**TILTAI, 2020, 1, 1–18** ISSN 1392-3137 (Print), ISSN 2351-6569 (Online)

# FEATURES OF PROFESSIONAL WELL-BEING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DIFFERENT PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

**Boris Pakhol**
*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv*

**Abstract**
The article is devoted to a review of the results of the study of the features of professional well-being among representatives of various professions. The following main indicators of the study were used: indicators of professional well-being, subjective economic well-being, occupational psychological well-being, professional demand for personality, professional motivation, work engagement, life satisfaction, subjective social well-being, meaningfulness of life, psychological capital, job satisfaction, psychological climate. The study involved 403 representatives of various professional groups: economists, engineers, police inspectors, cook-confectioners, managers, unskilled manual workers, medical representatives, salesmen, police investigators. The hierarchy of professional groups by mean indicators of professional well-being was revealed. The strength of the relationship between the general indicators of the study and professional well-being in each professional group is determined. Possible reasons for differences between groups for each indicator were explained. The predictors of professional well-being for different professional groups were identified. The results of the study confirmed that the structure of predictors of professional well-being can differ significantly for representatives of different professional groups. The differences between the groups are related to the hierarchy of predictors of professional well-being within a single semantic field. In addition, it was found that the scales of general indicators can contribute to the differences between professional groups, which requires additional study of the features of professional well-being, at the level of the items behind each general indicator.
KEYWORDS: predictors of professional well-being, work engagement, professional motivation, job satisfaction, meaningfulness of life.

**Anotacija**
Straipsnyje apžvelgiami skirtingų profesijų atstovų profesinės gerovės tyrimo rezultatai. Atliekant tyrimą pasirinkti šie pagrindiniai matavimo rodikliai: profesinė gerovė, subjektyvi ekonominė gerovė, profesinė motyvacija, įsitraukimas į darbą, pasitenkinimas gyvenimu, subjektyvi socialinė gerovė, gyvenimo prasmė, psichologinė patirtis, pasitenkinimas darbu, psichologinis klimatas. Tyrime dalyvavo 403 įvairių profesijų atstovai: ekonomistai, inžinieriai, policininkai, vadybininkai, medicinos darbuotojai, darbininkai, prekybininkai, policijos tyrėjai. Remiantis tyrimo duomenimis ir statistiniais skaičiavimais sudaryta profesinių grupių gerovės rodiklių schema. Atskleistas ryšys tarp bendrųjų rodiklių ir profesinės gerovės kiekvienoje tiriamųjų grupėje. Aptartos galimos priežastys, galėjusios lemti paskirų grupių profesinės gerovės skirtumus. Kadangi bendrųjų rodiklių skalės lemia grupių skirtumus, toliau atliekant tyrimą būtų prasminga tikslinti klausimyną, peržiūrint kiekvieną rodiklį.
PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: profesinę gerovę lemiantys veiksniai, įsitraukimas į darbą, profesinė motyvacija, pasitenkinimas darbu, gyvenimo prasmė.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15181/tbb.v84i2.2126

## Introduction

Today, well-being is one of the most relevant topics of socio-psychological research. The increased interest of scientists in general and professional well-being is primarily associated with a high level of technocratization of society and a crisis of the concept of happiness as a state of *satisfaction*.

The main modern vector of development of this construct is the search for its structure, which would take into account the influence of various psychological and/or socio-psychological factors characteristic of representatives of various professional groups.

Despite the relevance and importance of this topic, the issues of constructing an optimal theory of professional well-being, researching its predictors, their hierarchy and structure in various professional groups currently remain open.

Starting with the works of E. Mayo, the study of the problem of professional well-being occupies one of the important places in modern psychological research. So, over the past 90 years, it was found that the balance of positive and negative affect (N. Bradburn), the life satisfaction of workers (E. Diener, E. Osin, D. A. Leontiev), job satisfaction (E. Locke, F. Herzberg, J. R. Hackman, G. R. Oldham), along with self-efficacy (A. Bandura) and some other aspects of psychological capital (F. Luthans) are powerful predictors of productivity and labor efficiency.

But thanks to the new positive direction of psychological research (M. Seligman), professional well-being has become regarded as an independent, subjective and multicomponent (C. D. Ryff, C. L. M. Keyes, P. Warr, A. Baldschun, K. I. Ruth) phenomenon, as one of the aspects of the general well-being of the individual.

The theoretical analysis allowed us to highlight the most influential studies of various aspects of professional well-being, the theoretical achievements of which were used by us in this study: R. M. Ryan, E. L. Deci (theory of self-determination); E. Osin, A. A. Gorbunova, T. Gordeeva, T. Ivanova & other (research and theory of motivation); M. Csikszentmihaiyi, W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker (theory and methodology of the flow experience and work engagement); E. Diener, T. Y. Ivanova, E. I. Rasskazova, E. N. Osin (theory and research of job satisfaction); Yu. P. Povarenkov (professional identity); V. A. Khashchenko (theory and methodology of economic well-being); E. I. Ruth (occupational psychological well-being); E. V. Kharitonova (professional demand for personality); T. V. Danylchenko (subjective social well-being); D. A. Leontiev (methodology of meaningfulness of life); F. Luthans (theory and methodology of psychological capital) and others.

The achievements of the above authors flowed into the model of our study and were summarized in the working definition of professional well-being as *an integral indicator of optimal functioning of the individual in the professional sphere, associated with subjective assessment of various psychological and/or socio-psychological aspects of professional life.*

This definition is almost identical to the definition of E. I. Ruth (2016) but does not limit the possible component composition.

The results of studies by various authors show that the state of general psychological well-being in the professional sphere is influenced by:

- individually professional work-related factors (W. B. Schaufeli & A. B. Bakker; E. Osin, AA Gorbunova, T. Gordeeva, T. Ivanova; K. I. Ruth; E. V. Kharitonova; F. Luthans; A. Baldschun and others).
- individually personal non-work-related factors (E. Diener; D. A. Leontiev; E. Osin; T. V. Danylchenko; V. A. Khashchenko and others).
- organizational or contextual factors (T. Yu. Ivanova, E. I. Rasskazova, E. N. Osin; A. Baldschun; V. V. Shpalinskyy & E. Shelest; S. Meyerding and others).

Therefore, in the analysis of professional well-being, its possible aspects we have identified: subjective economic well-being, occupational psychological well-being, professional demand for personality, professional motivation, work engagement, life satisfaction, subjective social well-being, meaningfulness of life, psychological capital, job satisfaction, psychological climate.

Although since the 1920s, interest in studying the problem of professional well-being has occupied one of the leading places in the works of social psychologists, there is still no common understanding of its definition, components, and factors.

Object of study: professional well-being (PW).

Subject of research: features and predictors of professional well-being of representatives of various professional groups.

Purpose of the study. Based on the results of an empirical study, identify features and predictors of professional well-being among representatives of various professional groups.

## 1. Methods

The empirical study was conducted in 2018–2019 during 12 months in Ukraine. To standardize the passage of a set of methods, a web-site of the project (https://www.professionalwellbeing.com.ua) was created, information about the project was disseminated through online advertising services facebook and google adwords.

Filling in personal data and passing all the methods took place in Russian online with the help of Google forms. The collection of information was anonymous, which was communicated to the respondents in the preamble of the survey questionnaire.

The study involved representatives of the National Police of Ukraine, as well as representatives of large manufacturing, pharmaceutical, architectural, trade, marketing and IT companies, who applied to participate in the research project. Also, to increase the representativeness of the sample, the unemployed of city and district employment centers, as well as all those wishing to take the online test and get its results, were involved in the study:

Representatives of various professional groups took part in this study, such as economists (25 people), engineers (28 people), police inspectors (37 people), cook-confectioners (61 people), managers (87 people), unskilled manual workers (49 people), medical representatives (40 people), salesmen (41 people), police investigators (35 people) – from state and private companies (N = 403). The total length of the professional activity of the subjects was from 2 to 45 years, age – from 20 to 65 years, gender – 140 men (34.7%) and 263 women (65.3%).

The following psychological diagnostic methods were used during the study: Questionnaire of subjective economic well-being (SEW: V. A. Khashchenko, 2012); Methods of assessing of the occupational well-being (MAOW: E. I. Ruth, 2016); Professional demand for personality (PDP: E. V. Kharitonova, 2009); Questionnaire of professional motivation (PM: E. N. Osin, A. A. Gorbunova, T. Gordeeva, T. Ivanova, 2017); The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale by W. Schaufeli, A. Bakker (UWES: W. Schaufeli, A. Bakker, 2003) – adaptation by D. A. Kutuzova (2006); Life satisfaction scale (SWLS: E. Diener, P. A. Emmons, R. J. Larsen, S. Griffin, 1985) – adaptation of D. A. Leontiev and E. N. Osin (2003); Questionnaire of subjective social well-being (SSW: T. V. Danylchenko, 2017); Life Orientation Test (LOT: D. A. Leontiev, 2000); Questionnaire of psychological capital (PsyCap: F. Luthans, 2006; 2017); Questionnaire of components of job satisfaction (JS: T. Yu. Ivanova, E. I. Rasskazova, E. N. Osin, 2012); Diagnosis of the psychological climate in a small production group (Climat: V. V. Shpalinskyy, E. G. Shelest, 2002).

Testing the methods for reliability scores and consistency of the main indicators (Cronbach's alpha, α) gave the following results: UWES (α = 0,938; points = 3); PM_Auto (α = 0,922; points = 3); PM_Contr (α = 0,766; points = 3); PDP (α = 0,931; points = 8); MAOW (α = 0,873; points = 6); PsyCap (α = 0,873; points = 4); LOT (α = 0,912; points = 5); SEW (α = 0,696; points = 5); SSW (α = 0,81; points = 5); SWLS (α = 0,879; points = 5); JS (α = 0,757; points = 5); Climat (α = 0,907; points = 13). These results of Alpha Cronbach confirm the reliability score

and consistency of the general indicators of these methods and the adequacy of their application in our sample.

Also, a participant questionnaire was created, which included questions related to the socio-demographic characteristics of the subjects and a direct question about the self-assessment of the current level of professional well-being on a 10-point scale.

We assume that the content and structure of professional well-being may differ significantly for members of different professional groups.

Professional well-being is a complex socio-psychological phenomenon and to understand the essence of the above differences it is necessary: to establish a correlation between the general indicators and PW in each professional group and determine the difference in the mean values between the indicators that have the strongest correlations with PW, and then, based on common indicators need to identify PW predictors in various professional groups.

Correlation (R – Spearman) and regression analyzes were used to identify relationships between indicators.

To clarify the differences between indicators of professional well-being (PW) and other studied indicators in different professional groups, the Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Statistical data processing was carried out using the software package IBM SPSS Statistics 23 and Microsoft Excel 2010.

## 2. Results and Discussion

The main indicator of the study (PW) was obtained based on the answers of the subjects to the direct question about the level of their professional well-being (N = 403, M = 0,000; SD = 0.969). The statistics of Kolmogorov-Smirnov (0.094) and Shapiro-Wilkie (0.977) are significant ($p < 0.05$), which suggests that the distribution of the values of the main research indicator is not normal and indicates the need to use non-parametric methods for testing hypotheses.

Comparison of mean values of PW in groups divided by profession. To clarify the differences between professional groups by the main research indicator (PW), we present descriptive statistics of selected professional groups (Table 1).

Descriptive statistics show that there is a certain hierarchy between professional groups according to the mean values of PW indicators. But descriptive statistics are not enough to understand the significance of these differences. That is why, to clarify the significance of differences in mean values of PW in different professional groups, the Mann-Whitney U-test was used (Table 2).

*Table 1.* PW statistics in different professional groups (PW scale - standardized [-3; 3])

| Professional group | N | Mean | Standard Error | Standard Deviation | Min | Max |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Medical representatives | 40 | 0,6844 | 0,1040 | 0,658 | -1,170 | 1,800 |
| Managers | 87 | 0,2381 | 0,1028 | 0,959 | -2,650 | 1,800 |
| Engineers | 28 | 0,2210 | 0,1826 | 0,966 | -2,400 | 1,800 |
| Economists | 25 | 0,1215 | 0,2032 | 1,016 | -1,780 | 1,800 |
| Salesmen | 41 | 0,0887 | 0,1129 | 0,723 | -1,170 | 1,800 |
| Cook-confectioners | 61 | -0,1059 | 0,1218 | 0,951 | -2,650 | 1,800 |
| Unskilled manual workers | 49 | -0,2877 | 0,1276 | 0,893 | -2,400 | 1,800 |
| Police investigators | 35 | -0,3812 | 0,1603 | 0,948 | -2,650 | 1,540 |
| Police inspectors | 37 | -0,7312 | 0,1544 | 0,939 | -2,650 | 0,930 |

*Table 2.* Mean ranks PW by the Mann-Whitney U-test in different professional groups

| | Engineer | Police inspector | Cook-confectioner | Manager | Unskilled manual worker | Medical representative | Salesmen | Police investigator |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Economist | 27.86 | **25.86**** | 41.66 | 57.52 | 34.48 | **37.2*** | 33.02 | 26.97 |
| | 26.04 | **39.84**** | 47.98 | 52.94 | 43.42 | **26.28*** | 34.28 | 35.44 |
| Engineer | | 25.28** | 41.36* | 57.98 | **33.96**** | **38.4*** | 32.71 | **26.4**** |
| | | **43.19**** | **52.91*** | 58.07 | **47.80**** | **28.92*** | 38.36 | **39**** |
| Police inspector | | | **55.75**** | **72.37**** | 47.67 | **53.71**** | **48.48**** | 40.41 |
| | | | **39.18**** | **39.27**** | 37.97 | **23.09**** | **29.54**** | 32.80 |
| Cook-confectioner | | | | **81.96*** | 51.86 | **67.55**** | 56.01 | 44.74 |
| | | | | **63.85*** | 58.43 | **40.14**** | 48.47 | 50.66 |
| Manager | | | | | **53.31**** | **76.06*** | 58.63 | **44.95**** |
| | | | | | **77.05**** | **58.45*** | 67.26 | **68.15**** |
| Unskilled manual worker | | | | | | **60.52**** | **52.18*** | 42.50 |
| | | | | | | 32.32** | 39.90* | 42.50 |
| Medical representative | | | | | | | 31.58** | 24.14** |
| | | | | | | | **50.65**** | **50.12**** |
| Salesmen | | | | | | | | 32.58* |
| | | | | | | | | 43.54* |

* – The significance of differences at the $p \leq 0.05$ level; ** – the significance of differences at the $p \leq 0.01$ level.

The data obtained allow us to arrange the studied professional groups in a hierarchy. It was found that the group of medical representatives has significantly

higher PW indicators than representatives of other professions: economist/medical representative (PW: U = 332; p = 0,022); engineer/medical representative (PW: U = 404; p = 0.049); inspector police / medical representative (PW: U = 151.5; p <0.001); cook-confectioners / medical representative (PW: U = 558; p <0,001); manager / medical representative (PW: U = 1257.5; p = 0.011); medical representative/salesmen (PW: U = 434; p < 0.001); medical representative/police investigator (PW: U=215; p<0.001); unskilled manual workers/medical representative (PW: U = 359; p <0.001).

On the second level, four groups are distinguished: economists, salesmen, engineers and managers, who do not have significant differences between themselves in terms of PW, but significant differ from other groups: manager/unskilled manual workers (PW: U = 1387.5; p <0.001); manager / police investigator (PW: U = 943.5; p <0.001); cook-confectioners / manager (PW: U = 2004; p = 0.011); manager / unskilled manual workers (PW: U = 1387.5; p <0.001); engineer / unskilled manual workers (PW: U = 439.5; p = 0.008); engineer / police investigator (PW: U = 294; p = 0.006); engineer / cook-confectioners (PW: U = 632.5; p = 0.049).

Separately, we note the presence of significant differences between the group of salesmen and groups of unskilled manual workers and police investigators (unskilled manual workers / salesmen (PW: U = 730.5; p = 0.025; salesmen / police investigator (PW: U = 510.5; p = 0.029)) and absence of significant differences between a group of economists, unskilled manual workers and police investigators.

Also, we note the presence of significant differences between the group of salesmen and groups of unskilled manual workers and police investigators (unskilled manual workers / salesmen (PW: U = 730.5; p = 0.025); salesmen / police investigator (PW: U = 510.5; p = 0.029)) and absence of significant differences between a group of economists, unskilled manual workers and police investigators.

The third level is occupied by cook-confectioners, unskilled manual workers and police investigators who do not have significant differences between them in terms of the PW level, although, at the same time, cook-confectioners do not have significant differences with economists and salesmen.

At the bottom of the hierarchy is a group of police inspectors, which has significant differences with almost all other groups, except for unskilled manual workers and police investigators: police inspector / manager (PW: U = 750; p <0.001); police inspector / salesmen (PW: U = 390; p <0.001); police inspector / cook-confectioners (PW: U = 747; p = 0.004); economist / police inspector (PW: U = 254; p= 0.002); police inspector / medical representative (PW: U = 151.5; p <0.001); engineer / police inspector (PW: U = 232.5; p <0.001).

Establishment of correlations. To understand the essence of differences between professional groups, a correlation was established between the general indicators of all methods and PW in the mixed and each separately professional group.

A correlation analysis of general indicators with PW, in the whole sample, showed that there is a relatively strong relationship between professional well-being and such indicators as: work engagement (R = 0.606; p <0.01); autonomous motivation (R = 0.508; p <0.01); professional demand for personality (R = 0.491; p <0.01); occupational psychological well-being (R = 0.486; p <0.01); psychological capital (R = 0.430; p <0.01); meaningfulness of life (R = 0.470; p <0.01); job satisfaction (R = 0.530; p <0.01).

A medium-strength correlation was found between PW and the following indicators: professional controlled motivation (R = -0.285; p <0.01), subjective economic well-being (R = 0.348; p <0.01), subjective social well-being (R = 0.394; p <0.01), satisfaction with life (R = 0.293; p <0.01), psychological climate (R = 0.380; p <0.01).

Since all indicators have a significant correlation with PW, all 12 general indicators of the study were involved in further analysis (Table 3).

*Table 3.* The values of the correlation coefficients (R – Spearman) between PW and the studied indicators in various professional groups

| | **Medical representative** | **Manager** | **Engineer** | **Economist** | **Salesmen** | **Cook-confectioner** | **Unskilled manual worker** | **Police investigator** | **Police inspector** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UWES | .387* | .590** | .638** | .571** | .401** | .510** | .556** | .655** | .558** |
| PM_Auto | **.446**** | **.634**** | **.678**** | **.653**** | 0.306 | **.399**** | 0.159 | **.480**** | 0.309 |
| PM_ Contr | 0,097 | **-.379**** | **-.571**** | **-.710**** | -0.055 | 0.021 | **-.339*** | -0.304 | 0.085 |
| PDP | **.454**** | **.664**** | **.698**** | **.511**** | 0.254 | **.291*** | **.417**** | 0.185 | 0.174 |
| MAOW | **.484**** | **.616**** | **.730**** | **.657**** | 0.219 | 0.208 | **.328*** | **.379*** | 0.026 |
| PsyCap | 0.196 | **.540**** | **.692**** | **.531**** | 0.19 | **.520**** | **.489**** | 0.143 | -0.168 |
| LOT | 0.164 | **.488**** | **.658**** | **.570**** | 0.306 | **.292*** | **.325*** | **.388*** | 0.047 |
| SEW | -0.01 | **.370**** | **.508**** | **.398*** | **.360*** | -0.016 | 0.265 | 0.183 | 0.274 |
| SSW | 0.152 | **.494**** | **.530**** | **.435*** | 0.161 | **.303*** | **.291*** | 0.251 | 0.305 |
| SWLS | -0.003 | **.408**** | **.508**** | 0.081 | 0.232 | **.332**** | 0.192 | 0.156 | 0.311 |
| JS | .497** | .570** | .617** | .672** | .323* | .268* | .441** | .345* | .440** |
| Climat | 0.237 | **.429**** | 0.203 | **.542**** | 0.284 | **.370**** | **.306*** | 0.269 | 0.295 |

** – Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * – Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

According to the results of the correlation analysis, a hierarchy was established by the strength of the correlation between the general indicators of research and PW among representatives of various professional groups.

So, for example, the strongest and most significant correlation with PW was identified in the following groups: among medical representatives on the *job satisfaction* indicator ($R = 0.497$; $p < 0.01$); among managers on the *professional demand for personality* indicator ($R = 0.664$; $p < 0.01$); among engineers on the *occupational psychological well-being* indicator ($R = 0.730$; $p < 0.01$); among economists on the *professional controlled motivation* indicator ($R = -0.710$; $p < 0,01$); among salesmen on the *work engagement* indicator ($R = 0.401$; $p < 0.01$); among cook-confectioners on the *psychological capital* indicator ($R = 0.520$; $p < 0.01$); among unskilled manual workers on the *work engagement* indicator ($R = 0.556$; $p < 0.01$); among police investigators the *work engagement* indicator ($R = 0.655$; $p < 0.01$); among police inspectors on the *work engagement* indicator ($R = 0.556$; $p < 0.01$).

The universal indicators were *work engagement* (UWES) and *job satisfaction* (JS), which in all studied groups revealed a direct and significant correlation with professional well-being (PW).

To understand how the groups differ, a pairwise comparison of mean ranks (according to the Mann-Whitney U-test in various professional groups) was carried out for those indicators that have significant correlations with PW in the corresponding groups.

Individually professional (work-related) indicators. It was found that medical representatives have significantly higher mean rank of *work engagement* (UWES) than: economists (UWES: $U = 243$; $p < 0.01$), engineers (UWES: $U = 371$; $p = 0.019$), salesmen (UWES: $U = 452.5$; $p < 0.01$), managers (UWES: $U = 1331$; $p = 0.034$), cook-confectioners (UWES: $U = 607$; $p < 0.01$), unskilled manual workers (UWES: $U = 348.5$; $p < 0.01$), police investigators (UWES: $U = 288.5$; $p < 0.01$) and police inspectors (UWES: $U = 205$; $p < 0.01$), due to the nature of their profession. Versatility (a combination of the functions of a pharmacist-informant, manager, seller, and even elements of entrepreneurial activity), autonomy in decision-making, and low regulation of work processes contribute to a more creative approach to customers and a sense of flow.

In turn, engineers have significantly higher mean rank values for this indicator than unskilled manual workers (UWES: $U = 401$; $p < 0.01$), police investigators (UWES: $U = 335$; $p = 0.032$) and police inspectors (UWES: $U = 271.5$; $p < 0.01$).

It was also found that managers have significantly higher indicators of flow perception in professional activities and *work engagement* (UWES) than cook-confectioners (UWES: $U = 1836$; $p < 0.01$), unskilled manual workers (UWES: $U = 1107.5$; $p < 0.01$), police investigators (UWES: $U = 937.5$; $p < 0.01$) and police

inspectors (UWES: U = 783.5; p <0.01). In turn, police inspectors also have lower mean ranks of this indicators than economists (UWES: U = 322; p = 0.044) and salesmen (UWES: U = 482.5; p <0.01), and salesmen have significantly higher mean rank of *work engagement* indicators than unskilled manual workers (UWES: U = 646.5; p <0.01).

Both professional groups (police inspectors and police investigators) have the lowest mean rates of *work engagement* (UWES), which is possibly related to the specifics of the civil service. Note, that for respondents from state-owned companies (N = 72; m = -0.561; SE = 0.112; SD = 0.953), including the National Police of Ukraine, mean values of professional well-being have significantly lower indicators than respondents from private companies (N = 331; m = 0.122; SE = 0.051; SD = 0.968).

According to the theory of W. Schaufeli and A. Bakker (2003), indicators of the *work engagement* scale are the opposite of the burnout construct, which, according to the studies of C. Maslach and M. P. Leiter (1997), also has three dimensions: exhaustion, feelings of cynicism and detachment from the job, and a sense of ineffectiveness. The authors note that opposing scoring on three aspects of burnout (MBI, S. Maslach, S. E. Jackson & M. P. Leiter, 1996) suggests engagement. In other words, respondents from the national police of Ukraine have signs of professional burnout.

According to the *autonomous professional motivation* indicator (PM_Auto), it was found that the cook-confectioners group has significantly lower mean values than medical representatives (PM_Auto: U = 567.5; p = 5.72), managers (PM_Auto: U = 1553.5; p = 1.747) and police investigators (PM_Auto: U = 798; p = 0.04). Perhaps this is since a group of respondents are employees of an enterprise where Kaizen technology, an analog of Taylor's *scientific management*, is introduced, and there is practically no possibility for creative professional manifestation.

The introduction of the foundations of scientific management in an enterprise reduces the role of a human specialist to the role of a *screw* in the large mechanism of an enterprise, which negatively affects the interest in the work process itself, the awareness of work as a tool to achieve one's goals and as a way to realize one's meaning of life and vocation. On the contrary, it was found that the group of managers has significantly higher mean values of autonomous professional motivation than economists (PM_Auto: U = 684; p <0.01).

It is also characteristic that in terms of *controlled professional motivation* (PM_Contr), only a group of unskilled manual workers has significantly higher mean values than economists (PM_Contr: U = 330; p <0.01), engineers (PM_Contr: U = 323; p <0.01) and managers (PM_Contr: U = 895.5; p = 2.094). This may

indicate that the problem of *amotivation* (a condition in which the person does not have any desire and conscious goals to perform labor activity) can manifest itself in low-skilled professions that are chosen not at will, but due to the lack of professional education and / or other choices.

According to the general indicator of *professional demand for personality* (PDP), it was found that medical representatives have significantly higher mean values than economists (PDP: $U = 210$; $p<0.001$), engineers (PDP: $U = 394$; $p = 0.038$), cook-confectioners (PDP: $U = 514$; $p <0.001$) and unskilled manual workers (PDP: $U = 448$; $p <0.001$). Medical representatives feel more satisfied with the degree of realization of their professional potential, they are more positive about themselves as a competent and authoritative professional, they highly value the results of their professional activities and experience a more positive attitude of others towards themselves as a professional.

It was also found that managers have significantly higher mean values of professional demand for personality (PDP) indicators than economists (PDP: $U = 739.5$; $p = 0.015$) and unskilled manual workers (PDP: $U = 1608.5$; $p = 0.017$), and engineers – than cook-confectioners (PDP: $U = 593.5$; $p = 0.021$). Other groups do not have significant differences in this indicator.

In terms of occupational psychological well-being general indicator (MAOW), medical representatives found significantly higher mean values of MAOW than economists (MAOW: $U = 246$; $p <0.01$), engineers (MAOW: $U = 380$; $p = 0.024$), unskilled manual workers (MAOW: $U = 103.5$; $p = 4.794$) and police investigators (MAOW: $U = 383.5$; $p <0.01$).

It was also found that unskilled manual workers have significantly lower mean values of MAOW than economists (MAOW: $U = 241.5$; $p <0.01$), engineers (MAOW: $U = 213$; $p = 5.411$), managers (MAOW: $U = 528$; $p = 3.603$) and police investigators (MAOW: $U = 316$; $p = 8.866$), and also that the group of economists has significantly lower mean values of MAOW indicators than managers (MAOW: $U = 792$; $p = 0.038$).

According to a study by K. I. Ruth, professional psychological well-being assumes that respondents have stable communicative skills. As a result, those professions that contribute to the development of communication skills have higher mean rates according to MAOW.

According to a study by F. Luthans (2017), *psychological capital* (PsyCap) is a positive state of a person that combines self-esteem of four aspects: self-efficacy, optimism, determination or hope, and resilience.

It was found that unskilled manual workers have significantly lower mean values of psychological capital indicators than managers (PsyCap: $U = 936.5$; $p = 6.014$), engineers (PsyCap: $U = 409$; $p < 0.01$) and economists (PsyCap: $U = 379$; $p <0.01$),

and also that cook-confectioners have significantly lower mean values psychological capital indicators than the group of engineers (PsyCap: U = 496; p <0.01) and managers (PsyCap: U = 1159; p = 5.763).

Again, this may be since *unskilled manual workers* and *cook-confectioners* work in an enterprise where the technologies of *scientific management* are introduced and there is practically no possibility of manifesting these psychological resources, moreover, in technocratic enterprises, this manifestation is perceived as a negative factor, the so-called *human factor*.

Individually personal (non-work-related) indicators. According to the general indicator *meaningfulness of life* (LOT), it was found that cook-confectioners have significantly lower mean values of *meaningfulness of life* indicators than economists (LOT: U = 516.5; p = 0.019), managers (LOT: U = 1375.5; p <0.01), engineers (LOT: U = 452.5; p <0.01) and police investigators (LOT: U = 804.5; p = 0.045), also the *unskilled manual workers* group has significantly lower mean values of LOT indicators than economists (LOT: U = 392; p = 0.011), managers (LOT: U = 1071.5; p <0.01) and engineers (LOT: U = 342.5; p <0.01), and the group of managers has significantly higher mean values of LOT indicators than the group of police investigators (LOT: U = 1090; p = 0.014), salesmen (LOT: U = 1211.5; p <0.01) and police inspectors (LOT: U = 949.5; p <0.01)).

The general indicator *meaningfulness of life* (LOT) is associated with five components: meaningfulness of goals, meaningfulness of the process and results of activities, as well as *Locus of self-control* and *Locus of life-control* – these are the aspects that can influence the differences between groups.

For example, *cook-confectioners* have significantly lower mean values:

- than economists on the next LOT's subscales: *Result* (U = 553; p = 0.046) and *Locus of self-control* (U = 545; p = 0.038);
- than managers on the next LOT's subscales: *Goal* (U = 1449.5; p <0.01), Process (U = 1653.5; p <0.01), *Result* (U = 1547; p <0.01), *Locus of self-control* (U = 1445.5; p <0.01), *Locus of life-control* (U = 1564.5; p <0.01);
- than engineers on the next LOT's subscales: *Goals* (U = 484; p <0.01), *Process* (U = 620; p = 0.038), *Result* (U = 506.5; p <0.01), *Locus of self-control* (U = 530.5; p <0.01), *Locus of life-control* (U = 546; p <0.01);
- than police investigators on the next LOT's subscales: *Locus of life-control* (U = 492; p <0.01).

By the *subjective economic well-being* general indicator (SEW), no significant differences were found.

According to the subjective social well-being general indicator (SSW), it was found that the group of cook-confectioners has significantly lower mean values of SSW indicators than economists (SSW: U = 550.5; p = 0.043), engineers (SSW:

U = 584.5; p = 0.017) and managers (SSW: U = 1514.5; p <0.01), and the group of managers, on the contrary, has significantly higher mean values of SSW indicators than the unskilled manual workers' group (SSW: U = 1365; p <0.01).

Note, that the general SSW indicator combines several components: *social noticeability*, *social distantness*, *emotional acceptance*, *social approval* and *positive social judgments* - each of which can contribute to the differences between professional groups. For example, the difference between cook-confectioners and economists may be related to the important difference in the *social distantness* subscale (U = 485.5; p <0.01) – economists experience less isolation from others than cook-confectioners. The same problem causes the difference between cook-confectioners and engineers, – engineers significantly higher mean values for the *social distance* subscale (U = 533.5; p <0.01).

Regarding the difference between the groups of the cook-confectioners and the managers, it is due to a significant difference in the mean values for SSW's subscales, such as *social noticeability* (U = 1880.0; p <0.01), *social distantness* (U = 1368.5; p <0.01), emotional acceptance (U = 1885.5; p <0.01) and *social approval* (U = 1754.50; p <0.01). Managers on these scales have significantly higher mean values indicators and experience more attention, less isolation from others, more social approval and better relations with loved ones than cook-confectioners.

According to the general indicator *satisfaction with life* (SWLS), no significant differences were found between the groups, which testifies rather than the universality of this phenomenon.

Organizational (contextual) indicators. It was found that medical representatives have significantly higher mean rates of *job satisfaction* (JS) than other professional groups: economists (JS: U = 227; p <0.01), cook-confectioners (JS: U = 492; p = 4.252), managers (JS: U = 1321.5; p = 0.029), engineers (JS: U = 371.5; p = 0.018), unskilled manual workers (JS: U = 499; p = 7.178), police investigators (JS: U = 258; p = 2.636) and police inspectors (JS: U = 230.5; p = 2.018), except for *salesmen* with whom no significant differences were found. Perhaps this is since the content of the professional activity of both professions (medical representative and salesmen) has common features.

Also, salesmen also have significantly higher mean values JS indicators than economists (JS: U = 273.5; p <001), cook-confectioners (JS: U = 582; p = 5.001), unskilled manual workers (JS: U = 579.5; p <0.01), police investigators (JS: U = 300; p <0.01) and police inspectors (JS: U = 278; p <0.01). This may be due to significantly greater satisfaction on the *wages* subscale and *conditions and organization of labor* subscale, among salesmen, for example, economists have significantly lower mean values for these two subscales (U = 297.5; p <0.01 and

U = 261.5; p <0.01) than salesmen; other groups also have significantly lower mean values on these subscales.

Separately, we note managers who have significantly higher mean values of JS indicators than economists (JS: U = 770.5; p = 0.026), cook-confectioners (JS: U = 1624.5; p = 6.073), unskilled manual workers (JS: U = 1652.5; p = 0.029), police investigators (JS: U = 912; p <0.01) and police inspectors (JS: U = 864.5; p = 4.966) and engineers who have significantly higher mean values of JS than cook-confectioners (JS: U = 561.5; p <0.01), police investigators (JS: U = 306; p = 0.01) and police inspectors (JS: U = 301.5; p <0.01).

It was also found that unskilled manual workers have significantly higher mean values of JS than cook-confectioners (JS: U = 1144; p = 0.034) and police inspectors (JS: U = 629.5; p = 0.015). So, for example, cook-confectioners have significantly lower mean values indicators for the subscales *satisfaction with the leadership* (U = 1035; p <0.01) and *satisfaction with the team* (U = 1151; p = 0.036), and police inspectors have significantly lower mean values for *satisfaction with management* (U = 623.0; p = 0.013), *working conditions and organization* (U = 673.5; p = 0.04) and *wages* (U = 538; p <0.01), which leads to this differences.

According to the general indicator psychological climate (Climat), it was found that economists have significantly lower mean values indicators than managers (Climat: U = 772; p = 0.027) and unskilled manual workers (Climat: U = 434; p = 0.04). No other significant differences were found for this indicator.

PW predictors in various professional groups. To find out which of the 13 general indicators of the study can become PW's predictors, their regression analysis was done in various professional groups (Table 4).

Based on the results of the regression analysis, it was found that the *work engagement* indicator is a PW predictor for salesmen, cook-confectioners, police investigators and police inspectors; *professional demand for personality* is a predictor of PW for managers and unskilled manual workers; *job satisfaction* – for medical representatives; *occupational psychological well-being* – for economists.

An attempt at regression analysis at the level of the subscales that lie behind each general indicator more widely revealed the meaningful field PW. Without going into details, one can say that in different regression models, professional well-being is causally related to professional motivation, work engagement, job satisfaction, professional achievements, competence, and realization of professional potential, meaningfulness of life, professional and economic optimism, purposefulness and other aspects of psychological capital, positive relationships with other people and subjective adequacy of income.

*Table 4.* Regression coefficients (a) of general indicators in various professional groups

| Profession | Predictors | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized coefficients | t statistic | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Standard Error | Beta | | |
| Medical representatives | (Constant) | -1.656 | 0.72 | | -2.299 | 0.027 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.363$ | Job satisfaction | 0.031 | 0.009 | 0.475 | 3.283 | 0.002 |
| **Managers** | (Constant) | -4.097 | 0.528 | | -7.753 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.363$ | Professional demand for personality | 0.02 | 0.002 | 0.67 | 8.263 | 0.000 |
| **Engineers** | (Constant) | -6.863 | 1.256 | | -5.462 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.695$ | Occupational psychological well-being | 0.322 | 0.057 | 0.743 | 5.666 | 0.000 |
| **Economists** | (Constant) | -7.192 | 1.496 | | -4.808 | 0,000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.592$ | Occupational psychological well-being | 0.343 | 0.07 | 0.716 | 4.913 | 0.000 |
| **Salesmen** | (Constant) | -1.384 | 0.504 | | -2.748 | 0.009 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.285$ | Work engagement | 0.116 | 0.039 | 0.432 | 2.988 | 0.005 |
| **Cook-confectioners** | (Constant) | -1.599 | 0.321 | | -4.976 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.362$ | Work engagement | 0.13 | 0.027 | 0.538 | 4.908 | 0.000 |
| **Unskilled manual workers** | (Constant) | -3.876 | 1.009 | | -3.84 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.395$ | Professional demand for personality | 0.017 | 0.005 | 0.463 | 3.578 | 0.001 |
| **Police investigators** | (Constant) | -2.719 | 0.468 | | -5.81 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.467$ | Work engagement | 0.205 | 0.039 | 0.683 | 5.21 | 0.000 |
| **police inspectors** | (Constant) | -2.408 | 0.5 | | -4.815 | 0.000 |
| Model: 1 predictor – $R^2 = 0.257$ | Work engagement | 0.157 | 0.045 | 0.507 | 3,482 | 0.001 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Professional Well-being (PW) | | | | | | |

This diversity requires additional research on the structure and characteristics of PW for representatives of various professions, at the level of the points behind each subscale of general indicators.

## Conclusion

The study examined the features of professional well-being in various professional groups. It was revealed that there are both common features and differences. According to the results of the study, it was found that the group of medical representatives has a significantly higher mean values of PW indicator than representatives of other professions. Four professional groups stand out on the second level: economists, salesmen, engineers, and managers. The third level is occupied by cook-confectioners, unskilled manual workers, and police investigators. The last level is a group of police inspectors.

Due to the fact that differences between groups in *professional well-being* may be related with other general indicators of the study, we first determined the correlation between the general indicators of the study and *professional well-being* in each professional group (universal indicators for all groups were *work engagement* and *job satisfaction*), and then a pairwise comparison of the mean values was carried out for those indicators that in these groups have an moderate and strong significant correlation with PW. For each of the indicators, the possible reasons for the differences between the groups was explained.

Noted that each of the components of any general indicator can contribute to the differences between professional groups.

In general, the hierarchy of professional groups by mean values of each general indicator coincides with the hierarchy by mean values of *professional well-being*, which indicates the unity of the semantic field of professional well-being for the studied professional groups.

Testing the possibility of general indicators being predictors PW it was found that the *work engagement* indicator is a predictor of PW for salesmen, cook-confectioners, police investigators, and police inspectors; the *professional demand for personality* indicator – for managers and unskilled manual workers; the *job satisfaction* indicator is for medical representatives; and the *occupational psychological well-being* indicator is for economists.

The study confirmed that the structure of professional well-being predictors may differ significantly for different professional groups, but significant links between professional well-being and general research indicators revealed the unity of the PW semantic field for different professional groups. In addition, the scales of general indicators may contribute to the differences between professional groups,

indicating the need for further study of the optimal model of professional well-being, invariance of its structure and hierarchy of PW predictors in different professional groups, at the level of items of each common indicator.

Purely practical, understanding the possible differences in the content and structure of professional well-being for different professions reveals new perspectives of strategic HR planning and personnel management: understanding the state of employees, their motivation, important aspects of their professional life, employer brand features for different professions and tools to improve professional results. For psychologists from employment centers, this will help in the practice of professional selection and vocational guidance, in understanding the origins of experiencing professional crises in the unemployed, will deepen the content of vocational rehabilitation programs aimed at identifying socio-psychological conditions of professional well-being.

## References


Baldschun, A. (2015). The Six Dimensions of Child Welfare Employees' Occupational Well-Being. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, Vol. 4(4), p. 69–87. DOI: https://doi.org/10.19154/njwls.v4i4.4708.

Bandura, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511527692.

Berezovskaya, R. A. (2016). Occupational well-being: problems and prospects of psychological studies. *Psikhologicheskie Issledovaniya*, Vol. 9(45), p. 2. http://psystudy.ru (in Russian, abstr. in English).

Bradburn, N. (1969). *The Structure of Psychological well-being*. Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co.

Danylchenko, T. (2016). Subjective Social Well-being as a Psychological Phenomenon. *Psychological Prospects Journal*, Vol. (28), p. 93–107. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29038/2227-1376-2016-28-93-107.

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. *Handbook of positive psychology*, Vol. 2, p. 63–73.

Hackman, J. R., Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through design of work. *Organizational behaviour and human performance*, Vol. 16 (2), p. 250–279.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. others. (1959). *The Motivation to work*. New York. John Wiley & Sons.

Ivanova, T. I., Rasskazova, E. I., Osin, E. N. (2012). Struktura i diagnostika udovletvorennosti trudom razrabotka i aprobatsiia metodiki [Structure and Diagnosis of Job Satisfaction: Development and Approbation of the Methodology]. *Organizatsionnaia psikhologiia* [*Organizational Psychology*], Vol. 2(3), p. 2–15 (rus.).

Kharitonova, E. V., & Jasko, B. A. (2009). *A questionnaire Professional demand for a person* (PDP). Manual.

Khashchenko, V. A. (2011). Sub'ektivnoe ekonomicheskoe blagopoluchie i ego izmerenie: postroenie oprosnika i ego validizatsiya [Subjective economic well-being and its assessment: development and validation of a questionnaire]. *Eksperimental'naya psikhologiya [Experimental Psychology]*, |Vol. 4(1), p. 106–127.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annu. Rev. Psychol*., Vol. 56, p. 485–516.

Leontiev, D. A. (1992). *Test of the meaning of life orientations*. Moscow: Smysl (in Russian).

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 1297–1349.

Luthans, F. et al. (2006). Psychological capital development: toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, p. 387–393.

Mayo, E. (1949). Hawthorne and the western electric company. *Public administration: Concepts and cases*, p. 149–158.

Meyerding, S. G. (2015). Job characteristics and job satisfaction: A test of Warr's vitamin model in German horticulture. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, Vol. 18(2), p. 86.

Osin, E. N., & Leont'ev, D. A. (2008). Aprobatsiya russkoyazychnykh versiy dvukh shkal ekspress-otsenki subyektivnogo blagopoluchiya [Testing the Russian-Language Versions of Two Measures of Subjective Wellbeing]. In 3rd All-Russia Sociological Congress, Moscow: Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/23153063

Osin, E., Gorbunova, A. A., Gordeeva, T., Ivanova, T., Kosheleva, N., & Ovchinnikova, E. (2017). Professionalnaya motivatsiya sotrudnikov rossiyskikh predpriyatiy: diagnostika i svyazi s blagopoluchiem i uspeshnostyu deyatelnosti [Professional Motivation of Russian Employees: Assessment and Associations with Well-Being and Performance]. *Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 7(4), p. 21–49.

Pakhol, B. E. (2018). The structure of professional well-being: the definition of the phenomenon, factor structure and predictors. *Ukrainian Psychological Journal: collection of scientific works*, Vol. 3 (9), p. 121–135. Taras Shevchenko National University of Ukraine.

Povarenkov, I. P. (2014) Psikhologicheskaia kharakteristika professionalnoi identichnosti subieekta truda [Psychological characteristics of the professional identity of the subject of labor]. *Vestnik KGU im. N. A. Nekrasova [Vestnik KSU im. ON. Nekrasov]*, Vol. 20, p. 9–16 (rus.).

Ruth, E. I. (2016). *Occupational well-being among employees of private enterprises: criteria and assessment tool*. Master' dissertation. Saint Petersburg State University.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52(1), p. 141–166.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, Vol. 69(4), p. 719.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *UWES – Utrecht work engagement scale: test manual*. Unpublished Manuscript: Department of Psychology, Utrecht University.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). Positive psychology: An introduction. *Flow and the foundations of positive psychology*. Springer, Dordrecht, p. 279–298.

Shpalinskyy, V. V., Shelest, E. G. (1997). *Osnovy sovremennoy psikhologii [Fundamentals of modern psychology*. Khar'kov: IVMO KHK [textbook. allowance. Kharkov: IVMO KhK] (rus.).

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63, p. 193–210. DOI:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x

**Boris Pakhol** – PhD student, Social Psychology Department, Faculty of Psychology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: boris.pakhol@gmail.com