

RESEARCH ON THE DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD EFFECT OF EMPLOYEE JOB CRAFTING ON JOB PERFORMANCE

Qien Zhong*

Chinese Graduate School, Panyapiwat Institute of Management

Received: May 7, 2024 / Revised: August 23, 2024 / Accepted: August 30, 2024

Abstract

The relationship between job crafting and job performance is an important issue that scholars generally pay attention to. However, there are contradictory conclusions about these relationships in the existing studies, including both positive and negative relationships. Therefore, the research question of this study is to explore the double-edged sword effect of job crafting on job performance in both positive and negative pathways based on the job demand-resource model. Through descriptive statistics, hierarchical regression and Bootstrap mediation effect analysis on 323 pairs of data collected in three stages, the results show that on the one hand, it can increase employee's positive emotion and thus promote employee's job performance; on the other hand, it can increase employee's role conflict and thus inhibit their job performance. This research uncovers the complex relationships between job crafting and job performance. It enlightens organizations on both the advantageous and disadvantageous aspects of job crafting and offers guidelines on maximizing its positive potential.

Keywords: Job Crafting, Positive Emotion, Role Conflict, Job Performance

Introduction

Job crafting refers to the proactive adjustments and changes employees make in their daily work regarding the content, approach, and perception of their jobs to achieve a better fit between the individual and the work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). There are many examples of job crafting in the real life, for example, in the "Fat Donglai Supermarket", employees proactively help to support the elderly, guide customers who are asking for directions to their destinations,

and voluntarily cover and wipe off the snow on customers' electric vehicles (or bicycles) during rainy or snowy weather. It is these small, employee-initiated actions that are not originally part of their job roles that have warmed the hearts of numerous customers and attracted more and more patrons to visit by reputation.

Job crafting not only exists in real life, but also has been widely concerned in academic research. In early studies on the theme of job crafting, scholars mainly focused

*Corresponding Author

E-mail: dauphin920@foxmail.com

on exploring factors that might promote or hinder employees' engagement in job crafting (Wang et al., 2016). In recent years, with the development of research on job crafting and the increasing emphasis on employee value by enterprises, more and more scholars have called for a shift in research perspective to strengthen the focus on and discussion of the consequences of job crafting (Holman et al., 2024). Reviewing past research, it has been found that scholars have primarily concentrated on the impact of job crafting on employees' work attitudes, sense of meaningfulness, well-being, and work performance (Tims et al., 2022). It is generally believed that by engaging in job crafting, employees can improve their job-person fit, enhance their sense of control over work tasks, work relationships, and the organization, thereby benefiting the increase in their sense of meaningfulness and well-being, and improving their work attitudes and performance (Petrou et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2014). However, at the same time, some scholars argue that employees' job crafting behaviors may also have adverse effects on both the individual and the organization (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019). Therefore, in current research on the outcomes of job crafting, there is still a lack of unified understanding and recognition among scholars regarding whether, how, and when job crafting will lead to positive or negative results.

This investigation seeks to overcome the gaps in job crafting literature and elucidate the concept's dualistic nature by examining its influence on employee performance.

Utilizing the Job demands-resources framework (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), the study delves into how role conflict and positive emotions mediate the job crafting-performance nexus. It hypothesizes that job crafting can refine employees' task alignment and career progression, fostering a better work environment, elevating positive emotions, and ultimately boosting performance (Cooper et al., 2018). Conversely, given its proactive and extra-role nature, increased job crafting may lead to role-task discrepancies, potentially hindering performance (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Objective

This research uses the job demands-resources model to examine how job crafting affects work outcomes, including role conflict, positive emotions, and overall performance, examining both the beneficial and detrimental aspects. This study aims to clarify the mixed results found in existing literature on the effects of job crafting by employees. It contributes to advancing the field of job crafting research.

Literature Review

Job crafting is an employee-initiated process that involves altering job content and approaches to reshape their roles, foster job identification, and tailor their job functions. It is categorized into three forms: Task crafting, relationship crafting, and cognitive crafting, as defined by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001).

Later, Tims and Bakker (2010) redefined the concept of job crafting from the perspective of Job demand-resource model, arguing that

job crafting means that employees take the initiative to change job demands and resources. A kind of initiative to realize one's own ability and work preference. They believe that job crafting can be divided into three types, namely, increasing work resources, increasing challenging work requirements and reducing obstructive work requirements. With the deepening of the research, Tims and Bakker (2010) further divided the increase of work resources into structural work resources and social work resources on the basis of the original three categories, and then proposed four types of job crafting. Influenced by the definition of job crafting by Tims and Bakker (2010) and Petrou et al. (2012) believe that job crafting is a kind of initiative behavior based on individual employees, which consists of seeking work resources, seeking challenges and reducing requirements. Demerouti (2014) believed that job crafting means that employees take the initiative to adjust the balance between job requirements and resources, achieve person-post matching, and improve individual health and work motivation. Since then, many scholars have conducted extensive research on job crafting based on job demand-resource model (Lee et al., 2017; Zhang & Parker, 2019; Zhang & Parker, 2022; Huang et al., 2020; Irfan et al., 2023). Thus, the purpose of our study is to investigate the double-edged sword effect of job crafting on job performance using the job demand-resource model.

The Relationship between Job Crafting and Job Performance

Reviewing past research, it is evident that scholars have primarily focused on the impact of job crafting on employee job performance. It is widely believed that through job crafting, employees can improve their job fit, enhance their sense of control over tasks, relationships, and the organization, thereby improving their job attitudes and performance (Demerouti, 2014; Wrzesniewski et al., 2010; Petrou et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2014). However, at the same time, some scholars argue that job crafting may also have adverse effects on both the individual employee and the organization (Rofcanin et al., 2019; Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019). They posit that job crafting can increase the workload of employees, which may hinder their ability to complete their core job tasks. Therefore, there is a lack of a unified understanding and recognition of the relationship between job crafting and job performance in existing research. This paper aims to understand the double-edged sword effect of job crafting on job performance from the Job demands-resources model and to examine the mediating roles of positive emotions and role conflict.

The Mediating Role of Positive Emotion

Job crafting enables employees to better align their capabilities with their roles, strike a balance between job demands and available

resources, elevate their work engagement (Kuijpers et al., 2020), and boost both their positive emotional state and work vigor (Bakker & Oerlemans, 2019). According to the job demand-resource model, when employees can achieve a good balance between job requirements and resources they have, and maintain a good physical and mental state to enhance resource vitality, they can effectively improve their work motivation and work engagement, and contribute to positive work results (Cooper et al., 2018; Bakker, 2010). In addition, when employees re-organize and adjust their work tasks and work completion methods through job crafting, they can generate a higher level of work meaning and identity, while when employees are engaged in work they recognize and feel meaningful (Geldenhuis et al., 2021), they tend to generate a higher level of positive emotions and expand their cognitive scope and cognitive level. Not only can they re-understand the connection between their own work tasks and those of other colleagues, and re-allocate their own resources based on this new understanding, so as to improve their own resource utilization efficiency and improve task performance, but also can re-understand and define the dependence relationship between themselves and organizations, leaders, colleagues, and customers (Nonnis et al., 2020). Enabling employees to understand themselves as a whole with the organization, leaders, colleagues, and customers increases the likelihood that employees will engage in helpful behaviors (De Clercq et al., 2019).

Hypothesis 1: Positive emotion mediates the relationship between employees' job crafting and their job performance.

The Mediating Role of Role Conflict

Employees' involvement in job crafting or their intensive efforts to reshape their roles can lead to substantial consumption of personal resources, including time, cognitive energy, and emotional investment (Ikeda et al., 2024). However, since individual resources are limited in a certain period of time, employees will spend a lot of time making work after a lot of job reshaping, which will lead to a lack of work resources (Demerouti et al., 2001). The job demand-resource model argues, when employees are faced with large job requirements and lack sufficient work resources to support themselves in completing work tasks, a large amount of physical and psychological resources of employees will be lost, making employees face greater work pressure and unable to properly switch between different job roles (Ghanayem et al., 2020). However, when employees are short of resources and face great work pressure, they often cannot successfully complete this transformation, which will lead to the decline of task performance (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). At the same time, it will also cause employees to focus on completing routine tasks within their responsibilities, and fail to provide help to colleagues or customers at the same time, which is not conducive to improving the relationship between employees and their colleagues and customers, and will also lead to low

relationship performance of employees. According to the job demand-resource model, when employees are faced with large job requirements and are in a poor working state, and at the same time, they cannot obtain the supplement of work resources, they often show poor task performance (De Clercq et al., 2021). Furthermore, when employees are in this negative state, they tend to prioritize their own tasks and do not offer extra help to colleagues or customers, which results in poor relationship performance (Dierdorff et al., 2021).

Hypothesis 2: Role conflict mediates the relationship between employees' job crafting and their job performance.

Methodology

Questionnaire survey is used to collect data. In this study, the population refers to all employees in China. Simple random sampling was adopted in this study, in which every individual that meets the requirements is taken as the sample object, and the chance of each individual being selected into the sample is equal through randomization. We selected hotel service employees as our sample, which is chosen because there is a strong demand for employees to craft their jobs in this industry, which is in line with our research object. The survey questionnaires for each stage were sent to the manager and forwarded to the employees who participated in the survey. Before the employees filled in the questionnaire each time, the researchers stressed the ethical norms and confidentiality

of the survey to the participants to ensure that each employee could fill in the questionnaire confidently and truthfully.

To diminish the possible effects of Common Method Bias (CMB), the survey was distributed in phases, spaced 2-3 weeks apart (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Dennerlein & Kirkman, 2022). At time point 1, the first stage survey questionnaire was sent to employees, asking them to report job crafting and demographic variable information, etc. During the initial phase, 456 questionnaires were gathered. Subsequently, at Time 2, employees completed a survey on role conflict and positive emotion, resulting in 412 collected responses. The third phase involved reporting on task performance and OCB, with 352 questionnaires returned. Finally, by deleting some questionnaires that could not be matched and failed the attention test, 323 valid questionnaires remained, yielding a 70.83% response rate.

Job crafting: We measure it draws on the scale (15 items) from Tims et al. (2022). Sample item was "I have tried to improve my work ability" ($\alpha = 0.932$). Positive emotion: The short version of the positive emotion scale (5 items) from Mackinnon et al. (1999) was used. The sample item was "encouraged" ($\alpha = 0.759$). Role conflict: The short version of the role conflict scale (6 items) from Bowling et al. (2017) was adopted. Sample item was "In my job, I often feel that different people 'pull me in different directions'" ($\alpha = 0.883$). Task performance: The short version of the scale (4 items) used by Chen et al. (2002) was used. Sample item was "I have made

a significant contribution to the overall performance of my organization” ($\alpha = 0.863$). Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB): We used the OCB scale (8 items) from Lee and Allen (2002). Sample items was “I am willing to give my time to help people who have work problems” ($\alpha = 0.922$).

To mitigate the impact of extraneous variables and bolster the study’s result reliability, demographic data of employees were incorporated as control variables, in line with prior research. This includes the employee’s gender, age, education, and tenure in organization.

We first used SPSS 24 for descriptive statistical analysis, then used Mplus 7.4 software for regression analysis to test the hypothesis, and finally, we used Bootstrapping method to calculate indirect effects.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

We used SPSS 24.0 for both descriptive statistics and correlational analyses, with findings detailed in Table 1. In descriptive statistics, female accounted for 64.4%, the average age was 27.04 years old, most of them had junior college education (66.3%), and the average working tenure was 3.72 years. The table indicated a significant positive correlation between job crafting and positive emotion ($r = 0.162$, $p < 0.01$), as well as between job crafting and role conflict ($r = 0.313$, $p < 0.01$). Furthermore, positive emotion showed a significant positive association with task performance ($r = 0.216$, $p < 0.01$) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) ($r = 0.232$, $p < 0.01$). Conversely, role conflict was significantly negatively correlated with both task performance ($r = -0.178$, $p < 0.01$) and OCB ($r = -0.230$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Kurtosis	Skewness	M	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender	-1.645	-0.604	1.644	0.480								
2. Age	24.197	3.358	27.037	2.445	-0.190**							
3. Education	-0.787	0.412	2.300	0.498	-0.058	0.187**						
4. Tenure	30.643	3.864	3.718	1.834	-0.129*	0.879**	0.042					
5. JC	0.933	-0.200	4.827	0.820	0.038	-0.012	0.030	-0.124*				
6. PE	2.301	-0.487	4.202	0.652	-0.030	0.097	0.073	0.043	0.162**			
7. RC	0.952	-0.136	3.680	0.911	0.009	-0.140*	-0.014	-0.181**	0.313**	0.035		
8. TP	2.904	-0.647	4.947	0.745	0.089	0.015	0.072	0.000	-0.003	0.216**	-0.178**	
9. OCB	2.212	0.575	4.858	0.552	0.092	0.043	0.117*	0.000	-0.083	0.232**	-0.230**	0.686**

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses in the proposed model were tested using hierarchical regression analysis. The outcomes of this analysis are displayed in Table 2.

According to model 1b and model 2b in table 2, after controlling the influence of control variables, employees' job crafting had significant positive effects on employees' positive emotion ($\beta = 0.152, p < 0.01$) and role conflict ($\beta = 0.300, p < 0.01$). According to model 3b and model 4b, employee positive emotion had a significant positive effect on task performance ($\beta = 0.220, p < 0.01$) and OCB ($\beta = 0.243, p < 0.01$). Employee role conflict had a significant negative effect on positive emotion ($\beta = -0.196, p < 0.01$) and OCB ($\beta = -0.225, p < 0.01$).

More importantly, based on the views of Edwards and Lambert (2007), Mplus 7.4 software was used in this study and Bootstrap repeated sampling method was adopted to verify the mediating hypotheses of this study (result see Table 3). From table 3, job crafting's impact on task performance, mediated by positive emotion, had an indirect effect of 0.024 with a Standard Error (SE) of 0.017, and the 95% CI was 0.002 to 0.071, excluding 0, confirming a significant indirect effect. In addition, due to the direct effect

of job crafting on task performance was not significant (95% CI was -0.094 to 0.116). Positive emotion played a full mediating role between job crafting and task performance.

In addition, the indirect effect size for the effect of employees' job crafting on OCB through positive emotion was 0.019, SE was 0.009, and the 95% CI was 0.005 to 0.043, excluding 0, confirming a significant indirect effect. In addition, due to the direct effect of job crafting on OCB was not significant (95% CI was -0.130 to 0.021). Positive emotion played a full mediating role between job crafting and OCB. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported. Also from table 3, job crafting's impact on task performance, mediated by role conflict was -0.045, SE was 0.025, and the 95% CI was -0.101 to -0.002, excluding 0, confirming that the indirect effect was significant. Role conflict played a full mediating role between job crafting and task performance.

In addition, in the impact path of job reshaping on OCB through role conflict, job crafting's impact on OCB, mediated by role conflict was -0.031, SE was 0.017, and the 95% CI was -0.070 to -0.002, excluding 0, confirming a significant indirect effect. Role conflict played a full mediating role between job crafting and OCB. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was supported.

Table 2 Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Variables	Positive Emotion		Role Conflict		TP		OCB	
	M1a	M1b	M2a	M2b	M3a	M3b	M4a	M4b
Gender	-0.004	-0.013	-0.008	-0.025	0.098	0.097	0.111*	0.115*
Age	0.239	0.169	0.096	-0.044	0.052	0.013	0.160	0.161
Education	0.035	0.040	-0.022	-0.012	0.069	0.058	0.099	0.083
Tenure	-0.170	-0.090	-0.265*	-0.108	-0.036	-0.045	-0.130	-0.191
Job Crafting		0.152**		0.300**		0.012		-0.080
Positive Emotion						0.220**		0.243**
Role Conflict						-0.196**		-0.225**
R ²	0.019	0.040**	0.035*	0.119**	0.014	0.095**	0.029	0.142**
ΔR ²		0.021*		0.084**		0.081**		0.113**

Notes: N = 323; * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01

Table 3 Bootstrapping Test of Mediation Effect

Paths	Stage 1	Stage 2	Indirect	SE	95% CI
	Effect	Effect	Effect		
	Size/SE (a)	Size/SE (b)	(a*b)		
JC → RC → TP	0.389/(0.068)	-0.115/(0.060)	-0.045	0.025	[-0.101, -0.002]
JC → RC → OCB	0.389/(0.068)	-0.080/(0.041)	-0.031	0.017	[-0.070, -0.002]
JC → PE → TP	0.100/(0.043)	0.242/(0.092)	0.024	0.017	[0.002, 0.071]
JC → PE → OCB	0.100/(0.043)	0.193/(0.043)	0.019	0.009	[0.005, 0.043]

Discussion

Based on the job demand-resource model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), we explore the positive and negative effects of employees' job crafting on their job performance. Starting from the two paths of resource depletion effect and gain effect immediately generated when employees engage in job crafting, focusing

on the mediating roles of role conflict and positive emotion in the relationship between job crafting and job performance.

First, research shows that when employees engage in job crafting, it can lead to role conflict because they spend a lot of time and energy trying new things, which may not align with the organization's expectations.

This conflict can cause a cycle of resource loss, resulting in a decrease in work performance (Demerouti et al., 2001; Ghanayem et al., 2020). Additionally, the tension between an employee's role and their job crafting activities can negatively impact how well they perform their job (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

Second, studies indicate that job crafting can enhance employees' work conditions, lessen their stress, and conserve resources (Geldenhuis et al., 2021). It boosts positive emotions, which increases cognitive flexibility and job understanding. This, in turn, helps improve work performance. Positive emotions also play a role in linking job crafting to better job performance (De Clercq et al., 2019).

This finding has resolved the previous contradictory conclusions regarding the relationship between job crafting and job performance. In other words, job crafting can increase job performance by enhancing employees' positive emotions, while at the same time it may reduce job performance by increasing role conflict. This finding is also consistent with the predictions of the job demands-resources model, which posits that job demands have a negative impact, while job resources have a positive impact.

Additionally, our research findings offer some insights for organizational managers. Managers should recognize the double-edged sword effect of job crafting.

Therefore, when encouraging employees to engage in job crafting, they should adopt a balanced strategy that not only stimulates employees' positive emotions but also ensures that such behavior does not lead to role conflict. For instance, managers should establish clear guidelines and processes for job crafting. This includes providing employees with clear job objectives and expectations, ensuring that the direction of job crafting aligns with the organization's strategic goals, and reducing role conflicts arising from job crafting. At the same time, managers should establish effective communication channels, encourage employees to share their crafting plans and progress, and provide timely feedback and support. By doing so, managers may be able to harness the positive effects of job crafting as well as mitigate its negative effects.

Conclusions

This study reviews past research on job crafting and its effects, helping managers grasp its potential impacts. It confirms that job crafting can positively or negatively influence employees' job performance. This understanding allows managers to better guide job crafting activities. The study also differentiates between task performance and contextual performance, like Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), providing insights into how job crafting affects different performance areas.

References

- Bakker, A. B. (2010). Engagement and “job crafting”: Engaged employees create their own great place to work. In S. L. Albrecht (Ed.), *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice* (pp. 229-244). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273-285.
- Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. (2019). Daily job crafting and momentary work engagement: A self-determination and self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 112*, 417-430.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99-109.
- Bowling, N. A., Khazon, S., Alarcon, G. M., Blackmore, C. E., Bragg, C. B., Hoepf, M. R., & Li, H. (2017). Building better measures of role ambiguity and role conflict: The validation of new role stressor scales. *Work & Stress, 31*(1), 1-23.
- Chen, C. Y., Yen, C. H., & Tsai, F. C. (2014). Job crafting and job engagement: The mediating role of person-job fit. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 37*, 21-28.
- Chen, Z. X., Tsui, A. S., & Farh, J. L. (2002). Loyalty to supervisor vs. organizational commitment: Relationships to employee performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*(3), 339-356.
- Cooper, C. D., Kong, D. T., & Crossley, C. D. (2018). Leader humor as an interpersonal resource: Integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal, 61*(2), 769-796.
- De Clercq, D., Haq, I. U., & Azeem, M. U. (2019). Why happy employees help: How meaningfulness, collectivism, and support transform job satisfaction into helping behaviours. *Personnel Review, 48*(4), 1001-1021.
- De Clercq, D., Suhail, A., Azeem, M. U., & Haq, I. U. (2021). Citizenship pressure and job performance: Roles of citizenship fatigue and continuance commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 59*(3), 482-505.
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your own job through job crafting. *European Psychologist, 19*(4), 237-247.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499-512.
- Dennerlein, T., & Kirkman, B. L. (2022). The hidden dark side of empowering leadership: The moderating role of hindrance stressors in explaining when empowering employees can promote moral disengagement and unethical pro-organizational behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 107*(12), 2220-2242.

- Dierdorff, E. C., Rubin, R. S., & Ellington, J. K. (2021). Interpersonal skills, role cognitions, and OCB: Exploring mediating mechanisms and contextual constraints on role enactment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 129*, 103604.
- Edwards, J. R., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Methods for integrating moderation and mediation: A general analytical framework using moderated path analysis. *Psychological Methods, 12*(1), 1-22.
- Geldenhuis, M., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2021). How task, relational and cognitive crafting relate to job performance: A weekly diary study on the role of meaningfulness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30*(1), 83-94.
- Ghanayem, M., Srulovici, E., & Zlotnick, C. (2020). Occupational strain and job satisfaction: The job demand–resource moderation–mediation model in haemodialysis units. *Journal of Nursing Management, 28*(3), 664-672.
- Holman, D., Escaffi-Schwarz, M., Vasquez, C. A., Irmer, J. P., & Zapf, D. (2024). Does job crafting affect employee outcomes via job characteristics? A meta-analytic test of a key job crafting mechanism. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 97*(1), 47-73.
- Huang, L. C., Lin, C. C., & Lu, S. C. (2020). The relationship between abusive supervision and employee's reaction: The job demands-resources model perspective. *Personnel Review, 49*(9), 2035-2054.
- Ikeda, M., Tanaka, S., & Kido, K. (2024). Relationship between job crafting and emotional exhaustion: Focusing on the difference between effects of physical and cognitive crafting. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 39*(5), 601-612.
- Irfan, S. M., Qadeer, F., Sarfraz, M., & Bhutta, M. K. (2023). Determinants and consequences of job crafting under the boundary conditions of work uncertainty. *Career Development International, 28*(6/7), 686-705.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (2015). The social psychology of organizations. In *Organizational behavior 2* (pp. 152-168). Routledge.
- Kuijpers, E., Kooij, D. T., & Wan Woerkom, M. (2020). Align your job with yourself: The relationship between a job crafting intervention and work engagement, and the role of workload. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 25*(1), 1-16.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(1), 131-142.
- Lee, S. H., Shin, Y., & Baek, S. I. (2017). The impact of job demands and resources on job crafting. *Journal of Applied Business Research, 33*(4), 827-840.
- Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2019). A meta-analysis on promotion-and prevention-focused job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(1), 30-50.

- Mackinnon, A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Korten, A. E., Jacomb, P. A., & Rodgers, B. (1999). A short form of the positive and negative affect schedule: Evaluation of factorial validity and invariance across demographic variables in a community sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 27*(3), 405-416.
- Nonnis, M., Massidda, D., Cabiddu, C., Cuccu, S., Pedditzi, M. L., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Motivation to donate, job crafting, and organizational citizenship behavior in blood collection volunteers in non-profit organizations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(3), 934.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(8), 1120-1141.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879-903.
- Rofcanin, Y., Bakker, A. B., Berber, A., Gölgeci, I., & Las Heras, M. (2019). Relational job crafting: Exploring the role of employee motives with a weekly diary study. *Human Relations, 72*(4), 859-886.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(2), 1-9.
- Tims, M., Twemlow, M., & Fong, C. Y. M. (2022). A state of the art overview of job-crafting research: Current trends and future research directions. *Career Development International, 27*(1), 54-78.
- Wang, H., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). A review of job crafting research: The role of leader behaviors in cultivating successful job crafters. In S. K. Parker, & U. K. Bindl (Eds.), *Proactivity at work: Making things happen in organizations* (pp.77-104). Routledge.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review, 26*(2), 179-201.
- Wrzesniewski, A., Berg, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Turn the job you have into the job you want. *Harvard Business Review, 88*(6), 114-117.
- Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 40*(2), 126-146.
- Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Reducing demands or optimizing demands? Effects of cognitive appraisal and autonomy on job crafting to change one's work demands. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 31*(5), 641-654.



Name and Surname: Qien Zhong

Highest Education: Doctoral Candidate (Doctor of Philosophy Program in Business Administration), Panyapiwat Institute of Management

Affiliation: Panyapiwat Institute of Management

Field of Expertise: Strategic Human Resource Management