Gender, Job Crafting and Work Place Well-Being: A Correlational Study

IJHS

Mahreen Zarif	Lecturer Psychology, GGPGC, Mardan. mahreen_zareef@uop.edu.pk
Roomana Zeb	Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar. roomazeb@uop.edu.pk
Saima Arzeen	Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar. saimaarzeenmehar@uop.edu.pk

Abstract: *In this research endeavor, the primary objective was to investigate the interplay between Job Crafting, encompassing both its various types and forms, and Workplace Wellbeing. Additionally, it was posited that there might exist gender differences in the utilization of distinct types and forms of job crafting. The study sample comprised 377 employees employed across diverse educational institutions in Peshawar, spanning both the private and public sectors. Data collection relied on the administration of two self-report measures: the PERMA-Profiler (Butler & Kern, 2016) and the Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2019).An examination of gender distinctions via an independent sample t-test revealed that there were no discernible differences between males and females concerning the utilization of various types and forms of job crafting. Furthermore, correlation analysis disclosed a significant and positive association between job crafting total scores and workplace wellbeing total scores. This observation extended to the various facets of job crafting, demonstrating positive correlations with distinct dimensions of wellbeing. In summation, this study contributes substantially to the extant body of knowledge on job crafting, particularly by exploring its intricate connection with workplace wellbeing. These insights hold the potential to assist organizations in the formulation of effective strategies and interventions aimed at enhancing the wellbeing of both their employees and the organization as a whole*

Keywords: Job crafting, Workplace wellbeing, Gender difference

Introduction

In today's fast-paced business landscape, organizations grapple with constant changes driven by global, economic, and technological advancements (Cummings & Worley, 2009; Baard et al., 2014). These shifts have profound implications for how employees experience their work. As suggested by Parker (2014), in the challenging contemporary workplace, designing one's job can foster an environment conducive to learning and development, as well as improve both physical and mental well-being. Historically, job design has typically been a top-down process, with managers primarily responsible for structuring and modifying employee roles (Grant & Parker, 2009). However, this approach has faced criticism for its inability to adapt to evolving work contexts and increasing job complexity. Consequently, Grant and Parker (2009) introduced a proactive perspective on job design, emphasizing the

active role of employees in reshaping their roles to align with the demands of the modern workplace. In the past, employees often focused solely on adhering to their job descriptions, rarely having the opportunity to make changes to their job designs. However, as economic, educational, and social dimensions have rapidly evolved, employees now view their jobs as more than just a source of income. They increasingly adopt a proactive approach to their tasks. Consequently, organizational management now necessitates flexible job designs to accommodate employees' potential to proactively enhance workplace relationships and job-related activities (Grant & Parker, 2009).

A certain form of preemptive behavior that emerged a few years ago is known as "job crafting," where individuals adjust their work-related responsibilities within the framework of their job design. These adjustments can pertain to job-related tasks, social interactions in the workplace, perspectives on the job, or even the required skills to perform their job effectively (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2012). Various researchers have explored the factors driving employees to engage in job crafting. Since job crafting is a self- commenced act, it's expected that different employees in similar roles may exhibit diverse behaviors. Consequently, individual factors play a crucial role in understanding job crafting.

To comprehend how different approaches to job crafting contribute to work-related outcomes, researchers have developed theoretical frameworks. These studies have consistently found that job crafting behaviors are associated with positive results, including satisfaction with job, and well-being (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014), job performance (Khan et al., 2018), work engagement (Santiago et al., 2020), and improved person-job fit (Lu et al., 2014). Building on this research, the current study aims to examine the relationship between various dimensions of job crafting and workplace well-being, using Seligman's PERMA well-being model (2011).

Job crafting has been defined and explained from different theoretical perspectives, with two main views prevailing: the Role-Based Perspective and the Resource-Based Perspective. The Role perspective has largely emerged from qualitative research (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), while the Resource perspective has predominantly arisen from quantitative research (Tims et al., 2012, 2013). A third perspective, known as the Approach-Avoidance perspective, was proposed by Bipp and Demerouti (2015). In 2018, Bruning and Campion sought to integrate these perspectives into a comprehensive model known as the Role-Resource Approach-Avoidance model of Job Crafting.

Bindl et al. (2019) noted that despite these different approaches to defining job crafting, there was a gap in the literature concerning why employees engage in job crafting (i.e., the reasons behind it) and how job crafting is put into action (i.e., the process). To address these questions, they turned to two theories: Regulatory Focus Theory (RFT) and Self-Determination Theory (SDT). Both RFT and SDT were integrated to explain job crafting behaviour. Regulatory Focus Theory, proposed by Higgins (1997), suggests that individuals have two ways to pursue their goals: promotion-focused (change-oriented) and prevention-focused (stability-oriented). Self-Determination Theory, on the other hand, posits that an individual's behavior is driven by three core needs: relatedness, autonomy, and competence. Bindl et al. (2019) concluded an individual's utilization of either type of skill crafting whether promotion or prevention can be ascertained through the strength of their need for competence. Similarly, use of relationship crafting can be related with the strength of their need for relatedness, while task crafting (mainly promotion-focused) can be assessed through the strength of the need for autonomy. According to him, individual needs better reflect promotion-oriented job crafting than prevention-oriented job crafting.

By integrating Regulatory Focus Theory and Self-Determination Theory, Bindl et al. (2019) identified eight different dimensions of job crafting:

1. Prevention-Oriented   Cognitive

Crafting: Focusing on specific job aspects one is comfortable with.

2. Promotion-Oriented Cognitive Crafting: Perceiving the job in the broader organizational context.

3. Prevention-Oriented Relationship Crafting: Limiting relationships to a few trusted individuals.

4. Promotion-Oriented Relationship Crafting: Building relationships with newcomers and maintaining positive relationships with coworkers.

5. Prevention-Oriented Skill Crafting: Concentrating on existing skills to enhance performance and avoid failures.

6. Promotion-Oriented Skill Crafting: Seeking new skills to perform job tasks effectively, often through training and workshops.

7. Prevention-Oriented Task Crafting: Focusing efforts on the most critical task components, avoiding multitasking.

8. Promotion-Oriented Task Crafting: Engaging in new projects and adding complexity to tasks to broaden their scope.

The literature has consistently linked job crafting to positive outcomes such as job involvement, and performance enhancement (Bakker et al., 2012), career satisfaction (Dubbelt et al., 2019) and well-being (Heuvel et al., 2015). To expand on this body of research, the current study seeks to explore the correlation between various types and forms of job crafting and the PERMA well-being model (Seligman, 2011).

Well-being is a multifaceted concept that encompasses not only feeling good but also effective functioning (Huppert & So, 2011). It combines hedonic (the pursuit of pleasure) and eudaimonic (the pursuit of meaning) aspects.

Huppert et al. (2011) identified ten features of well-being: Competence, Emotional stability, Engagement, Meaning, Optimism, Positive emotion, Positive relationships, Resilience, Self-esteem, and Vitality. Similarly, Seligman (2011) shifted the focus from happiness to well-being, defining it in terms of five dimensions: Positive emotions, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment, known as the PERMA model of well-being.

Job crafting has been found to enhance well-being and performance (Schoberova, 2015), subjective well-being (Peral & Geldenhuys, 2016), and even affective well-being (Heuvel et al., 2015). Research has shown that job crafting interventions can lead to increased affective well-being (Robledo et al., 2019), and well-being mediates between job crafting and job performance (Khan et al., 2018). Additionally, job crafting has been linked to work engagement (Lu et al., 2014) and physical and psychological health (Lichtenthaler & Fishbach, 2018). Furthermore, employees' performance and health are positively associated with promotion-focused job crafting but inversely correlated with prevention-focused job crafting (Lichtenthaler & Fishbach, 2018).

In conclusion, job crafting, by mobilizing workplace resources, can enhance work engagement and overall flourishing (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). This dynamic approach to job design offers employees opportunities to shape their roles, resulting in improved well-being and performance across various work-related domains.

Historically, researchers have primarily emphasized the theoretical aspects of job crafting, striving to establish a thorough definition and categorization of this concept. Consequently, many studies treated gender as a control variable, with limited examination of its relationship with job crafting behavior. While some exceptions exist, some investigations yielded mixed findings concerning the impact of gender on proactive behavior within the job crafting context. For example, Petrou et al.

(2016) claimed higher job crafting scores for men than women, whereas, Van hoof and Van hooft (2014) claimed that women practiced job crafting more than men, thus both showing contrary results. Similarly, Rudolph et al. (2017) documented that females tend to engage in job crafting to a slightly greater extent than males. Keeping in mind these differences the present study aimed to investigate that whether gender makes a difference in the type or form of job crafting practiced by the employees.

Objectives

1- To discover the association between Job Crafting and workplace wellbeing.

2- To investigate which particular type and specific form of Job crafting is used by males and females.

Hypotheses

1- High scores on Job crafting scale will be positively correlated with high scores on workplace wellbeing.

2- Males and females will differ significantly between the types of job crafting used.

3- There will be significant differences between males and females in the form of job crafting used.

METHOD

Sample

By using the Raosoft sample size calculator (Raosoft, 2004), a purposive sample of 377 teachers, comprising 49.3% males (n=186) and 50.7% females (n=191), between 25 - 60 years of age (M=37.30, SD=9.93), was selected from different educational institutions in Peshawar (49.3% Public and 50.7% Private). Among them, 148 were teaching at the School level, 128 at the College level, and 101 at the University level. Inclusion criteria required the participants to have a minimum of six months' work experience. Employees having less than six months duration, as well as interns and self-employed individuals were not selected for the study.

Instruments

1. **Demographic Information**

The demographic questionnaire collected information about the gender and age of the subject. It also asked about the institute where the person was teaching like, School, College, or University. Further information asked included the job sector whether Public or Private; job status i.e., Permanent or Contract, and total teaching experience.

2- **Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2019)** The Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2019), is a 28 item five point Likert scale that assess the degree of employees engagement in various job crafting strategies. The scale measures Promotion vs. Prevention form of job crafting with its four types via Relationship, Skill, Task, and Cognitive crafting. In the development of the scale, some items are selected from existing job crafting scales while 12 new items are also generated. The eight dimensions of job crafting yield reliability ranging from .64 to .93. Various studied conducted on JCQ in the U.S and U.K proved its validity, which is also supported by the association of different job crafting behaviours with innovative work performance (Bindl et al., 2019).

2- **PERMA-Profiler (Butler & Kern, 2016)**

The PERMA-Profiler (Butler & Kern, 2016), is a 23 item Likert format scale, of workplace well-being that measures five domains: Positive emotion, Engagement, Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment. Responses range from 0 for never to 10 for *always*. The scale also included items assessing Negative emotions, Loneliness, and Physical health. PERMA has been validated by correlating it with flourishing, life satisfaction, and negative emotions scales. Results revealed significant positive correlation of PERMA sub scales with flourishing and life satisfaction and inverse correlation was found with negative emotion and loneliness (Butler &

Kern, 2016). High scores on sub-scales of wellbeing as well as total score show high wellbeing.

Procedure

Data collection involved the administration the demographic questionnaire, Job Crafting questionnaire, and PERMA-Profiler. Permission was obtained from the heads of educational

institutions for data collection, and participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. Clear instructions were provided to participants, emphasizing honest and voluntary participation. Participants were also informed that they have the right to withdraw from the research if they don't like to continue at any point.

Data collection methods included both in-person administration and online data collection through Google Forms. For the latter, participants were sent the questionnaire link along with a brief research description via official email addresses obtained from the institutions' websites. The link was also shared through social media channels and peer networks. Participants were requested to complete the questionnaires, which took approximately 20-25 minutes.

Table 1

Psychometrics of JCQ

Scale	M	SD	Cronbach's α
Job Crafting Questionnaire	99.30	13.23	.81
Pro-Job Crafting	58.76	9.43	.81
Pre- Job Crafting	40.54	6.05	.57
Pro-R/sh Crafting	14.03	3.67	.75
Pre- R/sh Crafting	8.58	2.67	.60
Pro-Skill Crafting	16.29	3.25	.78
Pre- Skill Crafting	11.58	2.49	.65
Pro-Task Crafting	13.17	3.49	.76
Pre- Task Crafting	9.79	2.32	.60
Pro-Cognitive Crafting	15.27	3.52	.75
Pre- Cognitive Crafting	10.60	2.62	.36

Note: JCQ= Job Crafting Questionnaire, Pre=Prevention focused, Pro=Promotion focused

Table 1 represents the alpha reliability of *JCQ* which shows high reliabilities for the full scale and the sub scales, i.e., above .70

Table 2

Psychometric properties of PERMA-Profiler

Variables	M	SD	α
PERMA-Profiler	122.93	18.72	.86
PE	23.48	4.68	.63
ENG	15.94	3.02	.45
RLP	22.21	5.53	.71
MEAN	23.83	4.44	.71
ACCOMP	23.89	4.19	.64

Note: PE=Positive emotions, ENG=Engagement, RLP=Relationship, MEAN=Meaning. ACCOMP=Accomplishment

Table 2 represents the coefficient alpha of work place well-being questionnaire which depicted high reliability of .86. Similarly the subscales also showed high reliabilities except engagement scale which showed low reliability (α= .45).

Table 3

Inter-scale correlations between JC full score and subscales with Workplace wellbeing total and subscales

Variable	1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	2	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5
1. Job Crafting	1												
1.1.R/sh C	.63**	1											
1.2.Skill C	.73**	.22**	1										
1.3.Task C	.70**	.39**	.29**	1									
1.4.Cogn C	.75**	.24**	.49**	.33**	1								
1.5.Pro JC	.91**	.56**	.71**	.63**	.66**	1							
1.6.Pre JC	.77**	.43**	.50**	.55**	.60**	.43**	1						
2-Wellbeing	.31**	.12**	.36**	.08	.29**	.34**	.15**	1					
2.1. PE	.23**	.12*	.23**	.07	.21**	.24**	.12*	.78**	1				
2.2. EN	.20**	.09	.14**	.13**	.19**	.19**	.14**	.57**	.24**	1			
2.3. RSP	.16**	.19**	.06	.78**	.56**	.19**	.06	.78**	.56**	.23**	1		
2.3. MEAN	.29**	.08	.42*	.03	.28**	.35**	.10*	.85**	.56**	.46**	.58**	1	
2.5. ACCOM	.30**	.10	.39**	.09	.25**	.31**	.17**	.75**	.51**	.34**	.44**	.61**	1

Note: JC = Job crafting, Pro= Promotion focus, Pre= Prevention focus, PE = Positive emotions, EN = Engagement, RSP = Relationships, MEAN = Meaning, ACCOM = Accomplishment.*; Correlation is significant at .01 level (Two-tailed); *Correlation is significant at .05 level (Two-tailed)

Table 3 indicates that job crafting total score is significantly correlated with the total score of workplace wellbeing. Similarly, Promotion job crafting and Prevention job crafting also positively correlated with total workplace wellbeing. Likewise, total score of workplace wellbeing also positively correlated with Relationship crafting, Skill crafting, task crafting and cognitive crafting.

Table 4

Mean, standard and t-values showing difference between Males and Females in Types and Forms of Job Crafting

Variables	Males		Female				95% CI	
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p	LL	UL
Types of Job Craft								
R/shp Crafting	22.39	.33	22.80	.30	.92	.36	-.47	1.28
Skill Crafting	27.77	.39	27.96	.34	.37	.19	-.82	1.20
Task Crafting	22.84	.33	23.09	.34	.52	.25	-.68	1.17
Cognitive Crafting	25.60	.36	26.14	.36	1.06	.54	-.47	1.55
Forms of Job Craft								
Promotion Focus	57.88	9.56	59.62	9.28	1.80	.07	-.16	3.66
Prevention Focus	40.73	6.39	40.37	5.72	-.58	.56	-1.59	.87
JC Total	98.61	13.38	99.99	13.12	1.01	.31	-1.30	4.07

Note: JC=Job crafting, R/shp =Relationship crafting

Table 4 represent that males and female did not differ in general job crafting behaviour as well as its different factors.

Discussion

Numerous studies have explored the relationship between job crafting and various dimensions of well-being. This study's primary objective was to investigate the association between job crafting and workplace well-being. To evaluate well-being, we employed the multidimensional PERMA model of well-being proposed by Seligman (2002). Our hypothesis posited a positive relationship between job crafting and workplace well-being, which the findings of the study proved. These results align with similar findings in previous studies. For instance, Heuvel et al. (2015) and Peral and Geldenhuys (2016) observed positive correlation between job crafting and affective well-being, and job crafting and subjective well-being respectively. In the same vein, Robledo et al. (2019) established positive correlation between job crafting and social and psychological well-being. Furthermore, Santiago et al. (2020) recently reported positive correlations between general job crafting and its specific types with workplace well-being.

These findings can also be interpreted with the help of the Job Demands-Resources (JDR) model, which proposes a positive correlation of well-being with job crafting. Additionally, it has been reported that to manage their resources, actively engaged employees are more inclined practice job crafting endeavors (Sakuraya et al., 2017). Hobfoll et al., (2018) presented similar kind of concept in the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. The theory states that individuals are motivated to maintain and acquire resources, as resource loss can lead to stress. Managing task, social, and personal resources, as reported by Weigal et al. (2010), enhances work engagement and positively influences interpersonal relationships at work.

Notably, workplace well-being exhibited a significant ($p < 0.001$) positive correlation with the four sub types of job crafting including Relationship crafting (r = .63**), Skill crafting (r = .73**), Task crafting (r = .70**), and Cognitive crafting (r = .75**). This aligns with Pimenta de Devotto et al.'s (2020) findings, which indicated that cognitive crafting is associated with workflow, cognitive and relational crafting which are linked with mental health positive outcomes, whereas, cognitive and relational crafting are associated with social well-being. Furthermore, engaged employees tend to focus more on relational and physical types of job crafting, particularly in uncertain work environments (Lu et al., 2014).

Promotion-focused job crafting was found to have a positive relationship with overall workplace well-being and all five well-being dimensions, consistent with recent studies (Brenninkmeijer et al., 2010; Huyghebaert-Zouaghi, 2020), which reported a positive relationship between promotion-focused job crafting, employee well-being, performance, and health. However, findings regarding prevention-focused job crafting are mixed. In the current study, it showed a positive relationship with overall workplace well-being (r = .15**), except for the relationships dimension. The findings of the present study contradict Brenninkmeijer et al. (2010) findings that associated prevention-focused job crafting to mental health problems. Likewise, prevention-focused job crafting has been linked to low scores on job satisfaction (Huyghebaert-Zouaghi, 2020) and less work engagement (Harju et al., 2021) while other studies, suggest that its impact on well-being depends on the specific aspects of the job being modified.

The lack of a significant relationship between prevention-focused job crafting and the relationships factor (r = .06, $p > 0.05$) of well-being could be attributed to the context of the

COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic introduced significant health crises, leading to various restrictions, social distancing measures, and altered work and personal lives. These circumstances may have negatively impacted interpersonal relationships in the workplace.

The differences in these results could also be attributed to variations in well-being across different contexts (Hamling, 2018) and occupational groups (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Well-being is contextual, with significant variations observed among different occupational groups (e.g., managers, sales workers, drivers, technicians) (Hamling, 2018). Higher-status occupational groups tend to report higher well-being scores compared to lower-status groups, likely due to differences in job demands and resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Given that this study exclusively sampled teachers, the relationships factor of well-being may not have been a prominent concern for them, as they often have limited time for socializing due to academic commitments.

Furthermore, this study uncovered a positive relationship between job crafting and the Positive Emotion dimension of well-being, Costantini and Sartori (2018), also reported that employees who engage in job crafting report more positive emotions related to their work. It is believed that positive emotions contribute to increased work engagement when combined with positive psychology interventions. Additionally, the study revealed a positive correlation between job crafting and the Work Engagement dimension of well-being, aligning with previous studies (Brenninkmeijer & Hekkert-Koning, 2015; Vanbelle, 2017) that found crafting structural and social job resources enhances job engagement. Job engagement helps manage personal and work resources and achieve desired work outcomes.

Moreover, this study identified a positive relationship between job crafting and the Relationship dimension of well-being. This result

concurs with Farrell and Strauss (2013), who found that positive work relationships enhance individuals' belief in their ability to succeed through proactive approaches and boost work engagement. Additionally, interpersonal relationships at work can be improved by managing task, social, and personal resources (Weigal et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the study reported a positive association between job crafting and the Meaning dimension of well-being. Studies of Werzeniewski and Dutton (2001), and Vanbelle (2017), also proposed that job crafting enhances the meaning of work personal achievement respectively. To understand this inter connection between meaning and job crafting, Job Demands-Control-Support (DCS) model (Karasek, 1979), explains that job demands, as well as control, and support are interwoven, which influence employee well-being, health, and performance. Using DCS model, Luchman and Morales (2013) asserted that exerting control over job and social support attained from the colleagues can forecast job outcomes.

In hypotheses 2 and 3 of this study, we posited the existence of gender differences in the utilization of various types and forms of job crafting behavior. We subjected these hypotheses to t-test analyses, and the results are presented in table 4. The significance values for different types of job crafting along with its forms (Promotion & Prevention), as well as the total score of Job Crafting scale, exceeded .05. Consequently, we accepted the null hypothesis, signifying that there is no substantial gender difference in the types used, forms engaged in, and general job crafting behaviors. This implies the rejection of the second and third hypotheses outlined in this study. Therefore, as Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) suggested, we can also infer that both genders engage in different types and forms of job crafting to make their work meaningful, interesting, valuable, as

guided by their beliefs.

It is worth noting that studies quote variations in their findings, some show males scoring higher than females on certain dimensions or in general job crafting behavior, and vice versa. Slemp et al. (2015), also indicated a lack of significant difference among males and females in the utilization of Task and Cognitive types of job crafting. However, they did find a significant gender-related distinction in Relationship type job crafting, a distinction not corroborated by the present study.

Furthermore, our results diverge from those of Petrou et al. (2016), who reported higher job crafting scores for men compared to women, while Van hoof and Van hooft (2014) found that females used job crafting more than males, thus yielding opposite outcomes. Similarly, Rudolph et al. (2017) documented that females tend to use job crafting to a slightly greater extent than males. These discrepancies in findings may be attributed to the fact that gender intersects with various other demographic and occupational characteristics, such as age, occupational type, and experience, among others (Bindl & Parker, in Press). As such, these variables necessitate meticulous control to comprehensively grasp the role of gender in relation to the variables under investigation in this study.

Significance of the study

Facilitating employee well-being can be achieved by promoting various job crafting strategies, in line with the recommendations of Demerouti et al. (2019), who proposed that job crafting intervention programs have the potential to induce changes in employees' cognitions and behaviors. Furthermore, the present research has unveiled a positive correlation between job crafting and workplace well-being. These findings can serve as a foundation for employers to consider implementing training programs aimed at fostering employee well-being and encouraging the adoption of job crafting behaviors.

As emphasized by Holcombe (2016), it is important to recognize that both individual factors, such as job crafting, and organizational elements, including work design characteristics, can contribute to enhancing employees' positive experiences, sense of meaning, and motivation in their work. Consequently, organizations should aim to structure jobs in a manner that offers employees opportunities and incentives to engage in job crafting behavior, as advocated by Grant and Parker (2009). Moreover, the study has established significant associations between workplace well-being and all four types of job crafting—namely, skill crafting, task crafting, relationship crafting, and cognitive crafting—as well as both promotion-focused and prevention-focused forms of job crafting. This theoretical framework can assist employers in pinpointing which specific job crafting behaviors should be prioritized to bolster overall well-being among their workforce.

Limitations and future suggestions

Firstly, it's important to note that the sample utilized in this study exclusively consisted of teaching faculty members from both Public and Private sector educational institutions encompassing schools, colleges, and universities in Peshawar. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships under investigation, future research endeavors could replicate this study using diverse samples from a broader geographical scope.

Secondly, the questionnaires employed in this study are self-report measures presented in a foreign language. Consequently, the outcomes are contingent on how respondents perceive and respond to them, potentially introducing social desirability response bias. To offer a more nuanced depiction of the connections among the variables, objective metrics like job performance,

absenteeism, and medical records could be employed. Additionally, utilizing a locally adapted version of the questionnaires in a language more familiar to the respondents might enhance comprehension and accuracy.

Moreover, it's crucial to recognize that various theoretical frameworks exist for understanding job crafting behavior. Future investigations could explore the proposed relationships between personality traits, job crafting, and workplace well-being by adopting alternative theoretical perspectives. For instance, one could delve into the Resource-Based Perspective (Tims et al., 2012) or the Role-Resource Approach-Avoidance approach (Bruning & Campion, 2018), among others, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of these dynamics.

REFERENCES

Aslam, A., Fatima, S., Hassan, M, M., Qureshi, J, A., & Dilawar, S. (2020). Job Crafting Incidents: Antecedents of Job Crafting and its Impact on Individual's Task and Contextual Performance: Application of Job Demand Resource Theory. Pacific Business Review International, 13(3), 138-155.

Baard, S. K., Rench, T. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. (2014). Performance adaptation: A theoretical integration and review. Journal of Management, 40, 48–99. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0149206313488210

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309-328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bakker, A, B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job Performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. Human relations, 65(10), 1359 –1378. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267124534 71

Berg, J, W., Verberg, C, P, M., Scherpbier, A, J, J, A., Jaarsma, D, C., Arah, O, A., Lombarts, K, M, J, M, H. (2018). Faculty's work engagement in patient care: impact on job crafting of the teacher tasks. BMC Medical Education. 18(312) https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1411-z

Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (in press). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. American Psychological Association

Bindl, U, K., Unsworth, K, L., Gibson, C, B., & Stride, C, B. (2019). Job Crafting Revisited: Implications of an Extended Framework for Active Changes at Work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 104(5), 605-628.

Bipp., T, & Demerouti, E. (2015). Which employees craft their jobs and how? Basic dimensions of personality and employees' job crafting behavior. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 88, 631–655

Boudrias, J-S., Desrumaux, P., Gaudreau, P., Nelson, K., Brunet, L., & Savoie, A. (2011). Modeling the Experience of Psychological Health at Work: The Role of Personal Resources, Social-Organizational Resources, and Job Demands. International Journal of Stress Management. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025353

Brenninkmeijer, V., Demerouti, E., le Blanc, P.M. and van Emmerik, I.H. (2010), "Regulatory focus at work: the moderating role of regulatory focus in the job demands-resources model", Career Development

International, 15(7), 708-728.

Brenninkmeijer, V., and Hekkert-Koning, M. (2015). To craft or not to craft: The relationships between regulatory focus, job crafting and work outcomes. Career Development International, 20 (2), 147-162. http://doi.org.10.1108/CDI-12-2014-0162

Brooks, S. K., Webster, R. K., Smith, L. E., Woodland, L., Wessely, S., Greenberg, N., & Rubin, G. J. (2020). The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: Rapid review of the evidence. 395, 912–920.

Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A role-resource approach avoidance model of job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory. Academy of Management Journal, 61, 499–522 http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0604

Butler, J., & Kern, M. L. (2016). The PERMA-Profiler: A brief multidimensional measure of flourishing. International Journal of Wellbeing, 6(3), 1-48. https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v6i3.526

Cheng, S-Y. (2017). Feedback-Seeking Behavior and Knowledge Sharing at Work. The 77th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Managment [conference paper]. Tainan City, Taiwan.

Costantini, A., and Sartori, R. (2018). The Intertwined Relationship between Job Crafting, Work-Related Positive Emotions, and Work Engagement. Evidence from a Positive Psychology Intervention Study. The Open Psychology Journal, 11, 210-221. http://doi.org.10.2174/1874350101811010210

Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2009). Organization development & change. Cengage Learning.

De Braine, R., & Roodt, G. (2011). The Job Demands Resources model as predictor of work identity and work engagement: A comparative analysis. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 37(2). http://doi.org.10.4102/sajip.v37i2.889

Deci, E. L., Olafsen, A, H., & Ryan, R. M. (2017). Self-Determination Theory in Work Organizations: The State of a Science. The Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4, 19–43. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych032516-11310/8

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.

Demerouti, e., Peeters, M, C, W., & Van den Heuvel, M. (2019). Job Crafting Interventions: Do They Work and Why? In L. E. Van Zyl, & S. Rothmann Sr. (eds.), Positive Psychological Intervention Design and Protocols for Multi-Cultural contexts. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-20020-6¬_5

Dubbelt, L., Demerouti, E & Rispens, S. (2019). The value of job crafting for work engagement, task performance, and career satisfaction: longitudinal and quasi experimental evidence, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28(3), 300-314. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1576632

Farrell, J. B., & Strauss, K. (2013). The people make the place, and they make things happen: Proactive behavior and relationships at work. In R. L. Morrison & H. D. Cooper-Thomas (Eds.), Relationships in organizations: A work

psychology perspective, 107-136

Golparvar, M., & Rezaie, A. (2014). Explaining Feeling of Energy and Happiness in the Workplace based on Components of Job Crafting. Management and Administrative Sciences Review. 3(1), 41-52.

Gordon, H, J., Demerouti, E., Le Blanc, P, M., Bakker, A, B., Bipp, T., and Verhagen, M, A, M, T. (2018). Individual job redesign: Job crafting interventions in healthcare. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 104, 98–114 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.07.002

Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. The Academy of Management Annals, 3(1), 317-375. http://doi.org.10.1080/19416520903047327

Greenglass, E, R., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2009). Proactive Coping, Positive Affect, and Well-Being: Testing for Mediation Using Path Analysis. European Psychologist, 14(1), 29–39. http://doi.org.10.1027/1016-9040.14.1.29

Griffin, M, A., Neal, A., Parker, S, K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. Academy of Management Journal, 50 (2), 327–347. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2007.24634438

Hakanen, J, J., Peetres, M, C, W., and Schaufeli, W, B. (2018). Different Types of Employee Well-Being across Time and Their Relationships with Job Crafting. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. 23(2), 289-301. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000081

Hamling, K. (2018). Wellbeing across occupations and in the emergency services: Amixed method study. [Doctoral thesis]. Auckland University of Technology

Harju, L, K., Kaltiainen, J., and Hakanen, J, J. (2021). The double-edged sword of job crafting: the effects of job crafting on changes in job demands and employee wellbeing. Human Resource Management, 1–16. http://doi.org.10.1002/hrm.22054

Higgins, E.T. (1997), "Beyond pleasure and pain". American Psychologist, 52 (12), 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, 30, 1-46.

Hobfoll, S, E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J, P., and Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context: The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior. 5:103–28. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640

Holcombe, K, J. (2016). Theoretical antecedents and positive employee work experiences of job crafting. [Doctoral thesis]. Colorado State University

Huppert, F. A., and So, T. T. C. (2011). Flourishing Across Europe: Application of a New Conceptual Framework for Defining Well-Being. Soc Indic Res, 110, 837–861. http://doi.org.10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7

Huyghebaert-Zouaghi, T., Berjot, S., Cougot, B., & Gillet, N. (2020). Psychological and relational conditions for job crafting to occur. Stress and Health. Advance online

publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3014

Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24(2), 285-306. http://doi.org.10.2307/2392498

Khan, M, M., Khan, E., & Imran, S, A. (2018). Using Job Crafting to Improve the Well-being and Faculty Performance: The Case of Higher Education Institutions of Pakistan. GMJACS, 8(1), 65-77.

Laurence, G. (2010). Workaholism and expansion and contraction oriented job crafting: The moderating effects of individual and contextual factors. [Unpublished doctoral thesis], Syracuse University.

Leana, C., Appelbaum, E. and Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: the role of job crafting. Academy of management journal, 52, 1169-1192. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.470846 51

Liberman, N., Idson, L.C., Camacho, C.J. and Higgins, E.T. (1999), "Promotion and prevention choices between stability and change". Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77(6), 1135-1145

Lichtenthaler, P, W., and Fishbach, A. (2018). Leadership, Job crafting, and employee health and performance. Leadership & Organization Development Journal. https://doi.org/10.1108/ LODJ-07-2017-0191

Lu, C., Wang, H., Lu, J., Du, D., Bakker, A, B. (2014). Does work engagement increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84, 142-152.

Luchman, J. N., & González-Morales, M. G. (2013). Demands, control, and support: A meta-analytic review of work characteristics interrelationships. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18(1), 37–52. http://doi.org.10.1037/a0030541

Margolis, S., Stapley, A, L., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2019). The association between Extraversion and well-being is limited to one facet. Journal of Personality, 88, 478–484. http://doi.org.10.1111/jopy.12504

Parker, S, K. (2014). Beyond Motivation: Job and Work Design for Development, Health, Ambidexterity, and More. Annual Review Psychology, 65, 661-691. http://doi.org.10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115208

Peral, S, & Geldenhuys, M. (2016). The effects of job crafting on subjective well-being amongst South African high school teachers. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 42(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v42i1.1378 \

Petrou, P., Demeroti, E., and Schaufeli, W, B. (2015). Job Crafting in Changing Organizations: Antecedents and Implications for Exhaustion and Performance. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. 20(4), 470 – 480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039003

Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2016). Regular Versus Cutback-Related Change: The Role of Employee Job Crafting in Organizational Change Contexts of Different Nature. International Journal of Stress Management. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/str0000033

Pimenta de Devotto, R., Freitas, C. P. P., &

Wechsler, S. M. (2020). The role of job crafting on the promotion of flow and wellbeing. Revista de Administração Mackenzie, 21(1), 1–24. http://doi.org.10.1590/1678-6971/eRAMD200113

Priyadarshi, P., & Raina, R. (2014). The mediating effects of work engagement: testing causality between personal resource, job resource and work related outcomes. Int. J. Indian Culture and Business Management, 9(4), 487–509.

Rana, M. (2015). Job crafting in organizations: A valuable approach for job performance or just a theoretical framework?

Raosoft, I. (2004). Sample size calculator. https://www.raosoft .com/samplesize.html

Robledo, E., Zappala, S, & Topa, G. (2019). Job Crafting as a Mediator between Work Engagement and Wellbeing Outcomes: A Time-Lagged Study. International journal of environmental research and public health, 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16081376

Rudolph. C.W., Katz, I.M., Lavigne, K.N., & Zacher, H. (2017, In Press). Job crafting: a meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior.

Sakuraya, A., Shimazu, A., Eguchi, H., Kamiyama, K., Hara, Y., Namba, K., kawakami, N. (2017). Job crafting, work engagement, and psychological distress among Japanese employees: a cross-sectional study. BioPsychoSocial Medicine, 11(6). http://doi.org.10.1186/s13030-017-0091-y

Santiago, C-S., Hoye, K, R., García, H. A., & McNaughtan, J. (2020): Educators, not bureaucrats: how managerial professionals at international student services centers engage in job crafting and create meaning in their work. Studies in Higher Education, http://doi.org.10.1080/03075079.2020.1716317

Sarigh, S., Margaretha, M., and Situmorang, A, P. (2020). Analyzing Antecedents and Consequence of Job Crafting. International Journal of Management, Economics and Social Sciences, 9(2), 76 – 89. http://doi.org.10.32327/IJMESS.9.2.2020.5

Schoberova, M. (2015). Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace: Employees and Managers Co-Creating Meaningful and Productive Work in Personal Development Discussions". Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP). Capstone Projects. 87.

Seligman, M. E. P (2002). Authentic Happiness. Free Press

Seligman, M. E. P. (2010). Flourish: Positive Psychology and Positive Interventions. The Tanner Lectures on Human Values. Delivered at th¬e University of Michigan

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). Flourish. Simon & Schuster.

Sirola, N & Pitesa, M. (2017). Economic downturns undermine workplace helping by promoting a zero-sum construal of success. Academy of Management Journal. 60, (4), 1339-1359.

Slemp, G, R., Kern, M, L., & Vella-brodrick, D, A. (2015). Workplace Well-Being: The Role of Job Crafting and Autonomy Support. Psych Well-Being, 5(7). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0034-y

Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2013).

The job crafting questionnaire: A new scale to measure the extent to which employees engage in job crafting. International Journal of Wellbeing, 3, 126–146.
https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v3i2.1

Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2014). Optimising employee mental health: The relationship between intrinsic need satisfaction, job crafting, and employee well-being. Journal of Happiness Studies, 15, 957–977. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9458-3

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80(1), 173–186. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009

Tims, M., Bakker, A, B., & Derks, D. (2013). The Impact of Job Crafting on Job Demands, Job Resources, and Well-Being. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18(2), 230-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032141

Vanbelle, E. (2017). Job Crafting: An Overarching Approach [Doctoral thesis, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences]. FWO.

Van Hooff, M, L, M., van Hooft, E, A, J. (2014). Boredom at Work: Proximal & Distal Consequences of Affective Work-Related Boredom. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19(3), 348-359. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a003682

Veenhoven, R. (2006). "How Do We Assess How Happy We Are? Tenets, Implications, and Tenability of ¬ree ¬eories." Paper presented at the conference New Directions in the Study of Happiness:

United States and International Perspectives, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana, October.

Weigal, M., Hornung, S., Parker, S. K., Petru, R., Glaser, J., & Angerer, P. (2010). Work engagement accumulation of task, social, personal resources: A three-wave structural equation model. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77(1), 140-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.03.002

Wingerden, J, V., Bakker, A, B., & Derks, D. (2017). Fostering employee well-being via a job crafting intervention. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 100, 164-174

Wrzesniewski, A., Berg, J, M., Grant, A, M., Kurkoski, J., & Welle, B. (2012). Job crafting in motion: achieving sustainable gains in happiness and performance. Working paper.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. The Academy of Management Review, 26(2), 179–201. https://doi.org/10.2307/259118.s

Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology, 1, 281-302. http:// doi.org.10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001015

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A, B., Demerouti, E., and Schaufeli, W, B. (2007). The Role of Personal Resources in the Job Demands-Resources Model. International Journal of Stress Management, 14(2), 121–141. http:// doi.org.10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121

Zeijin, M, E, L., Peeters, M, C, W and Hakanen, J, J. (2018). Workaholism versus work

engagement and job crafting: what is the role of self-management strategies? Human resource management journal. http:// doi.org.10.1111/1748-8583.12187

Zito, M., Colombo, L., Borgogni, L., Callea, A., Cenciotti, R., Ingusci, E., Cortese, C, G. (2019). The Nature of Job Crafting: Positive and Negative Relations with Job Satisfaction and Work-Family Conflict. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 16, 1176. http:// doi.org.10.3390/ijerph16071176