies of daily events applied a single measure of whether an event was experienced (e.g., Kanner et al., 1981). However, because the present study aimed to develop a scale to be used in diary designs, a more fine-grained measure was employed to gauge the relative frequency of events over the previous week.

To remove affectively neutral events and check their classification as either hassles or uplifts, we asked participants to rate how good/bad the event made them feel. Thus, affective reactions to events were measured on a 7-point scale (1 = *very negative*, 7 = *very positive*). To examine the newly constructed scale, we explored its factor structure and reliability, in terms of its frequency and intensity.

Analysis

We performed four principal factor analyses (maximum likelihood) with oblique rotation using SPSS to explore the factor structure of the SDHUW: two for the daily hassles scale (frequency and intensity), and two for the daily uplift scale (frequency and intensity). We retained the factors that had an eigenvalue higher than 1. Moreover, we retained the items with loadings of .35 or higher on the respective factor (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Floyd & Widaman, 1995). We removed the items with loadings of .35 or higher on more than one factor. Based on these criteria, we removed three items from the daily uplifts scale, and 10 items from the daily hassles scale. Two more factor analyses were performed on the remaining items and, as a result, the final questionnaire comprises 50 items, 25 of which on daily uplifts and 25 on daily hassles.

Results

Daily Uplifts Scale: Frequency

The factor analysis resulted in a five-factor solution, indicating no relevant cross-loadings, and explaining 61% of the variance (see Table 3). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.92, indicating that the data were appropriate for the analysis (Kaiser, 1974). The first factor (eigenvalue = 10.18) included seven items for *pleasant interpersonal interactions, helpfulness, and compliments* and explained 40% of the variance. The second factor, labeled *achievements, recognition, and task-related uplifts* (eigenvalue = 1.69), explained 7% of the variance (nine items). The third factor, labeled *humor and communication* (eigenvalue = 1.42), explained 6% of the variance (four items). The fourth factor included three items for *organizational uplifts* (eigenvalue = 1.05) and explained 4% of the variance. Finally, the fifth factor, called *time management and customer-related uplifts* (eigenvalue = 0.98), explained an additional 4% of the variance and comprised two items. The factor loadings of the items ranged from .36 to .79. Each dimension had good reliability. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .74 to .90 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

TABLE 3
Study 1: Items, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and factor loadings of the daily uplifts frequency scale ($N = 445$)

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	Factor				
				1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments			.86					
3. Today, I was complimented at work.	2.51	1.14		.75	.11	.30	.07	.15
9. Today, someone asked me for advice at work.	1.93	1.31		.71	.14	.12	.30	.01
5. Today, I gave someone a heartfelt compliment (at work).	2.23	1.27		.69	.10	.29	.03	.10
17. Today, I helped someone (at work).	3.56	1.46		.64	.24	.02	.04	.10
18. Today, someone helped me (at work).	1.95	1.31		.59	.31	.00	.32	.12
6. Today, at work, someone gave me a heartfelt compliment.	1.89	1.29		.51	.27	.13	.30	.15
8. Today, at work, someone advised me in a good way.	2.07	1.33		.41	.16	.10	.08	.13
Achievement, recognition, and task-related uplifts			.90					
22. Today, I learned something new at work.	2.03	1.29		.06	.74	.17	.22	.02
14. Today, I did something new at work.	2.06	1.30		.22	.70	.30	.00	.00
19. Today, at work, I was involved in challenging tasks.	3.24	1.38		.21	.68	.16	.28	.21
16. Today, at work, I solved a complex problem/task.	2.01	1.35		.17	.62	.14	.24	.15
13. Today, I achieved a goal/target at work.	2.04	1.33		.30	.61	.02	.12	.33
21. Today, I finished a task/project at work.	2.07	1.38		.29	.60	.05	.15	.30
23. Today, I received positive feedback about my performance at work.	2.15	1.32		.16	.45	.20	.08	.14
15. Today, I was creative and had good ideas at work.	2.23	1.26		.21	.38	.19	.03	.01
24. Today, I received recognition for my work.	1.87	1.25		.25	.53	.04	.07	.19

(Table 3 continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	Factor				
				1	2	3	4	5
Humor and communication			.76					
1. Today, I had a nice time and laughed at work.	3.27	1.16		.08	.23	.80	.15	.09
2. Today, at work, people around me were smiling, laughing, and in a good mood.	3.58	1.02		.21	.11	.78	.02	.11
10. Today, I heard/read something funny at work.	3.40	1.31		.16	.15	.53	.23	.00
4. Today, I communicated effectively at work.	3.24	1.14		.26	.05	.53	.13	.22
Organizational uplifts			.74					
25. Today, there was an informal meeting in the company.	1.69	1.33		.10	.15	.19	.74	.04
12. Today, at work, I made a request and it was accepted.	1.77	1.27		.18	.26	.00	.57	.24
11. Today, I took an enjoyable break, at work.	3.37	1.28		.15	.27	.13	.45	.20
Time management and customer-related uplifts			<i>r</i> = .54					
20. Today, I had enough time to do my job.	3.41	1.38		.08	.19	.11	.07	.77
7. Today, someone was assertive to me at work.	2.23	1.26		.18	.23	.24	.19	.58

Note. Factor loadings above .35 are in bold.

Daily Uplifts Scale: Intensity

The factor analysis resulted in a five-factor solution, similar to the factor structure found in the daily uplifts frequency scale. This factor structure indicated no relevant cross-loadings and explained 53% of the variance (see Table 4). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.88, indicating that the data were appropriate for the analysis (Kaiser, 1974). The first factor (eigenvalue = 7.54) included seven items for *pleasant interpersonal interactions, helpfulness, and compliments* and explained 30% of the variance. The second factor, labeled *achievements and recognition* (eigenvalue = 1.69), explained 7% of the variance (five items). The third factor, labeled *organizational and task uplifts* (eigenvalue = 1.61), explained 6% of the variance (five items). The fourth factor, including four items for *humor and communication* (eigenvalue = 1.26), explained 5% of the variance. Finally, the fifth factor, called *time management and customer-related uplifts* (eigenvalue = 1.18), explained an additional 5% of the variance and comprised four items. The factor loadings of the items ranged from .37 to .79. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .53 to .78.

Daily Hassles Scale: Frequency

The factor analysis resulted in a five-factor solution, which indicated no relevant cross-loadings, and explained 55% of the variance (see Table 5). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.85, indicating that the data were appropriate for the analysis (Kaiser, 1974). The first factor, labeled *conflicts and unpleasant interpersonal interactions* (eigenvalue = 8.81), explained 35% of the variance and comprised six items. The second factor, named *time management and task-related hassles* (eigenvalue = 1.61) explained 7% of the variance (seven items). The third factor, including four items for *threats to self-efficacy*

TABLE 4
Study 1: Items, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and factor loadings of the daily uplifts intensity scale ($N = 445$)

Items	M	SD	α	Factor				
				1	2	3	4	5
Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments			.81					
17. Today, I helped someone (at work).	6.83	2.92		.78	.09	.13	.02	.06
9. Today, someone asked me for advice at work.	5.82	2.64		.70	.14	.03	.19	.06
18. Today, someone helped me (at work).	6.93	2.88		.70	.17	.15	.04	.07
6. Today, at work, someone gave me a heartfelt compliment.	5.36	2.84		.50	.23	.26	.24	.06
5. Today, I gave someone a heartfelt compliment (at work).	5.61	2.94		.46	.22	.14	.18	.18
8. Today, at work, someone advised me in a good way.	6.03	2.89		.41	.23	.23	.16	.07
3. Today, I was complimented at work.	6.88	2.96		.36	.13	.02	.17	.05
Achievement and recognition			.78					
24. Today, I received recognition for my work.	6.84	2.53		.28	.69	.21	.06	.04
13. Today, I achieved a goal/target at work.	6.47	3.09		.27	.64	.23	.05	.16
23. Today, I received positive feedback about my performance at work.	6.73	2.99		.22	.63	.23	.26	.07
21. Today, I finished a task/project at work.	5.73	3.00		.09	.61	.16	.06	.21
15. Today, I was creative and had good ideas at work.	6.82	2.79		.23	.54	.18	.25	.03
Organizational and task uplifts			.74					
22. Today, I learned something new at work.	6.22	2.96		.05	.23	.66	.03	.15
14. Today, I did something new at work.	6.43	2.81		.10	.24	.61	.16	.06
19. Today, I was involved in challenging tasks at work.	5.59	2.87		.13	.17	.60	.14	.05
16. Today, I solved a complex problem/task, at work.	6.06	2.92		.27	.18	.56	.05	.22
12. Today, at work, I made a request and it was accepted.	6.36	2.83		.27	.25	.47	.09	.19
Humor and communication			.63					
2. Today, at work, people around me were smiling, laughing, and in a good mood.	5.75	1.44		.02	.05	.24	.75	.08
1. Today, I had a nice time and laughed at work.	5.35	2.00		.07	.22	.18	.64	.12
10. Today, I heard/read something funny at work.	6.66	2.84		.23	.08	.07	.61	.11
4. Today, I communicated effectively at work.	5.09	1.83		.08	.14	.00	.58	.05
Time management and customer-related uplifts			.53					
20. Today, I had enough time to do my job.	5.65	2.02		.02	.29	.12	.06	.77
11. Today, I took an enjoyable break, at work.	6.81	2.74		.15	.07	.15	.14	.67
7. Today, someone was assertive to me, at work.	5.95	2.09		.21	.25	.11	.16	.40
25. Today, there was an informal meeting in the company.	6.01	2.73		.17	.10	.12	.11	.33

Note. Factor loadings above .35 are in bold.

and performance (eigenvalue = 1.24), explained 5% of the variance. The fourth factor, termed *failures, interruptions, and annoyances* (eigenvalue = 1.08), explained 4% of the variance and included four items. Finally, the fifth factor, labeled *organizational and leader-related hassles* (eigenvalue = 1.03), explained an additional 4%

of the variance (four items). The factor loadings of the items ranged from .44 to .80. Each dimension had good reliability. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .58 to .83 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

TABLE 5
Study 1: Items, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and factor loadings of the daily hassles frequency scale ($N = 445$)

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	Factor				
				1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts and unpleasant interactions				.83				
1. Today, at work, I had to deal with someone in a rotten mood.	2.27	0.62		.74	.10	.20	.17	.16
6. Today, at work, I had to deal with a “know-it-all”.	2.48	0.92		.66	.02	.14	.20	.21
12. Today, at work, there was too much conflict around me.	2.29	0.68		.63	.17	.20	.22	.21
30. Today, at work, I had to demonstrate emotions that I was not feeling.	3.65	1.09		.57	.24	.24	.07	.02
23. Today, at work, someone was rude to me.	1.27	0.62		.54	.00	.15	.22	.12
15. Today, at work, I could not talk with someone I needed to.	3.35	0.78		.43	.11	.20	.25	.23
Time management and task-related hassles				.81				
5. Today, at work, I took too long to start a task.	2.00	0.94		.08	.73	.01	.33	.01
4. Today, at work, unimportant tasks messed with my work.	2.25	1.18		.09	.68	.26	.10	.03
29. Today, at work, I got involved in unpleasant tasks.	3.22	1.19		.13	.67	.05	.07	.10
2. Today, at work, I had to wait around and waste time.	2.20	1.11		.19	.61	.27	.02	.06
11. Today, an apparently easy task cluttered up my day at work.	2.31	1.14		.07	.59	.13	.17	.25
21. Today, I had trouble prioritizing my work.	3.88	0.93		.23	.58	.29	.05	.10
28. Today, I had too many things to do at once.	3.94	1.35		.28	.53	.02	.14	.15
Threats to self-efficacy and performance				.68				
20. Today, I had a poor performance at work.	2.40	0.72		.05	.20	.69	.28	.04
7. Today, at work, I could not achieve my goals.	2.38	0.79		.19	.29	.67	.18	.10
9. Today, at work, I had difficulties communicating effectively.	1.60	0.81		.12	.08	.58	.07	.27
14. Today, at work, I made a silly mistake.	1.93	0.80		.13	.24	.44	.21	.01
Failures, interruptions, and annoyances				.69				
16. Today, someone in my team made a mistake.	1.66	1.10		.30	.25	.07	.66	.10
27. Today, I got late for work.	1.65	0.94		.03	.21	.29	.66	.03
17. Today, a task made me have to work overtime.	1.51	0.85		.26	.21	.22	.42	.21
10. Today, I was interrupted during a task.	3.47	0.81		.26	.28	.25	.34	.21
Organizational and leader-related hassles				.58				
26. Today, I worked too long without a break.	1.56	0.92		.08	.16	.13	.11	.81
25. Today, at work, there was too much noise around me.	2.67	0.98		.28	.07	.09	.29	.62
3. Today, stupid bureaucratic rules interfered with my work.	1.20	0.62		.18	.21	.28	.16	.49
24. Today, at work, I received orders about the way to do my job.	1.31	0.67		.11	.24	.14	.18	.37

Note. Factor loadings above .35 are in bold.

Daily Hassles Scale: Intensity

The factor analysis resulted in a four-factor solution, indicating no relevant cross-loadings, and explaining 41% of the variance (see Table 6). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.85, indicating that the data were appropriate for the analysis (Kaiser, 1974). The first factor, labeled *conflicts and unpleasant interpersonal interactions* (eigenvalue = 6.33), explained 25% of the variance and comprised six items. The second factor, named *time management, failures, and task-related hassles* (eigenvalue = 1.55) explained 6% of the variance (nine items). The third factor, including five items for *threats to self-efficacy and performance* (eigenvalue = 1.30), explained 5% of the variance. Finally, the fourth factor, labeled *organizational and leader-related hassles* (eigenvalue = 1.25) explained an additional 5% of the variance (five items). The factor loadings of the items ranged from .35 to .78. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .57 to .75.

Discussion

The results of Study 1 provide support for both frequency and intensity in the daily hassles and uplifts scales. Regarding the daily uplifts scale, the first factor, *pleasant interpersonal interactions, helpfulness, and compliments*, refers to agreeable situations or behaviors toward oneself or toward others by work colleagues, managers/supervisors, or customers; for instance, the act of giving and receiving help and compliments from someone at work (e.g., "Today, someone helped me at work"). The second factor, *achievements, recognition, and task-related uplifts*, refers to the involvement in interesting tasks, to the achievement of job-related targets or goals, and to receiving different forms of recognition or rewards for the work, for meeting targets, or performing a job to a high standard (e.g., "Today, at work, I was involved in challenging tasks"). The third factor, *humor and communication*, encompasses humor, friendly, assertive, supportive, and approachable behaviors (e.g., "Today, I had a nice time and laughed at work"). The fourth factor, *organizational uplifts*, refers to organizational policies and rules that promote the occurrence of minor pleasures, such as daily breaks, social meetings, or accepted requests (e.g., "Today, I took an enjoyable break, at work"). The fifth factor, *time management and customer-related uplifts*, refers to efficient time management of the daily tasks and to positive experiences involving well-mannered customers (e.g., "Today, I had enough time to do my job").

The first factor of the daily hassles scale, *conflicts and unpleasant interpersonal interactions*, relates to disagreeable behaviors or situations directed at the respondent or others by work colleagues, managers, supervisors, or customers. These events involve communication difficulties, aggressive communication, lack of empathy, and bad mood behaviors (e.g., "Today, at work, I had to deal with someone in a rotten mood"). The second factor, *time management and task-related hassles*, concerns difficulties in managing daily tasks and the involvement in routine, uninteresting, unwanted, and unchallenging tasks (e.g., "Today, at work, I took too long to start a task"). The third factor, *threats to self-efficacy and performance*, refers to personal difficulties or flaws that somehow threaten an individual's self-efficacy and negatively influence employees' behaviors, attitudes, and performance at work (e.g., "Today, I had a poor performance at work"). The fourth factor, *failures, interruption, and annoyances*, refers to events or conditions arising from work, that somehow disturb the individual's daily work (e.g., "Today, someone in my team made a mistake").

TABLE 6
Study 1: Items, means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and factor loadings of the daily hassles intensity scale ($N = 445$)

	Factor						
Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>α</i>	1	2	3	4
Conflicts and unpleasant interactions			.75				
6. Today, at work, I had to deal with a “know-it-all”.	0.82	1.42		.78	.01	.05	.14
1. Today, at work, I had to deal with someone in a rotten mood.	1.02	1.43		.70	.06	.10	.00
12. Today, at work, there was too much conflict around me.	0.58	1.23		.63	.15	.15	.13
23. Today, at work, someone was rude for me.	0.55	1.21		.60	.20	.21	.00
25. Today, at work, there was too much noise around me.	0.96	1.41		.51	.07	.08	.23
15. Today, at work, I could not talk with someone I needed to.	0.64	1.28		.43	.20	.23	.13
Time management, failures, and task-related hassles			.72				
2. Today, at work, I had to wait around and waste time.	1.23	1.44		.21	.73	.05	.00
11. Today, an apparently easy task cluttered up my day at work.	1.17	1.57		.15	.60	.20	.20
29. Today, at work, I got involved in unpleasant tasks.	1.11	1.53		.21	.59	.06	.00
4. Today, at work, unimportant tasks messed with my work.	1.09	1.45		.08	.58	.22	.22
5. Today, at work, I took too long to start a task.	1.46	1.59		.00	.55	.11	.29
16. Today, someone in my team made a mistake.	1.26	1.71		.23	.41	.23	.08
10. Today, I was interrupted during a task.	0.99	1.46		.25	.40	.07	.23
27. Today, I got late for work.	1.47	1.71		.01	.38	.24	.21
21. Today, I had trouble prioritizing my work.	1.09	1.45		.01	.38	.20	.18
Threats to self-efficacy and performance			.67				
20. Today, I had a poor performance at work.	0.77	1.25		.12	.14	.70	.04
7. Today, at work, I could not achieve my goals.	0.66	1.61		.12	.14	.65	.07
9. Today, at work, I had difficulties communicating effectively.	0.75	1.38		.21	.14	.56	.22
14. Today, at work, I made a silly mistake.	0.78	1.27		.14	.18	.55	.27
30. Today, at work, I had to demonstrate emotions that I was not feeling.	0.96	1.41		.23	.17	.43	.25
Organizational and leader-related hassles			.57				
26. Today, I worked too long without a break.	1.26	1.88		.10	.02	.15	.72
28. Today, I had too many things to do at once.	1.39	1.67		.22	.23	.02	.52
17. Today, a task made me have to work overtime.	0.96	1.63		.24	.18	.10	.31
24. Today, at work, I received orders about the way to do my job.	1.41	2.07		.05	.10	.06	.30
3. Today, stupid bureaucratic rules interfered with my work.	0.33	0.91		.13	.15	.12	.30

Note. Factor loadings above .35 are in bold.

We assessed for common method bias using the common latent factor (Williams, Cote, & Buckler, 1989). We performed a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), using R, with all the items. The model exhibited a very poor fit, which provided a good indication that a single factor did not account for most of the variance in our data ($\chi^2 = 5112.32$; $\chi^2/df = 12.59$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .19). The model explained 18.64% of the variance in the items.

It is important to replicate the factor structure of the scale in other independent samples to rule out the possibility that the factor structure is due to specific characteristics of the current sample. Therefore, Study 2 was aimed to cross-validate the factor structure of the SDHUW and subsequently to examine its convergent validity.

STUDY 2: CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS AND CONVERGENT VALIDITY OF THE SDHUW

In this study, we first examined whether the factor structure of the scales for daily hassles and uplifts can be reliably replicated in two new samples using CFAs. Regarding the scale of daily uplifts, we expected that the five-factor model (of frequency and intensity) would fit the data better than the four alternative models: a one-factor model, a two-factor model, a three-factor model, and a four-factor model (Hypothesis 1a and 1b). For the daily hassles frequency scale, we hypothesized that the five-factor model would fit the data better than the alternative models: a one-factor, a two-factor, a three-factor, and a four-factor model (Hypothesis 1c). And, for the daily hassles' intensity scale, we expected that the four-factor structure would show a better fit when compared to the one-dimension, bi-dimension, and three-factor structures (Hypothesis 1d). Second, we examined the convergent validity of the SDHUW. Based on the AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), we related the SDHUW to constructs such as affect and job satisfaction. So, we expected that daily hassles and uplifts would be closely related to negative and positive affect, respectively (Hypotheses 2a and 2b). We also hypothesized that daily events were related to job satisfaction and well-being (Graf et al., 2016) because each of these constructs is closely related to daily and general events (Hypothesis 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b).

Method

Participants and Procedure

We collected data in two new samples. For Sample 1, several organizations were contacted and they agreed to survey their employees on a voluntary basis. Employees received an email questionnaire asking them to engage in a study of events at work. The link to the questionnaire was provided in the email, the purpose of the study was explained, and anonymity was assured. The participants provided their informed consent.

These employees filled out the SDHUW and the scales for positive and negative affect, job satisfaction, and well-being. Out of the 300 questionnaires sent out, 233 were completed (78% response rate). Forty-nine percent of the participants in the sample were female. The average age was 32.55 ($SD = 11.93$). On average, they worked 9.45 years ($SD = 10.18$) for their current organizations. Most participants (67%) had a high school degree. They worked in diverse work sectors: 39% in services, 36% in education, and 25% in retail.

For Sample 2, we gathered data through a snowball sample, using the researchers' social networks. Participants were invited by email to participate in this study. The link to the questionnaire was included in the email, the purpose of the study was explained, and anonymity assured. These employees filled out the same measures as those in Sample 1. Out of the 200 emails sent out with the link to the questionnaire, 147 were answered (74% response rate). In this sample, gender was almost equally distributed (51.7% female). The average age of the participants was 22.53 ($SD = 6.92$). On average, they worked 2.68

years in their current organizations ($SD = 4.71$). Most participants had a high school degree (68%) and 18% had a university degree. They worked in services (45%), education (37%), and retail (18%).

Measures

Affective daily events were measured by using the scale reported in Study 1.

Affect was measured by using the General Job-Related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS; Van Katwyk, Spector, Fox, & Kelloway, 2000). This includes 20 items answered on a five-point scale (1 = *never*, 5 = *too often*). The alpha coefficient for this measure ranged between .85 to .88 (across samples).

Subjective well-being was measured by the five items of the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). One item example is “In most ways, my life is close to my ideal.” Items were scored on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). The Cronbach’s alpha was .84 (Sample 1) and .89 (Sample 2).

Job satisfaction was measured through a single item (“Overall, how satisfied are you with your work?”) answered on a 7-point scale (1 = *totally unsatisfied*, 7 = *totally satisfied*) (Wanous & Lawler, 1972).

Analysis

To test Hypotheses 1a to 1d, we performed multigroup CFA using the R software. To assess the model fit, we used four indices: the chi-square/ df ratio (χ^2/df), the Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), the comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA). The chi-square/ df ratio provides information about how closely the model fit gets to the standard. Generally, values below 3 indicate a good model fit (Kline, 1998). As a rule of thumb, a CFI and TLI of $> .90$ and RMSEA of $< .08$ indicate a reasonable fit of the model to the data (Byrne, 2001). We compared the predicted factor model fit with the fit of the alternative models by testing the change in χ^2 and CFI across models. The results of the multigroup analysis regarding the goodness-of-fit indices of the models are presented in Tables 7 to 10.

Initially, we found a moderate fit of the hypothesized models. To pinpoint possible areas of misfit, modification indices were examined. Based on that and on theoretical considerations, the initially hypothesized models were re-specified with these parameters freely estimated, and we allowed the correlations between the errors of the items. This improved the hypothesized models considerably.

We assessed for common method bias by using the common latent factor (Williams, Cote, & Buckler, 1989), which involves a multigroup CFA in which all variables were loaded into one general factor. The model exhibited a very poor fit, which provided a good indication that a single factor did not account for most of the variance in our data ($\chi^2 = 6545.99$; $\chi^2/df = 16.12$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .18). The model explained 22.68% of the variance in the items. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Podsakoff (2012) argued that common method bias does not appear to have a significant impact on a cross-sectional study when the amount of the variance in the items explained by the method factor is equal to or below the average amount of method variance in self-reported research (25%). Therefore, common method bias should have no significant effect on the data.

Results

Daily Uplifts Scale: Frequency

We improved the fit of the five-factor model by correlating the items of the pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments dimension with the items of the humor and communication dimension, and the items of the achievement, recognition, and task-related uplifts dimension with the items of the time management and customer-related uplifts dimension.

The fit of the five-factor model was significantly and substantially better than that of the four-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 711.48$, $\Delta df = 88$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .14$), the three-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 599.31$, $\Delta df = 48$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .14$), the two-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 899.52$, $\Delta df = 98$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .17$), and a one-factor model in which all items were supposed to load on one general factor ($\Delta\chi^2 = 1035.32$, $\Delta df = 100$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .20$).

Hence, Hypothesis 1a was supported. So, the five-factor model adequately represented the observed data. The goodness-of-fit indices of the model were $CFI = .93$ and $RMSEA = .04$ which supports the acceptability of the fit (Bollen, 1989) (Table 7). The χ^2/df was also smaller than 3 for the five-factor model, indicating a good fit. Moreover, all items loaded significantly on the latent variables, with coefficients ranging from .50 to .92 (with all $ps < .001$).

TABLE 7
Study 2: Multigroup CFA and invariance test of the daily uplifts frequency scale ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
One-factor model	1902.56	550	3.45	.73	.71	.07
Two-factor model	1766.76	548	3.22	.76	.73	.06
Three-factor model	1466.55	498	2.94	.79	.78	.06
Four-factor model	1578.72	538	2.93	.79	.77	.05
Five-factor model	867.24	450	1.92	.93	.91	.04

Note. Absolute index: χ^2/df = normed chi-square. Relative indices: CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index. Fit index for comparing non-nested models: RMSEA = root mean squared error of approximation.

Daily Uplifts Scale: Intensity

We improved the fit of the five-factor model by correlating the items of the pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments dimension with the items of the humor and communication dimension, and the items of the achievement and recognition dimension with the items of the organizational and task uplifts and time management and customer-related uplifts dimension.

The fit of the five-factor model was significantly and substantially better than that of the four-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 727.78$, $\Delta df = 162$, $p < .05$, $\Delta CFI = .20$), the three-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 771.14$, $\Delta df = 168$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .21$), the two-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 847.50$, $\Delta df = 172$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .23$), and a one-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 995.91$, $\Delta df = 174$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .27$). The five-factor model adequately represented the observed data, and Hypothesis 1b was supported (Table 8). The goodness-of-fit indices of the model were $CFI = .94$ and $RMSEA = .04$, supporting the acceptability of the fit (Bollen, 1989). Moreover, all items loaded significantly on the latent variables, with coefficients ranging from .45 to .85 (all $ps < .001$).

TABLE 8
Study 2: Multigroup CFA and invariance test of the daily uplifts intensity scale ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
One-factor model	1751.59	598	2.92	.67	.64	.07
Two-factor model	1603.18	596	2.68	.71	.68	.07
Three-factor model	1527.08	592	2.65	.73	.70	.06
Four-factor model	1483.46	586	2.53	.74	.71	.05
Five-factor model	755.68	424	1.78	.94	.92	.04

Note. Absolute index: χ^2/df = normed chi-square. Relative indices: CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index. Fit index for comparing non-nested models: RMSEA = root mean squared error of approximation.

Daily Hassles Scale: Frequency

We improved the fit of the five-factor model by correlating the items of the conflicts and unpleasant interactions dimension with the items of the failures, interruptions, and annoyances dimension, the items of the threats to self-efficacy and performance dimension with the items of the organizational and leader-related hassles and of time management and task-related hassles dimension, and finally the items of the failures, interruptions, and annoyances dimension with the items of threats to self-efficacy and performance dimension.

The fit of the five-factor model was significantly and substantially better than that of the four-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 256.19$, $\Delta df = 104$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .15$), the three-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 270.79$, $\Delta df = 90$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .15$), the two-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 193.72$, $\Delta df = 132$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .16$), and a one-factor model in which all items were supposed to load on one general factor ($\Delta\chi^2 = 260.19$, $\Delta df = 130$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .18$). Hence, Hypothesis 1c was supported. Thus, the five-factor model adequately represented the observed data. The goodness-of-fit indices of the model were CFI = .89 and RMSEA = .04 supporting the acceptability of the fit (Bollen, 1989). The χ^2/df was 2.06 for the five-factor model, indicating a good fit (Table 9). Moreover, all items loaded significantly on the latent variables, with coefficients ranging from .38 to .73 (with all $ps < .001$). We also tested a six-factor model. However, the fit indices were not better than those of the five-factor model.

TABLE 9
Study 2: Multigroup CFA and invariance test of the daily hassles frequency scale ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
One-factor model	1570.84	504	3.11	.71	.69	.08
Two-factor model	1504.37	502	2.99	.73	.70	.07
Three-factor model	1581.44	544	2.91	.74	.71	.05
Four-factor model	1566.84	538	2.91	.74	.71	.05
Five-factor model	1310.65	634	2.06	.89	.85	.04

Note. Absolute index: χ^2/df = normed chi-square. Relative indices: CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index. Fit index for comparing non-nested models: RMSEA = root mean squared error of approximation.

Daily Hassles Scale: Intensity

We improved the fit of the four-factor model by correlating the items of the conflicts and unpleasant interactions dimension with the items of the time management, failures, and task-related hassles dimension; the items of the threats to self-efficacy and performance dimension with the items of the organizational and leader-related hassles, and of the time management, failures, and task-related hassles dimension.

The fit of the four-factor model was significantly and substantially better than that of the three-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 92$, $\Delta df = 38$, $p < .001$; $\Delta CFI = .17$), the two-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 137.09$, $\Delta df = 34$, $p < .01$; $\Delta CFI = .19$), and a one-factor model ($\Delta\chi^2 = 192.81$, $\Delta df = 32$, $p < .05$; $\Delta CFI = .20$). Thus, the four-factor model adequately represented the observed data, and Hypothesis 1d was supported. The goodness-of-fit indices of the model were CFI = .93 and RMSEA = .05 supporting the acceptability of the fit (Bollen, 1989). The χ^2/df was below 2 for the four-factor structure, indicating a good fit (Table 10). Moreover, all items loaded significantly on the latent variables, with coefficients ranging from .40 to .83 (with all $ps < .001$). We also tested a five-factor model, but the fit indices were not better than those of the four-factor model.

TABLE 10
Study 2: Multigroup CFA and invariance test of the daily hassles intensity scale ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
One-factor model	1192.51	550	2.16	.73	.70	.07
Two-factor model	1136.79	548	2.07	.74	.72	.07
Three-factor model	1091.98	544	2.00	.76	.74	.06
Four-factor model	999.70	582	1.718	.93	.90	.05

Note. Absolute index: χ^2/df = normed chi-square. Relative indices: CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index. Fit index for comparing non-nested models: RMSEA = root mean squared error of approximation.

Convergent Validity

Results regarding the convergent validity are based on partial correlations. We calculated it for each sample separately. The results are shown in Tables 11 to 14.

In Hypothesis 2a, we predicted that daily uplifts would be positively related to positive affect, and negatively related to negative affect. We found significant positive correlations between daily uplifts (frequency and intensity) and positive affect ($.27 > r < .35$, $p < .05$), as well as with all its dimensions ($.12 > r < .39$, $p < .05$) and positive affect. Likewise, we found significant negative relations between daily uplifts (frequency and intensity) and negative affect ($-.10 > r < -.19$, $p < .05$) (see Tables 11 and 12). We also found significant relations with all its dimensions and negative affect ($-.11 > r < -.29$, $p < .01$). So, Hypothesis 2a was corroborated by the data.

In Hypothesis 2b, we expected that the daily hassles would be positively related to negative affect, and negatively related to positive affect. Daily hassles (frequency and intensity) were significantly and positively related to negative affect ($.20 > r < .28$, $p < .05$), and negatively related to positive affect ($-.14 > r < -.21$, $p < .05$). Moreover, all its dimensions presented significant and positive associations with negative affect ($.14 > r < .30$, $p < .05$) and negative correlations with positive affect ($-.12 > r < -.24$, $p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2b was supported (see Tables 13 and 14).

We also predicted that the four daily uplifts dimensions would be positively related to job satisfaction (Hypothesis 3a) and well-being (Hypothesis 4a). Results demonstrated significant and positive correlations between daily uplifts (frequency and intensity) with job satisfaction ($.15 > r < .25, p < .05$) and well-being ($.19 > r < .28, p < .05$), in both samples. We also found significant and positive relations with all daily uplifts dimensions and job satisfaction ($.13 > r < .30, p < .05$) and well-being ($.13 > r < .28, p < .05$). Thus, Hypotheses 3a and 4a were supported.

We expected that daily hassles would be negatively associated to job satisfaction (Hypothesis 3b) and well-being (Hypothesis 4b). We found significant negative correlations between daily hassles and job satisfaction ($-.12 > r < -.19, p < .05$) and well-being ($-.13 > r < -.17, p < .05$), in both samples. Also, all the daily hassles dimensions were significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction ($-.12 > r < -.25, p < .05$) and well-being ($-.12 > r < -.24, p < .05$), supporting Hypotheses 3b and 4b.

Discussion

The main goal of Study 2 was to examine whether we could replicate the five-factor structure of the daily uplifts scale and the daily hassles scale of Study 1 in two new samples. Through CFA we found that the five-factor model for the daily uplifts scale is the best fit to the data compared to the other models (one-factor, two-factor, three-factor, and four-factor models). Moreover, the five-factor model for the daily hassles scale showed the best fit to the data, when compared to the other models analyzed (one-factor, two-factor, three-factor, and four-factor models). All the daily hassles and uplifts dimensions showed significant correlations with each other (in the expected direction). We expected the existence of correlations among all the dimensions of daily events in the work environment, because each dimension may promote conditions for the occurrence of other kinds of events, which at some point could lead to an increase in the number of daily events.

Study 2 also envisaged examining the convergent validity of the SDHUW. We examined the daily hassles scale and the uplifts scale separately. All daily uplifts dimensions correlated positively with positive affect, job satisfaction, and well-being and negatively with negative affect. Employees who experience daily uplifts tend to be more satisfied with their jobs and their lives. So, these results are in line with what is predicted by the AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996).

On the other hand, all daily hassles dimensions correlated positively with negative affect, thus supporting the assertion that daily hassles stimulate negative affect in the workplace (Ohly & Schmitt, 2015; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Accordingly, employees who reported daily hassles in the workplace were more likely to experience negative affect and less likely to experience positive affect.

Furthermore, all daily hassles dimensions correlated negatively with job satisfaction and well-being, and this pattern was consistent across samples. Employees who frequently face daily hassles may be more likely to experience negative affect in the workplace which, in turn, may decrease their job satisfaction and well-being.

These results are in line with the AET, which posits that an affective reaction to work events directly influences job satisfaction. In addition, empirical evidence has also demonstrated that hassles provoke negative affect, and, therefore, decrease individuals' well-being (e.g., Wegge et al., 2006).

TABLE 11

Study 2: Correlations and Cronbach's alphas (between brackets on the diagonal) among daily uplifts frequency dimensions and affect, job satisfaction, and well-being ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments	(.86) (.88)								
2. Task, achievements, and recognition	.75** .54**	(.90) (.89)							
3. Organizational uplifts	.57** .53**	.58** .55**	(.64) (.69)						
4. Humor and communication	.52** .42**	.54** .51**	.42** .35**	(.76) (.79)					
5. Time management and customer uplifts	.46** .41**	.53** .45**	.38** .33**	.49** .44**	(.55) (.60)				
6. Positive affect	.28** .23**	.29** .27**	.19** .13*	.15* .28**	.14* .14*	(.88) (.90)			
7. Negative affect	-.12* -.20**	-.24** -.15*	-.14* -.15*	-.17* -.15*	-.18* -.13*	-.36** -.42**	(.88) (.85)		
8. Job satisfaction	.16* .20**	.21** .21**	.14* .15*	.23** .30**	.18** .23**	.28** .32**	-.22** -.24**	- -	
9. Well-being	.23** .18*	.21** .27**	.13* .15*	.23** .24**	.21** .22**	.33** .34**	-.25** -.22**	.25** .27**	(.83) (.89)

Note. The first row in each cell refers to Sample 1 ($N = 233$); the second row refers to Sample 2 ($N = 147$).

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 12
Study 2: Correlations and Cronbach's alphas (between brackets on the diagonal) among daily uplifts intensity dimensions and affect, job satisfaction, and well-being ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments	(.81) (.85)				
2. Recognition and achievement	.65** .61**	(.80) (.79)			
3. Organizational and task uplifts	.54** .51**	.64** .53**	(.74) (.73)		
4. Humor and communication	.47** .43**	.43** .38**	.45** .40**	(.64) (.63)	
5. Time management and customer uplifts	.47** .39**	.42** .35**	.45** .40**	.41** .42**	(.55) (.54)
6. Positive affect	.28** .25**	.24** .40**	.26** .35**	.19* .18*	.16* .17*
7. Negative affect	-.12* -.20**	-.24** -.24**	-.18* -.15*	-.13* -.12*	-.14* -.13*
8. Job satisfaction	.16* .25**	.26** .24**	.25** .20**	.27** .16*	.16* .16*
9. Well-being	.25** .17*	.28** .26**	.17* .29**	.27** .25**	.14* .21**

Note. The first row in each cell refers to Sample 1 ($N = 233$); the second row refers to Sample 2 ($N=147$).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 13
Study 2: Correlations and Cronbach's alphas (between brackets on the diagonal) among daily hassles frequency dimensions and affect, job satisfaction, and well-being ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Conflicts and unpleasant interactions	(.83) (.82)				
2. Time management and task hassles	.61** .54**	(.81) (.80)			
3. Threats to self-efficacy and performance	.61** .52**	.61** .55**	(.70) (.68)		
4. Failures and interruptions	.65** .60**	.61** .56**	.60** .52**	(.70) (.69)	
5. Organizational and leader hassles	.56** .53**	.52** .55**	.47** .48**	.52** .51**	(.60) (.59)
6. Positive affect	-.16* -.18*	-.16* -.18*	-.14* -.15*	-.22* -.18*	-.13* -.22**
7. Negative affect	.30** .30**	.25** .19*	.26** .30**	.18* .18*	.15* .18*
8. Job satisfaction	-.15* -.14*	-.25** -.21**	-.16* -.16*	-.11* -.14*	.12* .14*
9. Well-being	-.19** -.21**	-.25** -.21**	-.14* -.16*	-.12* -.14*	-.13* -.14*

Note. The first row in each cell refers to Sample 1 ($N = 233$); the second row refers to Sample 2 ($N=147$).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 14
Study 2: Correlations and Cronbach's alphas (between brackets on the diagonal) among daily hassles intensity dimensions and affect, job satisfaction, and well-being ($N = 233$ and $N = 147$)

	1	2	3	4
1. Threats to self-efficacy and performance	(.70) (.68)			
2. Conflicts and unpleasant interactions	.48** .54**	(.75) (.74)		
3. Time management, failures, and task hassles	.53** .55**	.50** .45**	(.73) (.71)	
4. Organizational and leader hassles	.47** .66**	.51** .46**	.52** .51**	(.60) (.59)
5. Positive affect	-.13* -.16*	-.25** -.20**	-.18* -.14*	-.17* -.13*
6. Negative affect	.24** .23**	.16* .21*	.21* .15*	.14* .14*
7. Job satisfaction	-.16* -.14*	-.18* -.23**	-.16* -.16*	-.23** -.14*
8. Well-being	-.12* -.15*	-.20** -.14*	-.13* -.15*	-.14* -.21**

Note. The first row in each cell refers to Sample 1 ($N = 233$); the second row to Sample 2 ($N = 147$).
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

STUDY 3: THE DHUSW AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH WORK ATTITUDES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES

The third study aimed to examine whether the SDHUW would be related to work attitudes (work engagement and job crafting) and three negative psychological states (stress, anxiety, and depression). The hypothesis that work engagement is expected to be an outcome of affective daily events is based on the findings that positive affect predicts high levels of work engagement (Bakker, Vergel, & Kuntze, 2015). Work engagement is a positive, active, affective state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Bakker, 2009; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Engaged employees feel connected to their work (Kahn, 1990) and are highly energetic individuals with high self-efficacy, who exercise influence over events that affect their lives (Bakker, 2009). Thus, engaged employees may tend to devalue daily hassles and overestimate daily uplifts. We, therefore, hypothesized a positive relationship of engagement with the four daily uplifts dimensions (Hypothesis 1a) and a negative association with the four daily hassles dimensions (Hypothesis 1b).

The second outcome that we focused on is job crafting. Job crafting has been defined as self-initiated behavioral changes that employees engage in to align their jobs with their preferences, motives, and passions (Berg & Dutton, 2008; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). Accordingly, employees may alter aspects of their tasks, such as their number or content. They may also change aspects regarding the relationships they have at work, such as the amount and intensity of contact they have with colleagues. Lastly, to enhance the meaning of their work, employees may change their cognitions regarding aspects of their jobs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Fried, Grant, Levi, Hadani, & Slowik, (2007) proposed that when there is a positive affect, that is when employees enjoy more frequent daily uplifts, they may be more likely to craft jobs. On the other hand, in jobs where hassles are frequent, the tendency for employees to craft their jobs may decrease (Petrou, Demerouti, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Hetland, 2012). We, therefore, hypothesized that

the relationship between job crafting and the five daily uplifts dimensions is positive (Hypothesis 2a) and that there is a negative association with the five daily hassles dimensions (Hypothesis 2b).

Finally, we examined how affective daily events relate to negative psychological symptoms: depression, anxiety, and stress. Several studies showed that the frequency of negative daily events predicts high levels of stress, anxiety, and depression (Kanner, et al., 1981; Nezlek & Gable, 2001). In contrast, other studies showed that the frequency and intensity of positive events may minimize the likelihood of high levels of such negative psychological states (Bylsma, Taylor-Clift, & Rottenberg, 2011). Therefore, we predicted that daily uplifts would be related negatively to such negative psychological states (Hypothesis 3a) and that daily hassles would be positively associated to those states (Hypothesis 3b).

Method

Participants and Procedure

We invited several organizations from diverse work sectors (education, retail, and services) to participate in this study. We talked to the human resources department of the organizations and asked some of their employees to participate by sending them an e-mail with information about a study on well-being at work. Those who agreed to participate received more specific information and were asked to give their informed consent and complete a general questionnaire with socio-demographic information and scales to measure affective daily events, work engagement, job crafting, and negative psychological states. Out of the 350 emails sent, we obtained 270 answers (77% response rate) (146 women and 124 men). The mean age was 33.52 ($SD = 12.43$). Participants worked, on average, 3.62 ($SD = 5.48$) years for their current organizations; 71% of the participants had a high school degree. Participants worked in diverse work sectors: 36% in education, 32% in finance, and 32% in retail.

Measures

Affective daily events: we used the SDHUW. All daily hassles and uplifts reliabilities and correlations of both measures are presented in Tables 15 to 18.

Work engagement was assessed using the short form of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). The scale includes nine items distributed across the following three underlying dimensions of engagement: vigor (three items; e.g., “Last week, at my job, I felt strong and vigorous”), dedication (three items; e.g., “Last week, I was enthusiastic about my job”), and absorption (three items; e.g., “Last week, I felt happy when I was working intensely”). Each item was rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*). In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha of the composite scale was .92.

Job crafting was measured using the 21-item Job Crafting Scale (JCS; Tims et al., 2012). Answers were given on a 5-point frequency scale regarding the previous week (1 = *never*, 5 = *often*). An example item is “Last week, I tried to learn new things at work.” Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .77.

Negative psychological symptoms were assessed using the Depression Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS; Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995). It is a 21-item self-report measure of anxiety, depression, and stress. Each subscale comprises seven items answered on a 4-point scale of frequency related to the previ-

ous week (1 = *did not apply to me at all*, 4 = *applied to me very much, or most of the time*). An example item is “Last week, I was aware of my mouth being dry.” Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .90.

Analysis

To test all the hypotheses, we calculated partial correlations to control for age and educational level. We decided to control for gender and educational level once there was evidence that the participant’s gender may influence the affective experiences reported. The belief that women are more emotional than men is one of the strongest gender stereotypes (e.g., Shields & Shields, 2002). There is also evidence of differences between educational level in diverse affective-related outcomes (e.g., emotional expression) (Fong Lam, Chen, Zhang, & Liang, 2015).

We assessed for common method bias using the common latent factor (Williams, Cote, & Buckler, 1989). We performed a CFA with all variables loading on one general factor. The model exhibited a very poor fit, which provided a good indication that a single factor did not account for most of the variance in our data ($\chi^2 = 5567.79$; $\chi^2/df = 13.71$; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .19). The model explained 19.94% of the variance in the items. The results indicated no influence of common method bias.

Results

Hypothesis 1 predicted that the daily uplifts dimensions (frequency and intensity) would be significantly and positively related to work engagement (Hypothesis 1a) and that the daily hassles dimensions (frequency and intensity) would be significantly and negatively correlated to work engagement (Hypothesis 1b). The results showed that all the daily uplifts dimensions correlated significantly with work engagement (see Table 15), ranging from .11 to .37 ($ps < .05$). Besides, all the daily hassles dimensions evidenced significant negative correlations with work engagement, ranging from $-.10$ to $-.25$ ($ps < .05$). Thus, we found support for Hypotheses 1a and 1b.

In relation to Hypothesis 2, the results showed significant and positive correlations between daily uplifts dimensions (frequency and intensity) and job crafting. The correlations ranged from .11 to .22 ($ps < .05$) and supported Hypothesis 2a. Moreover, we found significant and negative relations between daily hassles dimensions (frequency and intensity) and job crafting ($-.11 > r < -.22$, $p < .05$). Thus, Hypothesis 2b was supported by the data.

Finally, Hypothesis 3a stated that daily uplifts dimensions (frequency and intensity) would correlate negatively with depression, anxiety, and stress. The results showed that all the daily uplifts dimensions correlated significantly and negatively with the three psychological symptoms (depression: $-.10 > r < -.57$; anxiety: $-.10 > r < -.47$; stress: $-.10 > r < -.42$; $ps < .05$), except the time management and customers’ uplifts dimension. Both frequency and intensity dimensions presented negative, but nonsignificant, associations ($p > .05$).

Moreover, we predicted significant positive correlations between the daily hassles dimensions and the negative psychological symptoms. The results showed that daily hassles dimensions (frequency and intensity) correlated positively and significantly with depression, anxiety, and stress. For depression, the correlations varied between .12 and .48 ($p < .05$); for anxiety, it ranged between .11 and .55 ($p < .05$); and for stress, it ranged between .26 and .57 ($p < .05$). Thus, we found support for Hypothesis 3b.

TABLE 15

Study 3: Correlations between daily uplifts frequency dimensions and work engagement, job crafting, and negative psychological states ($N = 270$)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments	(.86)									
2. Task, achievements, and recognition	.55**	(.90)								
3. Organizational uplifts	.57**	.58**	(.74)							
4. Humor and communication	.52**	.54**	.42**	(.76)						
5. Time management and customer uplifts	.46**	.53**	.38**	.49**	(.54)					
6. Work engagement	.36**	.37**	.12*	.15*	.11*	(.92)				
7. Job crafting	.19**	.14*	.22**	.20**	.17*	.43**	(.77)			
8. Depression	-.46**	-.11*	-.11*	-.33**	<i>ns</i>	-.40**	-.29**	(.88)		
9. Anxiety	-.26**	-.10*	-.14*	-.18*	<i>ns</i>	-.53**	-.31**	.62**	(.85)	
10. Stress	-.42**	-.21*	-.11*	-.33**	<i>ns</i>	-.49**	-.24**	.58**	.74**	(.87)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 16
Study 3: Correlations between daily uplifts intensity dimensions and work engagement, job crafting, and negative psychological states ($N = 270$)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Pleasant interactions, helpfulness, and compliments	(.81)				
2. Recognition and achievement	.65**	(.79)			
3. Organizational and task uplifts	.54**	.64**	(.74)		
4. Humor and communication	.47**	.43**	.45**	(.67)	
5. Time management and customer uplifts	.47**	.42**	.45**	.41**	(.54)
6. Work engagement	.32**	.34**	.27**	.17**	.12*
7. Job crafting	.22**	.22**	.13*	.11*	.17**
8. Depression	-.57**	-.15*	-.10*	-.47**	ns
9. Anxiety	-.41**	-.16*	-.11*	-.47**	ns
10. Stress	-.40**	-.14*	-.11*	-.41**	ns

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 17
Study 3: Correlations between daily hassles frequency dimensions and work engagement, job crafting, and negative psychological states ($N = 270$)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Conflicts and unpleasant interactions	(.84)				
2. Time management and task hassles	.61**	(.81)			
3. Threats to self-efficacy and performance	.62**	.61**	(.70)		
4. Failures and interruptions	.65**	.62**	.60**	(.69)	
5. Organizational and leader hassles	.56**	.52**	.47**	.52**	(.58)
6. Work engagement	-.21**	-.14*	-.10*	-.13*	-.23**
7. Job crafting	-.20**	-.17**	-.12*	-.11*	-.19**
8. Depression	.48**	.16*	.18*	.23**	.44**
9. Anxiety	.41**	.11*	.14*	.13*	.55**
10. Stress	.49**	.34**	.34**	.28**	.57**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Discussion

In Study 3, we examined the correlations of the affective daily events scale with diverse outcomes, namely, work engagement, job crafting, and psychological symptoms. Overall, we can conclude that daily uplifts dimensions are significantly and positively related with work engagement and job crafting. This finding may imply that the frequency and intensity experienced by daily uplifts at work increase work engagement and the tendency to craft the job. Daily uplifts trigger positive affect, as stated by the AET and in line with Study 2. The experience of positive affect may lead employees to be more engaged with and to craft their jobs. For instance, receiving some reward or recognition for one's work may lead employees to be more absorbed with their tasks and to increase social and structural job resources, or to decrease hindering job demands.

TABLE 18
Study 3: Correlations between daily hassles intensity dimensions and work engagement, job crafting, and negative psychological states ($N = 270$)

	1	2	3	4
1. Threats to self-efficacy and performance	(.68)			
2. Conflicts and unpleasant interactions	.49**	(.75)		
3. Time management, failures, and task hassles	.53**	.51**	(.73)	
4. Organizational and leader hassles	.47**	.51**	.47**	(.60)
5. Work engagement	-.10*	-.18**	-.11*	-.25**
6. Job crafting	-.19**	-.22**	-.13*	-.21**
7. Depression	.20**	.46**	.12*	.31**
8. Anxiety	.15*	.44**	.13*	.53**
9. Stress	.29**	.44**	.26**	.37**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Additionally, the daily uplifts dimensions showed different patterns of correlation with negative psychological symptoms. The frequency and intensity dimensions of time management and customer's uplifts showed a nonsignificant relation with depression, anxiety, and stress. This may be due to the low intensity of these uplifts. And, as such, it might have mitigated its effect on negative psychological symptoms. All the remaining dimensions appear to be significantly related to the three psychological symptoms. These results may mean that the experience of some types of daily uplifts may lead to lower levels of stress, anxiety, or depression. For instance, a helpful climate among co-workers may decrease the likelihood of high levels of stress, anxiety, and even depression in the workplace.

All of the daily hassles dimensions correlated negatively with work engagement and job crafting, which suggests that the negative affect, stimulated by such daily hassles, decreases work engagement or job craft behaviors. In addition, all the dimensions of daily hassles showed significant and positive associations with depression, anxiety, and stress. Thus, we may infer that daily hassles affect employees' behaviors at and toward work, for instance, decreasing dedication to the tasks, or structural or social resources to perform it. Notwithstanding, daily hassles, such as interpersonal conflicts at work, appear to increase the likelihood of an employee suffering symptoms of depression, anxiety, or stress.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Several scholars (e.g., Larsson, Berglund, & Ohlsson, 2016; Ohly & Schmitt, 2015) recognized that daily events at work are an important area for research and practice in organizational behavior. The importance of daily events at work has been recognized (Beauregard, 2014) and there has been an increased emphasis on understanding the link between such experiences and any consequent affect that might influence diverse outcomes in organizational life. However, to our knowledge, no general measure of affective daily events at work exists that can be used in diary designs.

The newly developed and validated scale for daily hassles and uplifts at work (SDHUW) may help researchers to empirically examine these happenings more often and to gain further knowledge about their antecedents and consequences.

The SDHUW

The present series of studies has shown that the SDHUW is a reliable instrument consisting of two scales: the daily hassles scale and the daily uplifts scale. Both scales performed well regarding the structural and psychometric properties across the three studies. In particular, the scales evidenced an invariant factor solution, high reliability, and convergent validity.

The daily uplifts consist of five dimensions: achievement, recognition, and task-related uplifts; pleasant interpersonal interactions, helpfulness, and compliments; humor and communication; time management and customer-related uplifts; and organizational uplifts. The daily hassles scale comprises five dimensions: conflicts and unpleasant interpersonal interactions; threats to self-efficacy and performance; time management and task-related hassles; failures, interruptions, and annoyances; and organizational and leader-related hassles.

The five daily uplifts dimensions evidenced substantially positive relationships with positive affect, job satisfaction, and well-being, and a negative relationship with negative affect. The five daily hassles dimensions presented substantially negative relationships with positive affect, job satisfaction, and well-being, and a positive relationship with negative affect. Thus, these results are indicative of convergent validity. Moreover, these results are in line with the AET (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), which states that unpleasant affective experiences (hassles) are negatively related to job satisfaction, whereas pleasant affective experiences (uplifts) are positively related to job satisfaction. These results are further supported by the relationship between hassles/uplifts and well-being.

In addition, correlations with diverse outcome variables showed that employees who experienced daily uplifts in the workplace were more likely to be engaged, to craft their jobs, and to have fewer symptoms of depression, anxiety, and stress. On the other hand, results indicated that the daily hassles dimensions were significantly correlated to lower levels of work engagement and job crafting, and higher levels of depression, anxiety, and stress.

The pattern we found in our studies suggests that employees who evidenced high levels of daily hassles were less likely to be satisfied with their jobs, less likely to be engaged, or to increase their job resources and challenging job demands. Conversely, they were more likely to disengage from their work and to suffer from negative psychological symptoms, such as stress. In contrast, the pattern we found for daily uplifts was different. Employees who experienced a high number of daily uplifts were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and lives, to increase their job resources and challenging job demands, and less likely to disengage from work, or to suffer from stress, anxiety, or depression.

Further research is needed to examine the occurrence and type of daily hassles and uplifts at work and the possible consequences of such events for individual employees and the organization at large.

Limitations and Future Research

The three studies, however, have several limitations that need to be addressed. First, two dimensions present poor reliability. In particular, organizational and leader-related hassles dimension showed a poor Cronbach's alpha in both daily hassles frequency and intensity scales. The same was true for the intensity subscale of the time management and customer-related uplifts dimension. This result is probably due to the low frequency of this kind of events reported by the participants in this study. As such, careful attention should be given to these dimensions in future studies.

On the other hand, although we assessed the common method bias by using the unmeasured method factor technique as suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2012), other designs should be considered in future studies. The use of cross-sectional data does not allow for cause-and-effect inferences. Reversed causality is possible for the relationships between, for example, daily events and job satisfaction or well-being. Daily events may be a consequence of being happy at work, because a happy worker may promote conditions conducive to more daily uplifts and fewer daily hassles. However, the goal of this research was not to establish the causal relationships of affective daily events with these studies, but to develop a psychometrically-sound scale to measure it, and to relate it to other constructs relevant to organizational life. Further studies should investigate the psychometric properties of the SDHUW within a daily design and in relation to other constructs (e.g., burnout).

We did not test for discriminant and incremental validity because other measures great length would threaten the reliability of participants' answers. Therefore, discriminant and incremental validity should be tested in future studies. Another limitation is that our results may not be tailored to specific working populations given that they were conceived for different work settings. This means that replications should be conducted in specific professional contexts.

Implications for Organizational Research and Practice

By providing a generic, reliable, and valid scale to measure affective daily events, we hope to encourage the study of affective experiences in the workplace. Job designs may increase the frequency of daily uplifts and decrease the experience of daily hassles in the workplace.

Many researchers have already shown that daily hassles lead to negative outcomes, like stress or decreased performance, and that daily uplifts lead to higher levels of well-being (Wegge et al., 2006). Moreover, increased occurrence of daily hassles and uplifts are associated with diverse measures of health conditions, health care utilization, and self-reported health (e.g., Graf et al., 2017), such as health-related absenteeism, or hospital admission (e.g., Williams, Zyzanski, & Wright, 1992). Daily hassles have been shown to impair mood at work (DeLongis et al., 1988). Preserving work and nonwork relationships quality through daily experiences appears to be best achieved by equipping individuals to recognize the benefits of uplifts, along with managing hassles (Totenhagen, Serido, Curran, & Butler, 2012).

However, few studies have hitherto examined how daily hassles and uplifts influence those and other individual outcomes. By focusing more on the role of such affective events, it is possible to gain better insight into the interplay between events, employees, and organizational outcomes.

FUNDING

This study was supported by Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, SFRH/BD/80460/2011, and UID/GES/00315/2013.

REFERENCES

- Bakker, A. B. (2009). Building engagement in the workplace. In R. J. Burke & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The peak performing organization* (pp. 50-72). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
doi:10.1108/02683940710733115

- Bakker, A. B., Vergel, A. I. S., & Kuntze, J. (2015). Student engagement and performance: A weekly diary study on the role of openness. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39(1), 49-62.
doi:10.1007/s11031-014-9422-5
- Basch, J., & Fisher, C. D. (1998, August). *Affective events-emotion matrix: A classification of work events and associated emotions*. Paper presented at the First Conference on Emotions in Organizational Life, San Diego, California.
- Basch, J., & Fisher, C. D. (2000). Affective events-emotion matrix: A classification of work events and associated emotions. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. J. Härtel, & W. J. Zerbe (Eds.), *Emotions in the workplace: Research, theory and practice* (pp. 36-48). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Beauregard, T. A. (2014). Fairness perceptions of work-life balance initiatives: Effects on counterproductive work behavior. *British Journal of Management*, 25, 772-789.
doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12052
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107(2), 238-246.
doi:10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238
- Berg, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2008). Crafting a fulfilling job: Bringing passion into work [Teaching case]. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Ross School of Business.
- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., & Schilling, E. A. (1989). Effects of daily stress on negative mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(5), 808-818.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.808
- Bollen, K. A. (1989). *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bylsma, L. M., Taylor-Clift, A., & Rottenberg, J. (2011). Emotional reactivity to daily events in major and minor depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 120(1), 155-167.
doi:10.1037/a0021662
- Byrne, B. M. (2001). Structural equation modeling with AMOS, EQS, and LISREL: Comparative approaches to testing for the factorial validity of a measuring instrument. *International Journal of Testing*, 1(1), 55-86.
doi:10.1207/S15327574IJT0101_4
- Cascón-Pereira, R., & Hallier, J. (2012). Getting that certain feeling: The role of emotions in the meaning, construction and enactment of doctor managers' identities. *British Journal of Management*, 23, 130-144.
doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00748.x
- Clancy, A., Vince, R., & Gabriel, Y. (2012). That unwanted feeling: A psychodynamic study of disappointment in organizations. *British Journal of Management*, 23, 518-531.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00780.x
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 10(1), Article 7.
Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol10/iss1/7>
- DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. (1988). The impact of daily stress on health and mood: Psychological and social resources as mediators. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 486-495.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.3.486
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.3.499
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Fisher, C. D., & Noble, C. S. (2004). A within-person examination of correlates of performance and emotions while working. *Human Performance*, 17(2), 145-168.
doi:10.1207/s15327043hup1702_2
- Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 286-299.
doi:10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.286
- Fong Lam, U., Chen, W. W., Zhang, J., & Liang, T. (2015). It feels good to learn where I belong: School belonging, academic emotions, and academic achievement in adolescents. *School Psychology International*, 36(4), 393-409.
doi:10.1177/0143034315589649
- Fried, Y., Grant, A. M., Levi, A. S., Hadani, M., & Slowik, L. H. (2007). Job design in temporal context: A career dynamics perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(7), 911-927.
doi:10.1002/job.486
- Graf, A. S., Long, D. M., & Patrick, J. H. (2017). Successful aging across adulthood: Hassles, uplifts, and self-assessed health in daily context. *Journal of Adult Development*, 24(3), 216-225.
doi:10.1007/s10804-017-9260-2
- Healey, M. P., Hodgkinson, G. P., Whittington, R., & Johnson, G. (2015). Off to plan or out to lunch? Relationships between design characteristics and outcomes of strategy workshops. *British Journal of Management*, 26(3), 507-528.
doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12038

- Junça-Silva, A., Caetano, A., & Lopes, R. R. (2018). Activated or deactivated? Understanding how cognitive appraisals can drive emotional activation in the aftermath of daily work events. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 68(4-5), 189-198.
doi:10.1016/j.erap.2018.10.001
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
doi:10.5465/256287
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
doi:10.1007/BF02291575
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of two modes of stress measurement: Daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 4(1), 1-39.
doi:10.1007/BF00844845
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Larsson, G., Berglund, A. K., & Ohlsson, A. (2016). Daily hassles, their antecedents and outcomes among professional first responders: A systematic literature review. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 57(4), 359-367.
doi:10.1111/sjop.12303
- Larsson, G., Ohlsson, A., Berglund, A. K., & Nilsson, S. (2017). Daily uplifts and coping as a buffer against everyday hassles: Relationship with stress reactions over time in military personnel. *Scandinavian Psychologist*, 4, Article e13.
doi:10.15714/scandpsychol.4.e13
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Progress on a cognitive-motivational-relational theory of emotion. *American Psychologist*, 46(8), 819-834.
doi:10.1037/0003-066X.46.8.819
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44(1), 1-21.
doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.44.020193.000245
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lovibond, P. F., & Lovibond, S. H. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states: Comparison of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS) with the Beck Depression and Anxiety Inventories. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 33(3), 335-343.
doi:10.1016/0005-7967(94)00075-U
- Maybery, D. J., Neale, J., Arentz, A., & Jones-Ellis, J. (2007). The negative event scale: Measuring frequency and intensity of adult hassles. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 20(2), 163-176.
doi:10.1080/10615800701217654
- Nezlek, J. B., & Gable, S. L. (2001). Depression as a moderator of relationships between positive daily events and day-to-day psychological adjustment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(12), 1692-1704.
doi:10.1177/01461672012712012
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ohly, S., & Schmitt, A. (2015). What makes us enthusiastic, angry, feeling at rest or worried? Development and validation of an affective work events taxonomy using concept mapping methodology. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 30(1), 15-35.
doi:10.1007/s10869-013-9328-3
- Porath, C. L., & Erez, A. (2007). Does rudeness really matter? The effects of rudeness on task performance and helpfulness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1181-1197.
doi:10.5465/amj.2007.20159919
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2006). Achievement goals and discrete achievement emotions: A theoretical model and prospective test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(3), 583-597.
doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.3.583
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(8), 1120-1141.
doi:10.1002/job.1783
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.
doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
doi:10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
doi:10.1177/0013164405282471

- Schmidt, J., Klusmann, U., Lüdtke, O., Möller, J., & Kunter, M. (2017). What makes good and bad days for beginning teachers? A diary study on daily uplifts and hassles. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 48, 85-97.
doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.09.004
- Shields, S. A., & Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, A. J., & Caetano, A. (2013). Validation of the flourishing scale and scale of positive and negative experience in Portugal. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(2), 469-478.
doi:10.1007/s11205-011-9938-y
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 173-186.
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009
- Totenhagen, C. J., Serido, J., Curran, M. A., & Butler, E. A. (2012). Daily hassles and uplifts: A diary study on understanding relationship quality. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(5), 719-728.
doi:10.1037/a0029628
- Van Katwyk, P. T., Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Using the Job-Related Affective Well-Being Scale (JAWS) to investigate affective responses to work stressors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 219-230.
doi:10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.219
- Wagner, B. M., Compas, B. E., & Howell, D. C. (1988). Daily and major life events: A test of an integrative model of psychosocial stress. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16(2), 189-205.
doi:10.1007/BF00912522
- Wanous, J. P., & Lawler, E. E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(2), 95-105.
doi:10.1037/h0032664
- Wegge, J., Dick, R. V., Fisher, G. K., West, M. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2006). A test of basic assumptions of affective events theory (AET) in call centre work. *British Journal of Management*, 17(3), 237-254.
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00489.x
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (Vol. 18, pp. 1-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Williams, L. J., Cote, J. A., & Buckley, M. R. (1989). Lack of method variance in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Reality or artifact? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 462-468.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.74.3.462
- Williams, R., Zyzanski, S. J., & Wright, A. L. (1992). Life events and daily hassles and uplifts as predictors of hospitalization and outpatient visitation. *Social Science & Medicine*, 34(7), 763-768.
doi:10.1016/0277-9536(92)90363-U
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201.
doi:10.5465/amr.2001.4378011
- Xanthopoulou, D., & Meier, L. L. (2014). Daily burnout experiences. In M. P. Leiter, A. B. Bakker, & C. Maslach (Eds.), *Burnout at Work: A Psychological Perspective* (pp.80-101). New York, NY: Psychology Press.