

# Development and Validation of a Short Broad Job Crafting Scale

Group & Organization Management  
2023, Vol. 0(0) 1–35

© The Author(s) 2023

Article reuse guidelines:

[sagepub.com/journals-permissions](https://sagepub.com/journals-permissions)

DOI: 10.1177/10596011231208924

[journals.sagepub.com/home/gom](https://journals.sagepub.com/home/gom)



Els Vanbelle<sup>1</sup> , Yannick  
Griep<sup>2,3</sup> , Anja Van den  
Broeck<sup>1,4</sup>, and Hans De Witte<sup>4,5</sup> 

## Abstract

The dominant perspectives in the job crafting literature have different views on “what elements of their job employees craft” and “why employees craft their jobs”. To better grasp both perspectives, we developed and validated a short 4-item instrument (BJCS) to capture job crafting as the self-initiated changes made to one’s job with the intention to optimize one’s functioning. We validated the BJCS through five phases: (1) we developed the BJCS and conducted a qualitative study to establish content validity, (2) we establish its reliability and psychometric properties, (3) we demonstrated discriminant and convergent validity of the BJCS in relation to existing job crafting measures, and (4 & 5) the BJCS showed to be predictive and incrementally valid *over and above* existing measures in relation to indicators of optimal and dysfunctional functioning. Taken together, we demonstrated the validity of a broad short measure for job crafting which is especially relevant for the use in repeated measurement research.

---

<sup>1</sup>KU Leuven, Brussels, Belgium

<sup>2</sup>Radboud University, Nijmegen, Netherlands

<sup>3</sup>North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa

<sup>4</sup>KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

<sup>5</sup>North-West University, Vanderbijlpark, South Africa

## Corresponding Author:

Hans De Witte, Research Unit of Occupational and Organisational Psychology and Professional Learning, KU Leuven, Dekenstraat 2, Postbox 3725, Leuven 3000, Belgium.

Email: [hans.dewitte@kuleuven.be](mailto:hans.dewitte@kuleuven.be)

Data Availability Statement included at the end of the article

## Keywords

job crafting, validation, short-scale, longitudinal studies

## Introduction

Job crafting defined as the changes employees make in the task, relational, and cognitive boundaries of their job to achieve meaning and identity at work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) has positive implications for employee well-being, attitudes, and behavior. Indeed, job crafting was found to be related to higher degree of psychological well-being (Berg et al., 2010; French, 2009); increased work engagement and performance and reduced turnover intentions (Bakker et al., 2003, 2004, 2007; Tims et al., 2013); decreased absenteeism and increased performance (Ghitulescu, 2006); increased perceptions of control, higher self-image, and increased readiness to change (Lyons, 2008); positive emotions, happiness, and experience of flow (Ko, 2012; Wrzesniewski et al., 2013); increased alignment with personal expectations and fulfillment of valued identities (Grant, 2007); feelings of achievement and enjoyment (Berg et al., 2010); and increased competence and feelings of mastery (Barker, 2007). Because of its positive implications, employers increasingly expect employees to craft their jobs in response to the changes in the organization and external environment (Petrou, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2018). Leading academic databases show that research on job crafting is on the rise as well (Bindl et al., 2019; Rudolph et al., 2017; Tims et al., 2022).

The full understanding of job crafting and its effects on employee well-being, attitudes and behavior is however hampered by the different perspectives towards job crafting, each focusing on a subset of specific job crafting behaviors and reasons why employees may craft their job (Bruning & Campion, 2018). These perspectives have developed in parallel, such that scholars working from one perspective may neglect the aspects described in the other perspective. Additionally, we argue that the current literature may miss out on other relevant adaptations employees can make to their job. For example, while the existing perspectives have focused on task crafting, social, relational crafting, cognitive crafting, and context crafting (Van Vuuren & Dorenbosch, 2011), employees might equally well make changes to their job that are not captured by these traditional perspectives such as making changes to their job with the perspective of optimizing their well-being, redirecting focus, and/or work-life balance. Hence the current perspectives on job crafting may not provide full insight in how employees take responsibility for their own stress management and productivity through changing their job design (Bindl et al., 2019; Grant & Parker, 2009).

To overcome this issue, we develop and validate a short broad job crafting scale (BJCS) which captures changes employees may make with the intention to optimize their functioning. In line with the existing literature on job crafting, optimal functioning refers to an optimal state of work-related well-being (i.e., high engagement, low burnout, high enjoyment, and a low need for recovery) akin to performing at work (i.e., high autonomous motivation, high in-role performance, and low turnover intentions). Moreover, whereas many specific scales are rather lengthy, we develop a short scale to facilitate the study of job crafting in a real-life context, ideally suited for usage in repeated measurement designs where longer scales are often impractical or not well-suited (e.g., [Ohly et al., 2010](#)). In the following, we elaborate on the current conceptual perspectives and measurements of job crafting, and we outline our theoretical perspective. We then present five phases in which we develop the new job crafting scale and address its reliability and validity.

## Literature Review and Theoretical Background

To date, two perspectives—although other perspective may exist—have continued to dominate the literature on job crafting: the perspective of [Wrzesniewski and Dutton \(2001\)](#) on the one hand and the perspective of [Tims and Bakker \(2010\)](#) on the other hand. Although both the perspective of [Wrzesniewski and Dutton \(2001\)](#) and Tims and Bakker ([Tims et al., 2012, 2022](#); [Tims & Bakker, 2010](#)) see job crafting as the self-initiated, self-targeted changes employees make to their job, their opinions differ in terms of which particular job aspects employees may craft (i.e., the *what* of job crafting; [Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001](#)) and the specific intended purpose of job crafting (i.e., the *why* of job crafting; [Tims et al., 2012, 2022](#); [Tims & Bakker, 2010](#)). In what follows we will discuss these distinct perspectives in more detail.

### *What Do People Craft?*

[Wrzesniewski and Dutton \(2001\)](#) introduced the term ‘job crafting’ and defined the construct as “the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their job” (p.179). Grounded in Role Theory ([Katz & Kahn, 1978](#)) this perspective suggests that organizations may specify their expectations and performance requirements in work roles ([Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1992](#)). Such work roles are however not only determined by the social structures (i.e., organizations) but also by the individuals who occupy them (i.e., managers, supervisors) ([Oeser & Harary, 1964](#)). Accordingly, [Wrzesniewski and Dutton \(2001\)](#) argue that employees may alter

the boundaries of their work role by (1) modifying the type and number of tasks they perform (i.e., changing task boundaries), (2) altering with whom they interact and the nature of these interaction (i.e., changing relational boundaries) or (3) changing their own perspective of the work (i.e., changing cognitive task boundaries). Employees are considered to engage in these types of crafting to enhance the purpose or meaning of their work, to gain a positive work identity, and to make connections at work.

Considering the “*what*” of job crafting, it is important to realize that the current job crafting perspectives differ in the type of changes they consider. Whereas Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) include task, relational and cognitive crafting, Tims and Bakker (2010) aim to focus on the “actual behavior of employees in modifying their job design to enhance their own work motivation” (Tims & Bakker, 2010, p.5). As such, they do not include the cognitive type of job crafting which, in their opinion, rather refers to coping with specific circumstances instead of actively shaping one’s actual job. Like Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), Tims and Bakker (2010) also consider aspects of relational crafting including asking for feedback or coaching opportunities. In addition, they further differentiate task crafting into the crafting of hindrances, challenges, and structural resources. Currently, scholars refer to these behaviors as “expansive/enhancement job crafting”, including increasing job resources and challenges, and “avoidance/protective job crafting”, including decreasing job hindrances (Hakanen, Peeters, & Schaufeli, 2017; Petrou et al., 2015).

Despite the variety of different types of job crafting behaviors that have already been addressed in the literature, qualitative research highlights the existence of yet other job crafting behaviors. For example, apart from other types of cognitive crafting (e.g., changing one’s meta-cognitions), Bruning and Campion (2018) also point at crafting of the work organization (i.e., changing the systems and strategies of how work is organized) and adoption (i.e., changing technology and sources of knowledge to alter the work process) as additional ways to physically change one’s job. As another example: Van Vuuren and Dorenbosch (2011) have also argued that employees may also engage in so-called context crafting by altering their physical work environment or the timing and place of work. Moreover, Van den Heuvel and colleagues (2015) noticed that employees may initiate numerous specific changes that might be too small and specific to be captured by the current job crafting scales. For example, items such as “I seek for advice” may not capture specific job crafting behaviors such as ‘I used an online platform to look for tips to be more assertive at work’. Against this background, we argue that the perspectives of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) and Tims and Bakker (2010) include a range of job crafting types that is too narrow, and hence could miss out personally relevant changes employees may initiate.

## Why Do People Craft?

Tims and Bakker (2010) start from the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker et al., 2014) and its further developments in terms of job challenges and job hindrances (Crawford et al., 2010; Van den Broeck et al., 2010). They define job crafting as employees making actual changes in “their levels of job demands and job resources in order to align them with their own abilities and preferences” (p.4). Much in line with the resource perspective (Hobfoll, 1989), employees may thus engage in job crafting to seek more resources and manage their job demands. Specifically, they may (1) decrease hindering job demands (e.g., decreasing emotional workload), (2) increase challenging job demands (e.g., starting new projects), (3) increase structural job resources (e.g., craft more opportunities for learning and development) or (4) increase social job resources (e.g., seek feedback). Tims and Bakker (2010) contend that employees engage in job crafting to “enhance or benefit their *own* goals” (p.1), for example in terms of increasing their well-being and improving person-job fit.

Regarding the “why” of job crafting, it is generally agreed upon in the job crafting literature that employees make changes to their jobs with the intention of improving it for themselves (Bruning & Campion, 2018). This is what makes job crafting unique and different from other proactive behaviors (Demerouti, 2014) such as personal initiative (i.e., self-started behavior that goes beyond formal job requirements, but serves organizational goals) and organizational citizenship behavior (i.e., behaviors aimed at supporting either others at work or the organization itself). The purpose of employees redesigning their job is not to promote the good of the others and the organization (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), but rather to enhance personal (work)outcomes (Tims & Bakker, 2010). Although the current job crafting perspectives include the purpose element in their conceptual definition, in general, they do not operationalize it consistently. For example, both Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) and Tims and Bakker (2010) have put several purposes of job crafting to the fore. Still others have mentioned or studied other purposes of job crafting showing that employees may for example also craft their jobs to foster their performance (Demerouti, Bakker, & Gevers, 2015; Oldham & Fried, 2016), or adaptivity (Petrou et al., 2018). Job crafters may equally aim for impact (Bruning & Campion, 2018) or to reach their goals and strive for personal rewards and avoid personal punishments (Zeijen & Peeters, 2018). Hence, strictly speaking, the operationalization of job crafting may miss out on one of the crucial aspects of the construct in each of the separate approaches. Ultimately, as previously stated, crafting one’s job serves the purpose of increasing one’s optimal functioning as per our

perspective. Optimal functioning is an umbrella concept for a range of individual level variables that have been linked to job crafting, including work-related well-being (i.e., high engagement, low burnout, high enjoyment, and a low need for recovery; [Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014](#); [Ryan et al., 2008](#)) and work-related performance (i.e., high autonomous motivation, high in-role performance, and low turnover intentions; [Grant & Parker, 2009](#); [Oldham & Fried, 2016](#); [Wrzesniewski et al., 2013](#)).

### *Combining Both Perspectives*

Overall, it can be concluded that studies adopting one of the two aforementioned perspectives may miss out on aspects or purposes considered as essential to job crafting. Moreover, by narrowing down the different aspects, studies relying on either of these dominant job crafting perspectives neglect yet other types and purposes of job crafting that have been reported in the literature. Hence, we define job crafting as a purposeful proactive behavior (for a similar approach see also [Griep et al., 2022](#)) and call for a broader conceptualization of job crafting, adopting a broader perspective on both *what* employees may craft, and *why* they engage in job crafting. We thus aim to take the purpose of job crafting into account in its measurement to overcome these limitations in the current job crafting literature.

### **The Broad Job Crafting Scale (BJCS)**

As shown in [Table 1](#), different job crafting measurements have been developed (e.g., [Kroon et al., 2013](#); [Laurence, 2010](#); [Leana et al., 2009](#); [Petrou et al., 2012](#)), and several have been formally validated across different samples (i.e., [Tims et al., 2012](#); [Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012](#); [Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013](#); [Niessen et al., 2016](#)). However, these measures align with either one of the dominant perspectives in the job crafting literature ([Tims & Bakker, 2010](#); [Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001](#)). Hence, they only include a limited number of job crafting behaviors and lack a specification of the purpose of job crafting or include it in a non-systematic way (e.g., [Leana et al., 2009](#); [Niessen et al., 2016](#)).

To overcome the limitations of these measures, and in line with our conceptualization of job crafting as the self-initiated changes employees make to their job with the intention to optimize their functioning, we develop and validate the Job Crafting Scale (BJCS). This measurement adds to the literature in three ways. First, while the existing measurements direct employees towards a predetermined selection of *specific* job crafting types and may miss out on other relevant changes employees may make to their job, the BJCS makes abstractions of the type of changes employees initiate and leaves room

**Table 1.** Existing Job Crafting Measures and Main Approaches.

|                                                         | Study                                                                    | Type of changes and number of items                                                                                                                                                                                              | Example items                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Job crafting approach of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) | Leana et al. (2009)<br>Also used by Leana et al. (2009)                  | General measure<br>1. Individual crafting (6 items)<br>2. Collaborative crafting (6 items)                                                                                                                                       | 1. <i>Introduce new approaches on your own to improve your work in the classroom</i><br>2. <i>Work together with your coworkers to introduce new approaches to improve your work in the classroom</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|                                                         | Laurence (2010)<br>Also used by Laurence (2010) and Bakker et al. (2014) | Specific type of changes<br>1. Expansion oriented physical crafting<br>2. Expansion oriented relational/cognitive crafting<br>3. Contraction oriented physical crafting<br>4. Contraction oriented relational/cognitive crafting | 1. <i>I have taken steps to change the way I go about doing my work and to expand the scope of my work goals</i><br>2. <i>I have taken steps to increase the extent to which I deal with other people on my job</i><br>3. <i>I have taken steps to change the way I go about doing my work and to limit the scope of my work goals (for example, so that I can spend more time and energy on friends, family, hobbies, etc.)</i><br>4. <i>I have taken steps to limit the scope of my job responsibilities at (organization)(for example, so that I can spend more time and energy on friends, family, hobbies, etc.)</i> |
|                                                         | Slemp and Vella-Brodick (2013)                                           | Specific type of changes<br>1. Task crafting (5 items)<br>2. Relational crafting (5 items)<br>3. Cognitive crafting (5 items)                                                                                                    | 1. <i>Introduce new work tasks that you think better suit your skills or interests</i><br>2. <i>Make an effort to get to know people well at work</i><br>3. <i>Think about how your job gives your life purpose</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|                                                         | Niessen et al. (2016)                                                    | Specific type of changes<br>1. Task crafting (3 items)<br>2. Relational crafting (3 items)<br>3. Cognitive crafting (3 items)                                                                                                    | <i>So that the job I do suits me..</i><br>1. <i>I concentrate on specific tasks</i><br>2. <i>I invest in relationships with people whom I get along with the best</i><br>3. <i>I view my tasks and responsibilities as being more than just part of my job</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

(continued)

**Table 1. (continued)**

|                                                 | Study                         | Type of changes and number of items                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Example items                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Job crafting approach of Tims and Bakker (2010) | Tims et al. (2012)            | Specific type of changes:<br>1. Increasing structural resources (5 items)<br>2. Increasing social resources (5 items)<br>3. Increasing challenging demands (5 items)<br>4. Decreasing hindering demands (6 items)                                                  | 1. <i>I try to develop my capabilities</i><br>2. <i>I ask my supervisor to coach me</i><br>3. <i>When an interesting project comes along, I offer myself proactively as project co-worker</i><br>4. <i>I make sure that my work is mentally less intense</i>                                                                                         |
|                                                 | Nielsen and Abildgaard (2012) | Specific type of changes<br>1. Increasing challenging demands (4 items)<br>2. Decreasing social job demands (3 items)<br>3. Increasing social job resources (3 items)<br>4. Increasing quantitative demands (3 items)<br>5. Decreasing hindering demands (2 items) | 1. <i>When a new tasks comes up I sign up for it</i><br>2. <i>I try to avoid emotionally challenging situation with my customers</i><br>3. <i>I ask for feedback on my performance from my colleagues</i><br>4. <i>When there isn't much to do I offer my help to colleagues</i><br>5. <i>I ensure that my work is the least burdening/straining</i> |
|                                                 | Petrou et al. (2012)          | Specific type of changes<br>1. Seeking resources (6 items)<br>2. Seeking challenges (3 items)<br>3. Reducing demands (4 items)                                                                                                                                     | 1. <i>I ask colleagues for advice</i><br>2. <i>I ask for more responsibilities</i><br>3. <i>I try to ensure that my work is emotionally less intense</i>                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                                                 | Kroon et al. (2013)           | Specific type of changes<br>1. Challenging crafting (4 items)<br>2. Reducing workload (4 items)                                                                                                                                                                    | Translated from Dutch:<br>1. <i>I change my job to make it more fun</i><br>2. <i>I ask colleagues to take over tasks because of workload</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

for employees' personal consideration of personally relevant changes. As the BJCS allows to account for the range of possible changes, it may better capture the prevalent diversity of job crafting behaviors. Second, the BJCS takes the purpose of job crafting into account. Including the purpose or target of job crafting is relevant given that job crafting is argued to be a change-oriented and self-directed, proactive behavior (Grant & Parker, 2009; Tims & Bakker, 2010). Yet, this characteristic is often omitted in contemporary measures of job crafting. The BJCS takes a broad range of purposes of job crafting into account by referencing optimal functioning in terms of well-being, attitudes, and behavior. Third, we developed a short questionnaire. The BJCS may therefore provide a practical measurement to examine job crafting as a broad construct and its nomological network (Tims et al., 2016; Vogt et al., 2016).

The BJCS was developed and validated throughout five phases. In Phase 1, we developed the scale and inspected its content validity by means of a qualitative study. In Phase 2, we tapped into the psychometric properties, factorial validity and (test-retest) reliability. In Phase 3, we conducted exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses on the BJCS and two existing job crafting measurements representing the dominant perspectives in the job crafting literature (i.e., Tims et al., 2012; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013) to examine its construct validity. We expected the BJCS to be different, yet related to these measures, because it captures a broad and general range of changes employees may make for a wider set of purposes than the other scales. In Phase 4, we investigated the predictive validity of the BJCS and in Phase 5, we examined its incremental validity in relation to optimal functioning over and above the other job crafting measurements.

Regarding the predictive and incremental validity, we expected the BJCS to positively relate to positive indicators and negatively to negative indicators of optimal functioning, including well-being outcomes (i.e., work engagement, work enjoyment and burnout and need for recovery), attitudinal outcomes (i.e., autonomous motivation and turnover intention), and behavioral outcomes (i.e., in-role performance); which combined refer to optimal functioning in the workplace. First, we expect job crafting to relate positively to work engagement and work enjoyment, and negatively to burnout and need for recovery. Following Conservation of Resources Theory (Hobfoll, 1989), employees mobilize their resources to craft their jobs (Berg et al., 2008) and gain additional resources. This results in feelings of work enjoyment and work engagement (Tims et al., 2013). In addition, the mobilization and accumulation of resources may prevent employees from resource depletion and hence, burnout and need for recovery (Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012; Tims et al., 2014). Second, we expected job crafting to positively enhance the

autonomous motivation to work and to decrease turnover intentions. Employees who redesign their job through job crafting make the job more consistent with one's goals, values, and preferences (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). This fosters the internal regulation for conducting the job, and hence increases autonomous work motivation (Gagné & Panaccio, 2014). In addition, job crafting can be a means by which employees diminish turnover intentions as employees craft their job to change it according to their personal preferences, abilities and needs, which may decrease the need to turnover (Bakker et al., 2014; Wrzesniewski et al., 2013). Finally, we expected a positive relationship between job crafting and in-role performance. Although job crafting does not per se have to align with organizational goals (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), to date, most empirical findings demonstrated that job crafting positively associates to performance (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Tims et al., 2015). We aim to replicate this finding.

## **Method Phase I: Scale Development and Content Validity and Results Phase I: Scale Development and Content Validity**

### *Scale Development*

The items of the BJCS were developed deductively (Hinkin, 1995). The authors of this study—who all have a background in I/O psychology—formulated four items that include a reference to both the “what” (i.e., making changes to one's job) and “why” (i.e., optimal functioning) of job crafting. We enabled employees to think of any possible personally relevant change they made to the job, without directing them to specific behaviors. Following the stem: “*Some people make changes in their job, others do not. To what extent do you shape your job? Please register to what extent you agree with the following statements*”, we started the items with ‘*I make changes to my job*’ or ‘*I change my job*’. We thus made abstraction of the specific type of changes to leave room for personal interpretation. We added the reference to optimal functioning by referring to improving one's well-being (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013), attitudes (person-job fit, meaning, identity; Tims, et al., 2016; Wrzesniewski et al., 2013) and performance as a behavioral outcome (Bakker et al., 2012). Specifically, we generated the following items: ‘*I make changes to my job to feel better*’, ‘*I change my job so it better fits with who I am*’, ‘*I change my job so it better fits with what I think is important*’, ‘*I make changes to my job to perform better*’. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *totally disagree*, (2) *disagree*, (3) *neither disagree, nor agree*, (4) *agree*, and (5) *totally agree*. Prior to testing the content validity of

this questionnaire in a qualitative study, these items were presented to, and provided by, experts in the field of job crafting.

### Content Validity

We conducted a qualitative study to examine the necessity of a broad, general job crafting construct and tested whether our measure taps into such a construct. To this end, we first asked participants to report on the changes they make to their job as well as on the goal underlying such behavior. We then showed the items of the BJCS and asked participants to provide examples for each of the four items. We expected that participants would come up with a diversity of job crafting behaviors which would go beyond the job crafting types operationalized in the current literature. Furthermore, we expected that the underlying reasons for making changes in one's job would mainly concern personal goals, namely optimizing one's functioning in terms of well-being, attitudes and behavior. Specifically, we invited 26 participants to take part in this qualitative study. 52% of our participants were men. The average age of the respondents was 35.56 years. The majority (80%) held a university degree, 56% worked as a white-collar employee, 20% in an administrative position and 24% in a middle management position.

Results showed that—as expected—participants reported a diversity of job crafting behaviors going beyond the types of job crafting mentioned in the literature. Changes concerned both the job content such as *“come up with new ideas”*, *“making changes in my tasks”* or *“redistributing tasks”*, and work methods such as *“implementing new ways of conducting work”* or *“requesting training opportunities”*. These changes hint at, albeit go beyond existing measures of, task crafting, increasing structural resources, increasing challenging demands and reducing hindering demands. Furthermore, respondents crafted social aspects, much in line with existing scales of increasing social resources (e.g., *“ask colleagues or the supervisor for advice when getting stuck”*), or relational crafting (e.g., *“invest in the quality of social interactions”*). However, they also mentioned changes that are not captured in these types of job crafting such as *“communicate and reflect on interpersonal interaction and collaboration”*, *“determine the frequency/quantity of social contacts”*, *“seek for new people to work with”* or *“exchange and vary tasks among colleagues”*. Although less frequently, respondents hinted at cognitive crafting as well, as they *“set priorities”*, *“reflect at lunch on what they need to feel happy (get some fresh air or schedule a meeting)”* or *“think about the alignment of their job with their vision and the importance of the identification with one's job”*. In addition, employees *“create more structure”* in their job, *“test alternative work methods according to personal preferences”* and

*“focus on small changes to perceive greater personal control”*. Finally, respondents also engaged in the so-called context crafting, as they *“adapt their work hours in function of their work life balance”*, *“work from home”* and *“reorganize their physical work environment”* (Van Vuuren & Dorenbosch, 2011). In line with our idea that employees craft with the intention of optimizing their functioning, respondents indicated that they make changes in their job to further optimize their well-being (e.g., *“to monitor their resilience”*, *“to invest in their work-life balance”*), attitudes (e.g., *“to divide workload according to personal competencies”*, *“to reach person-job fit”*) and behavior (e.g., *“to work more efficiently”*). Notably, although nearly not mentioned, individuals also made changes to their job for *“external reasons”*, *“because they have to”* or *“to solve (technical) problems”* hinting at other types of proactive behavior that primarily target the organization or others instead of the self and should therefore not be considered as job crafting as per the definition used in this manuscript.

## **Method Phase 2–5: Psychometric Properties, Reliability and Validity**

### ***Samples and Procedures***

As shown in Table 2, we collected two datasets to further validate the BJCS. First, we conducted a 3-wave study, with a time lag of six months between waves, among Dutch-speaking employees of a Belgian health care organization. The data were collected in collaboration with the HR-manager and participation was voluntary. During our data collection, the organization went through organizational change which involved the merger of the three departments. The first wave (T1) was collected pre-change, the second wave (T2) was collected during the organizational change, and the third wave (T3) was collected post-change. We invited all 518 employees to participate in our online questionnaire on work related well-being. We invited the majority of employees by e-mail with a personalized link to the questionnaire. In addition, 60 employees received the link and a unique code by post to get access to the online questionnaire.

In addition to this data collection, we collected a 2-wave dataset, with a time lag of three months between waves, among Dutch-speaking employees of the Belgian government. In total, we invited 2505 employees by e-mail to participate in our electronic questionnaire. We communicated on the content, stressed that participation was voluntary and provided the contact details of the main researcher and ethical committee.

**Table 2.** Overview Samples Across the Different Phases.

|                                             | Qualitative<br>Data (N = 26) | Dataset 1: Health care<br>employees |                    |                    | Dataset 2:<br>Governmental<br>employees |                    |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                             |                              | T1<br>(N = 423)                     | T1-T2<br>(N = 313) | T1-T3<br>(N = 305) | T1<br>(N = 637)                         | T1-T2<br>(N = 358) |
| Phase 1                                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Scale<br>development<br>&<br>Pilot study    | X                            |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Phase 2                                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Psychometric<br>properties &<br>reliability |                              | X                                   |                    |                    | X                                       |                    |
| Test-retest<br>reliability                  |                              |                                     | X                  | X                  |                                         | X                  |
| Phase 3                                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Construct<br>validity                       |                              |                                     |                    |                    | X                                       |                    |
| Phase 4                                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Predictive<br>validity                      |                              |                                     |                    | X                  |                                         |                    |
| Phase 5                                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         |                    |
| Incremental<br>validity                     |                              |                                     |                    |                    |                                         | X                  |

Notes. Measures used in Phase 4: BJCS, work engagement, burnout, autonomous motivation, turnover intentions, in-role performance. Measures used in Phase 5: BJCS, job crafting scale (Tims et al., 2012) and job crafting questionnaire (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013), work enjoyment, need for recovery, autonomous motivation, turnover intentions.

In *Phase 2*, we used the first wave of data (T1) of Dataset 1. Of the 518 employees who were invited, 423 employees completed the questionnaire (response rate 81.66%). The average age of the participants was 39 years ( $SD = 11.15$ ) and the sample consisted of 28.80% men. The majority (62.50%) had a university of applied science degree, 25.60% a university degree and 16.00% a primary or secondary school degree. We used the data collected at T1 and T2 ( $N = 315$ , response rate 60.81%), T1 and T3 ( $N = 305$ , response rate 58.89%) and T2 and T3 ( $N = 305$ , response rate 58.89%) of Dataset 1 and T1 and T2 ( $N = 358$ , response rate 14.29%) of Dataset 2 to examine test-retest reliability. The average age in the latter sample was 44.43 years ( $SD = 10.33$ ).

The sample consisted of 54.20% men. In terms of job position, 40.80%, 22.30%, 26.80% and 10.10% of the respondents worked in a job requiring a master degree, a bachelor degree, a high school degree or no degree was needed, respectively.

In *Phase 3*, we used the T1 data of Dataset 2. Of the 2505 invited employees, 637 participants completed the questionnaire at T1 (response rate of 25.43%). The average age was 44.41 years ( $SD = 10.28$ ). The sample consisted of 53.00% men. In terms of job position, 39.00% of the respondents worked in a job for which a master degree is required, 23.00% in a job that requires a bachelor degree, 28.00% in a job that demands a high school degree and 10.00% in a job for which no degree was required. The participants worked on average 11.90 years ( $SD = 10.28$ ) in their current job.

In *Phase 4*, we used the data of Dataset 1 collected at T1 and T3. Of the 518 employees, 300 filled out both the questionnaire at T1 and T3. The average age was 39.47 years ( $SD = 10.91$ ) and 28.00% were men. The majority (64.00%) had a university of applied science degree, 21.30% a university degree and 14.60% a primary or secondary school degree. We used the 2-wave data of Dataset 2 in *Phase 5*.

## Measures

**Job Crafting.** Three scales were used to measure job crafting. First, we included the *Job Crafting Scale (BJCS)*, which is subject to validation in the current manuscript. It consisted of four items (see [Table 3](#)). Two different answer scales were used. In Dataset 1, we used a 5-point Likert scale from (1) *totally disagree* to (5) *totally agree*. In Dataset 2, we changed the answer scale to a 7-point frequency scale from (1) *seldom or never*, (2) *rarely*, (3) *occasionally*, (4) *sometimes*, (5) *frequently*, (6) *usually*, and (7) *daily* so as to tap into specific job crafting behaviors, rather than a general attitude ([Van Parys, 2016](#)) and to allow participants to use more scale points, thereby enhancing information richness.

**Job Crafting Scale (JCS) and Job Crafting Questionnaire (JCQ).** We included the JCQ ([Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013](#)) and the JCS ([Tims et al., 2012](#)) to investigate the construct (Phase 3) and incremental validity (Phase 5) of the BJCS in Dataset 2. The JCQ measured the three types of job crafting of [Wrzesniewski and Dutton \(2001\)](#) and consisted of 15 items. Example items are respectively 'I introduce new approaches to improve my work', 'I think about how my job gives my life purpose', and 'I make an effort to know people well at work'. The JCS measured four types of job crafting following the perspective of [Tims and Bakker \(2010\)](#) and consisted of 21 items. Example items are respectively 'I try to develop my capabilities', 'I ask my supervisor to

**Table 3.** Descriptives and Exploratory Factor Analysis on the BJCS as Described in Phase 2.

|                                                                    | M               |                 | SD              |                 | Factorloading EFA |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
|                                                                    | Dataset 1<br>T1 | Dataset 2<br>T1 | Dataset 1<br>T1 | Dataset 2<br>T1 | Dataset 1<br>T1   | Dataset 2<br>T1 |
| 1. I Make changes to my job to feel better                         | 3.46            | 3.01            | .77             | 1.60            | .86               | .89             |
| 2. I change my job so it better fits with whol am                  | 3.26            | 2.87            | .80             | 1.64            | .90               | .90             |
| 3. I change my job so it better fits with whatI think is important | 3.19            | 2.86            | .83             | 1.65            | .82               | .89             |
| 4. I Make changes to my job to perform better                      | 3.42            | 3.18            | .76             | 1.65            | .86               | .90             |

Note. All items were administered in Dutch, English translations for communication purposes.

*coach me*’, ‘When an interesting project comes along, I offer myself pro-actively as project co-worker’, and ‘I make sure that my work is mentally less intense’. Both the JCS and JCQ were rated on a 5-point frequency scale ranging from (1) *never* to (5) *often (as often as possible at work)*.

**Optimal Functioning.** We assessed *work engagement* (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) in Dataset 1, through its core dimensions of vigor and dedication of the short 9-item version of the Dutch Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli et al., 2006). Each dimension was measured with three items rated on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from (1) *never* to (7) *always/every day*. The reliabilities at T1 and T3 were satisfactory for both *vigor* ( $\alpha_{T1} = .90$ ,  $\alpha_{T3} = .89$ ) and *dedication* ( $\alpha_{T1} = .90$ ,  $\alpha_{T3} = .93$ ). Example items are: ‘At work, I feel bursting with energy’, ‘I am enthusiastic about my job’.

We measured the core dimensions of *burnout* (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) in Dataset 1, using the subscales of emotional exhaustion and cynicism of the Dutch Utrecht Burnout Scale to measure burnout (UBOS; Schaufeli & van Dierendonck, 2000). Emotional exhaustion was measured with five items such as ‘I feel emotionally drained from my work’. Reliabilities were satisfactory at T1 ( $\alpha_{T1} = .87$ ) and T3 ( $\alpha_{T3} = .92$ ). Cynicism was measured with four items such as ‘I have become less enthusiastic about my work’. Reliabilities

were satisfactory at T1 ( $\alpha_{T1} = .84$ ) and T3 ( $\alpha_{T3} = .91$ ). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (0) *never* to (6) *always/every day*.

*Work enjoyment* was measured using the Short Inventory to Monitor Psychosocial Hazards in Dataset 2 (SIMPH; Notelaers et al., 2007). The scale consisted of five items such as '*I enjoy my work*' ( $\alpha_{T2} = .91$ ). These were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *totally disagree* to (5) *totally agree*.

We measured *need for recovery* using the SIMPH in Dataset 2 (Notelaers et al., 2007). The scale consisted of five items that were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) *totally disagree* to (5) *totally agree*. A sample item is '*I find it hard to relax at the end of the workday*'. The reliability was satisfactory ( $\alpha_{T2} = .89$ ).

*Autonomous motivation* was measured as a combination of two dimensions of the Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale of Gagné et al. (2015). Identified regulation was measured with three items such as '*I put effort in my current job because I personally consider it important to put efforts in this job*'. Intrinsic motivation was measured with three items such as '*I put effort in my job because I have fun doing my job*'. Items were rated on a scale from (1) *not at all* to (7) *completely*. Reliabilities were satisfactory in Dataset 1 ( $\alpha_{T1} = .93$ ;  $\alpha_{T3} = .92$ ) and in Dataset 2 ( $\alpha_{T3} = .93$ ).

We measured *turnover intentions* with the following single item in Dataset 1: '*To what extent do you plan to look for a job outside this organization?*', from the Dutch Questionnaire on the Experience and Evaluation of Work (QEEW; van Veldhoven et al., 2002). The item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) *totally disagree* to (5) *totally agree*.

*In-role performance* was measured with the subscale individual task proficiency of Griffin et al. (2007), consisting of three items such as '*I carried out the core parts of my job well*'. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) *totally disagree* to (5) *totally agree*. We only measured in-role performance in Dataset 1 at T3, reliability was satisfactory ( $\alpha_{T3} = .86$ ).

## Results Phase 2–5: Psychometric Properties, Reliability and Validity

### Phase 2: Psychometric Properties and Reliability

As shown in Table 3, the means of all items of the BJCS in Dataset 1 ranged from 3.19 to 3.46 and in Dataset 2 from 2.86 to 3.18, while the standard deviations ranged from .76 to .83 in Dataset 1 and from 1.60 to 1.65 in Dataset 2. The values of skewness ranging from  $-.35$  to  $-.03$  ( $SD = .12$ ) and kurtosis ranging from  $-.58$  to  $-.11$  ( $SD = .24$ ) showed that the distributions were (slightly) negative in Dataset 1, which indicate relatively high scores and

a rather flat distribution, respectively (Field, 2013). The values of skewness ranging from .52 to .74 ( $SD = .13$ ) and kurtosis ranging from  $-.40$  to  $-.10$  ( $SD = .26$ ) showed that the distributions were positive in Dataset 2, which indicate relatively low scores and a rather flat distribution, respectively (Field, 2013).

Exploratory factor analysis demonstrated that all four items loaded on one factor in both Datasets, with item loadings ranging from .82 to .90, exceeding the recommended .40 (Hinkin, 1995; Table 3). The inter-item correlations ranged from .57 to .76 in both datasets which can be considered as exemplary because they exceed .30 (Robinson et al., 1991). Internal consistency analysis showed satisfactory Cronbach's alpha's in both datasets (Dataset 1  $\alpha_{T1} = .88$  and Dataset 2  $\alpha_{T1} = .92$ ). The test-retest correlations between the job crafting scores over time all exceeded the criterion of  $> .40$  (Robinson et al., 1991), showing that job crafting is relatively stable over the course of three months (Dataset 2:  $r_{T1,T2} = .56$ ), six months (Dataset 1:  $r_{T1,T2} = .49$ ;  $r_{T2,T3} = .58$ ) and one year (Dataset 1:  $r_{T1,T3} = .54$ ).

### Phase 3: Construct Validity

We examined the construct validity of the BJCS in relation to the scales of Tims and colleagues (JCS; 2012) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (JCQ; 2013). We did randomly split the T1 data of Dataset 2 into two subsets. In the first subset ( $N_1 = 319$ ), we explored the underlying factor structure of the job crafting measures. In the second subset ( $N_2 = 318$ ), we aimed to confirm the underlying structure of the EFA results and to compare this structural model with alternative models.

*Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA).* Using the first subset ( $N_1 = 319$ ), we used principal axis factoring with oblique rotation in SPSS 24 to explore the underlying structure of the data. Nine factors were extracted with Eigenvalue  $> 1$ . Seven of these factors could be interpreted in a meaningful way: (1) content crafting (combination of task crafting and increasing challenging demands), (2) reducing hindering demands, (3) BJCS, (4), cognitive crafting, (5) relational crafting, (6) increasing social resources (feedback seeking), (7) crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development (subset of increasing structural resources and one item of increasing challenging demands). These seven factors explained 51.24% of the variance. As expected, the four items of the BJCS loaded on a separate factor and hence, the BJCS showed to be different from the other job crafting measures. Moreover, the BJCS explained 5.44% of the variance in job crafting over and above the first factor content crafting (24.73%) and the second factor reducing hindering

demands (7.90%). Hence, the BJCS explained additional variance in job crafting that is not captured by these traditionally well-used job crafting scales.

Following Costello and Osborne (2005), we then inspected the scree plot to decide how many factors should be retained. The plot showed the natural bend at the number of five factors. To compare several models, we then ran multiple factor analyses extracting five, six and seven factors. All three models showed a clean data structure; meaning that items that were supposed to load on a specific factor loaded on that factor with a factor loading of  $> .30$  and did not have a significant cross-loading on another factor. In each of the three exploratory factor analyses a set of items did not load on any of the factors or loaded on an unintended factor only. Specifically, the items *'I make sure I use my capacities to the fullest'* and *'I decide on my own how I do things'* (both items referring to increasing structural resources) did not load on any factor and were therefore dropped in further analyses. We also dropped the item *'I prefer work tasks that suit my skills or interests'* (i.e., part of Wrzesniewski and Dutton's type of task crafting) which loaded  $> .32$  on the unintended cognitive crafting factor (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

More specifically, in the model with seven factors, the item *'I try to make my work more challenging by examining the underlying relationships between aspects of my job'* (i.e., part of Tims and Bakker's construct of increasing challenging job demands) did not load on any factor and was dropped. The item *'If there are new developments, I am one of the first to learn about them and try them out'* did not load on the increasing challenging demands factor, or on the work content crafting factor. However, we retained this item as it represents crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development, a subset of the original increasing structural resources scale. In the model of six factors, the factor of crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development loaded onto one factor with the content crafting factor. The item *'I try to develop myself professionally'* did not load on any factor in this six-factor model. In the model of five factors, relational crafting and feedback seeking (increasing social resources) loaded onto one factor. As the 7-factor model represented the most nuanced, meaningful, grouping of the job crafting items, we advance this model as the hypothesized model in the following confirmatory factor analyses.

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses.** Using the second subset ( $N_2 = 318$ ), we conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in MPLUS 7.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) using robust maximum likelihood estimator MLM to account for the non-normal distribution of the observed variables (Byrne, 2012). The CFA's were performed on 37 items.<sup>1</sup> We compared the hypothesized 7-factor model with four alternative models. As shown in Table 4, the 7-factor model showed the best fit to the data and demonstrated the lowest BIC-value compared to the

**Table 4.** Fit Statistics for the Models Based on Confirmatory Factor Analyses.

| Models |                  | $\chi^2$ | df  | RMSEA | CFI | TLI | SRMR | BIC      | BIC sample size adjusted |
|--------|------------------|----------|-----|-------|-----|-----|------|----------|--------------------------|
| M1     | 7 latent factors | 963.47   | 606 | .04   | .93 | .92 | .05  | 30686.90 | 30261.90                 |
| M2     | 6 latent factors | 1122.71  | 612 | .05   | .90 | .89 | .06  | 30830.26 | 30424.29                 |
| M3     | 5 latent factors | 1417.53  | 617 | .06   | .84 | .83 | .07  | 31130.09 | 30739.97                 |
| M4     | 3 latent factors | 2175.09  | 624 | .09   | .69 | .67 | .10  | 31939.30 | 31571.38                 |
| M5     | 1 latent factor  | 2855.11  | 627 | .11   | .55 | .52 | .11  | 32678.88 | 32320.49                 |

Note. Analyses were run on a subset of the Dataset 2 at T1 collected among governmental employees ( $N = 312$ ). M1: Hypothesized 7-factor model including content crafting (task crafting and increasing challenges load onto one factor), reducing hindering demands, BJCS, cognitive crafting, relational crafting, feedback seeking (increasing social resources) and crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development (three items of the increasing structural resources dimension). M2: 6-factor model in which the factor crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development load onto one latent factor with content crafting. M3: 5-factor model in which relational crafting and increasing social resources (feedback seeking) loaded onto one latent factor. M4: 3-factor model in which each factor represented another measurement, namely the BJCS, the JCS, and the JCQ. M5: 1-factor model representing an underlying job crafting factor. The following items were excluded from the analyses: 'I make sure I use my capacities to the fullest', 'I decide on my own how I do things' and 'I prefer work tasks that suit my skills or interests'. Furthermore, two additional covariances were included in each model based on their content: 1) the JCQ-item 'I take on additional tasks at work' with the JCS-item 'I regularly take on extra tasks even though I do not receive extra salary for them', 2) the JCQ-items 'I remind myself of the importance of my work for the broader community' and 'I remind myself about the significance my work has for the success of the organization'.

alternative six-, five-, three- and one-factor models, providing support for the divergent validity of the BJCS. The factor loadings of the four items of the BJCS were significant and ranged from .79 to .89 which exceeded the recommended .40 (Hinkin, 1995).

*Latent Correlations Between Job Crafting Dimensions.* We then investigated the convergent validity of the BJCS by inspecting the latent correlations between the BJCS and the six other job crafting factors. As shown in Table 5, the results showed moderate to high positive latent correlations of the BJCS with all other job crafting factors (Field, 2013). The highest latent correlations were found between BJCS and content crafting ( $r = .55, p < .001$ ), increasing social resources ( $r = .40, p < .001$ ) and crafting opportunities for skill utilization and

**Table 5.** Latent Correlations Between Job Crafting Factors.

|                                                                 | 1      | 2      | 3     | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|---|
| 1. BJCS                                                         | —      |        |       |        |        |        |   |
| 2. Content crafting                                             | .55*** | —      |       |        |        |        |   |
| 3. Reducing hindering demands                                   | .17**  | .08    | —     |        |        |        |   |
| 4. Cognitive crafting                                           | .34*** | .52*** | .19** | —      |        |        |   |
| 5. Relational crafting                                          | .25*** | .46*** | -.05  | .47*** | —      |        |   |
| 6. Increasing social resources                                  | .40*** | .60*** | .24** | .44*** | .46*** | —      |   |
| 7. Crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development | .40*** | .76*** | -.04  | .40*** | .43*** | .57*** | — |

Note. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

development ( $r = .40, p < .001$ ). The BJCS moderately related to cognitive crafting ( $r = .34, p < .001$ ) and relational crafting ( $r = .25, p < .001$ ). The lowest latent correlation was found between BJCS and reducing hindering demands ( $r = .17, p < .01$ ). In sum, as expected, we demonstrated that the BJCS measured a different but related construct to the other job crafting measurements.

#### Phase 4: Predictive Validity

Prior to investigating the predictive validity of the BJCS, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis to examine the discriminant validity of job crafting and the outcomes (vigor, dedication, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, autonomous motivation, turnover intention and in-role performance). We used the robust maximum likelihood estimator MLM to account for the non-normal distribution of the observed variables (Byrne, 2012). The results showed that the 7-factor model at T1 (job crafting, vigor, dedication, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, autonomous motivation and turnover intention;  $\chi^2(df)_{T1} = 646.20(277)$ ; RMSEA<sub>T1</sub> = .06; CFI<sub>T1</sub> = .95; TLI<sub>T1</sub> = .94; SRMR<sub>T1</sub> = .06) and the 8-factor model at T3 (job crafting, vigor, dedication, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, autonomous motivation, turnover intention and in-role performance;  $\chi^2(df)_{T3} = 685.47(347)$ ; RMSEA<sub>T3</sub> = .05; CFI<sub>T3</sub> = .96; TLI<sub>T3</sub> = .95; SRMR<sub>T3</sub> = .05) yielded a good fit to the data (Schreiber et al., 2006). Based on the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) representing the balance between the number of parameters (i.e., model complexity) and the fit of the model to the data (Aiken et al., 1991), these models demonstrated the lowest

BIC-value ( $BIC_{T1} = 25832.68$ ;  $BIC_{T3} = 24253.24$ ) and thus showed a better fit to the data in comparison with the alternative models in which job crafting loaded onto one factor with autonomous motivation ( $BIC_{T1} = 26679.27$ ;  $BIC_{T3} = 25156.89$ ), vigor ( $BIC_{T1} = 26618.16$ ;  $BIC_{T3} = 25435.86$ ), dedication ( $BIC_{T1} = 27137.27$ ;  $BIC_{T3} = 25627.86$ ) or performance ( $BIC_{T3} = 24773.74$ ). These results support the discriminant validity of the BJCS.

We then inspected the correlations between job crafting and the outcome variables, both concurrently and over time (Table 6). Attesting to the predictive validity of the BJCS, results showed that job crafting at T1 positively correlated with vigor ( $r_{T1} = .19, p < .01, r_{T2} = .15, p < .05$ ), dedication ( $r_{T1} = .18, p < .05; r_{T2} = .12, p < .05$ ) and autonomous motivation ( $r_{T1} = .25, p < .01; r_{T2} = .19; p < .01$ ), both concurrently and one year later (T3). No significant results were found for emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and turnover intentions or in-role performance.

### Phase 5: Incremental Validity

We then examined whether the BJCS explained additional variance in the outcome variables, above and beyond the other job crafting dimensions resulting from Phase 3. To this end, we conducted hierarchical regression analyses using bootstrapping (5000) of job crafting T1 predicting work enjoyment, need for recovery, autonomous motivation and turnover intentions at T2, six months later. In Table 7, we show that the BJCS contributed to the prediction of work enjoyment ( $\beta = .14, p < .001$ ) over and above reducing hindering demands ( $\beta = -.32, p < .001$ ) and increasing social resources ( $\beta = .12, p < .001$ ) ( $\Delta R^2 = .02, p < .01$ ). The BJCS also predicted additional variance in autonomous motivation ( $\beta = .14, p < .001$ ) over and above reducing hindering demands ( $\beta = -.30, p < .001$ ), cognitive crafting ( $\beta = .21, p < .001$ ) and crafting opportunities for skill utilization and development ( $\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .01$ ). Contrary to our expectations, the BJCS did not add to the prediction of need for recovery and turnover intentions.

## Discussion

Building on pioneering job crafting perspectives which refer to diverse definitions and types of job crafting (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), we define job crafting in a broad, general way as the self-initiated changes employees make to their jobs with the intention to optimize their functioning. As such, we adopt a broad perspective regarding *what* employees may craft and *why* they may engage in job crafting behaviors. Such a broad perspective is necessary because existing job crafting perspectives

**Table 6.** Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations Between BJCS and Outcomes.

|                          | <i>M (SD)</i><br><i>T1</i> | <i>M (SD)</i><br><i>T3</i> | 1     | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. BJCS                  | 3.37 (.69)                 | 3.30 (.67)                 | —     | .15*   | .12**  | -.04   | -.001  | .19**  | .04    | -.02   |
| 2. Vigor                 | 5.50 (1.19)                | 5.21 (1.22)                | .19** | —      | .85**  | -.41** | -.63** | .56**  | -.41** | .09    |
| 3. Dedication            | 5.77 (1.20)                | 5.43 (1.32)                | .18** | .82**  | —      | -.32** | -.65** | .62**  | -.45** | .08    |
| 4. Emotional exhaustion  | 2.58 (.98)                 | 2.88 (1.19)                | -.07  | -.39** | -.31** | —      | .62**  | -.26** | .32**  | -.18** |
| 5. Cynicism              | 1.94 (1.02)                | 2.28 (1.28)                | -.005 | -.62** | -.60** | .58**  | —      | -.44** | .54**  | -.13*  |
| 6. Autonomous motivation | 3.89 (.79)                 | 3.70 (.75)                 | .25** | .52**  | .59**  | -.25** | -.40** | —      | -.33** | .12*   |
| 7. Turnover intentions   | 2.02 (1.02)                | 2.21 (1.17)                | -.01  | -.39** | -.41** | .34**  | .52**  | -.29** | —      | .01    |
| 8. In-role performance   | —                          | 3.94 (.60)                 | —     | —      | —      | —      | —      | —      | —      | —      |

Note. \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ . Correlations between BJCS T1 and outcomes T1 ( $N = 300$ ) below the diagonal, BJCS T1 and outcomes T3 ( $N = 305$ ) above the diagonal.

**Table 7.** Standardized Regression Coefficients of Hierarchical Regressions of Job Crafting Behaviors (T1) on Outcomes (T2).

|                                                                    | Work<br>enjoyment | Need for<br>recovery | Autonomous<br>motivation | Turnover<br>intention |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Specific job crafting behaviors                                    |                   |                      |                          |                       |
| Content crafting                                                   | .11               | -.01                 | .06                      | .13 <sup>†</sup>      |
| Reducing hindering<br>demands                                      | -.32***           | .17**                | -.30***                  | .20*                  |
| Cognitive crafting                                                 | .07               | .12 <sup>†</sup>     | .21***                   | -.04                  |
| Relational crafting                                                | .003              | -.07                 | .04                      | .05                   |
| Increasing social resources                                        | .12*              | .005                 | .04                      | -.01                  |
| Crafting opportunities for<br>skill utilization and<br>development | .10               | -.03                 | .15*                     | -.11                  |
| BJCS                                                               | .14**             | -.04                 | .14**                    | -.07                  |
| R <sup>2</sup>                                                     | .24               | .04                  | .29                      | .06                   |
| ΔR <sup>2</sup>                                                    | .02**             | .00                  | .01**                    | .00                   |

Note. \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ ;  $\Delta R^2$  = change in  $R^2$  in comparison with model without BJCS.

limit job crafting to a predetermined selection of specific changes in task, relational or cognitive boundaries of the job (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) or to changes in job demands and job resources (Tims et al., 2012). Moreover, we also broaden the scope of the reason why employees may craft. While Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) focus on meaning and identity as the purposes of job crafting, and Tims and Bakker (2010) put person-environment fit and well-being to the fore, other scholars have for example highlighted the crucial role of impact (Bruning & Campion, 2018; Zeijen & Peeters, 2018). We capture these aspects under the umbrella of optimal functioning referring to a wide range of well-being, attitudinal and behavioral aspects (Gagné & Vansteenkiste, 2013; Van den Broeck et al., 2018).

To enable quantitative research in the realm of this broad approach to job crafting, we developed and validated the Broad Job Crafting Scale (BJCS). This short 4-item measure proved to be reliable, stable over time and valid across different samples. First, the BJCS proved to be distinct from but related to other job crafting measurements (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Tims et al., 2012). The scale was significantly related to the six other job crafting factors, emerging from combining the perspectives of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) and Tims and Bakker (2010). Employees who engaged in job crafting as measured through the BJCS scored especially high on crafting the content of their jobs and crafting opportunities for skill utilization and

development. These findings indicate the prominent role of enhancing one's task or content-related changes employees might make to their job in the realm of job crafting (see also [Lyons, 2008](#); [Tims et al., 2012](#); [Van Wingerden et al., 2013](#)). To a lesser extent, employees scoring high on the BJCS also scored high on cognitive crafting, on the relational job crafting types, and on reducing hindering demands. The BJCS thus captures diverse ways of crafting, going beyond the specific job crafting types defined within the literature.

Apart from relating to other job crafting measures, the BJCS also related to several aspects of employee optimal functioning and was able to predict it over time. First, the BJCS related to positive well-being and attitudinal outcomes such as work engagement, enjoyment and autonomous motivation (but no support was found for incremental validity regarding other aspects of optimal functioning), showing that by means of job crafting employees invest in the energizing aspects of work, fostering personal development and hence, adding to work enjoyment and work engagement ([Tims et al., 2013](#)). In addition, by means of job crafting, employees invest in the meaning of their job ([Tims et al., 2016](#)) and reshape their job so it becomes more consistent with their goals and values ([Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001](#)). This then promotes the process of internalization and hence, autonomous motivation ([Gagné & Panaccio, 2014](#)). Notably, the BJCS showed to explain additional variance in work enjoyment and autonomous motivation over and above the JCS and JCQ, suggesting that the BJCS includes other job crafting aspects than those included in the latter measures that account for these beneficial outcomes.

In line with recent literature, our findings suggest that the relationships between job crafting and positive outcomes are - in general - straightforward, whereas the relationships between job crafting and negative outcomes seem to be more complex. In our study, job crafting was not related to the negative indicators of optimal functioning (i.e., burnout, need for recovery and turnover intentions). One explanation is that job crafting is a positive construct rooted in positive psychology. Rather than avoiding negative outcomes, employees may thus mainly craft their job in order to enhance positive outcomes and start positive spirals ([Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013](#)). This is in line with the conservation of resources theory ([Hobfoll, 1989](#)) and the idea that employees crafting their job may already have a certain level of resources which they then invest in generating additional resources ([Berg et al., 2008](#)). The relationship between job crafting and negative outcomes may be conditional upon other factors such as leadership. Reducing hindrances might be an active coping strategy to prevent oneself from experiencing negative outcomes when "enacted in constructive and skillful ways", for instance in the context of time management or as a temporary way to deal with demanding circumstances

(Petrou et al., 2015, p.477). Presumably, managers have an important role to play in stimulating job crafting among their followers. Indeed ‘positive’ leadership styles such as autonomy-supportive and empowering leadership are found to stimulate subordinates’ job crafting (Hetland et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2018), while ‘negative’ leadership styles caused opposite effects (e.g., laissez-faire leadership – Oprea et al., 2022). Recently, Fong et al. (2022) found that leadership styles are not solely an antecedent of job crafting but might also change based on subordinates’ job crafting.

Following the positive association between the BJCS and reducing hindering demands, we raise the question which type of hindrance crafting is captured in our broader approach. Given that we include the intention of optimizing one’s functioning, that it is to enhance well-being, meaning and identity of work, as well as performance, we would expect to capture constructive forms of hindrance crafting. This assumption finds preliminary support in our qualitative data in which employees reported to set priorities, to delegate some tasks according to personal strengths and abilities and to alter some collaborations when they do not feel comfortable.

Unexpectedly, the BJCS did not relate to in-role performance. From a theoretical point of view, this could suggest that in-role performance is a more distal outcome of job crafting: while some quantitative studies established direct relationships (e.g., Gordon et al., 2015; Petrou et al., 2015), the majority of previous research showed that job crafting indirectly related to job performance, for example via work engagement (Bakker et al., 2012; Demerouti, Bakker, & Halbesleben, 2015; Demerouti et al., 2015; Tims, et al., 2015). The lack of a relationship between job crafting and in-role performance may also be due to a methodological issue. Given that we collected these data before and just after the merger of different departments of the organisation, employees’ job crafting behavior may be rather “targeted at finding appropriate ways of responding to, dealing with, or coping with [the] new situation” (Petrou et al., 2015, p.471), rather than increasing one’s performance. Hence, adaptivity to change might have been a more appropriate outcome here (Peeters et al., 2016).

### *Limitations and Future Research Directions*

This study is not without its limitations. A first aspect that should be considered when using the BJCS is the choice of answering scale on which respondents have to rate the items. Throughout the validation phases we switched from a 5-point Likert scale to a 7-point frequency scale. As shown in Phase 4 and 5, these options are equivalent in predicting the outcomes, but the 7-point scale allows to measure job crafting as a true behavior instead of

a general attitude (Van Parys, 2016). Because job crafting aims to refer to “an action” (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p.201), we recommend future research using the BJCS to continue using the frequency scale. Moreover, we prefer a 7-point scale over a 5-point scale as it allowed to obtain richer answering patterns. A comparison of the standard deviations of the BJCS using the 5-point attitudinal scale (Dataset 1) versus the 7-point frequency scale shows that the latter indeed allows to capture more variance in the data. A potential limitation of a 7-point frequency scale is perhaps its skewed distribution such that more data points are collected at the lower side of the scale. To deal with the non-normality of the data, scholars should use the robust estimator MLM and bootstrapping (Byrne, 2012), as we did in the current study.

Second, we used different datasets to validate the BJCS across samples. Nevertheless, specific features of these samples might have influenced our findings (e.g., change context). Until now, our knowledge on the impact of context and personal characteristics such as demographics in relation to job crafting is limited (but see for example Kooij et al., 2017). Indeed, workers do not work in a vacuum, but are surrounded by social and often organizational contexts that influence the intention to engage in job crafting (Costantini et al., 2022). Work design scholars pointed out multiple times that it is crucial to look at all layers of work design to fully understand workers’ perceived job characteristics and job crafting actions (Parker, 2014). Today, several scholars have contributed to the literature by shedding light on the social or organizational environment in which job crafters are embedded (e.g., Fong et al., 2021, 2022). However, in future studies, considering the organizational and social environment should not be a contribution per se, but something necessary in every crafting research, especially when investigating the validity of the BJCS in different contexts and among heterogeneous samples.

Third, so far, in the job crafting literature, it remains rather unclear in which time interval the results of job crafting should come to the fore (Hakanen et al., 2017). Longitudinal research on job crafting is still relatively scarce and included diverse time-lags ranging for example from one week (e.g., Tims, et al., 2016), over three months (e.g., Vogt et al., 2016) to one year (Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012; Petrou et al., 2015) or even four years (Hakanen, Seppälä, & Peeters, 2017). We used different time lags (i.e., three months; one year), but it would be interesting to examine whether different changes would require different timeframes. Structural, perhaps more deliberate, changes may especially have an impact in the long run while small changes may primarily benefit temporary needs requiring short timeframes (Dorenbosch et al., 2013).

## Conclusion

This article adds to the literature on job crafting by proposing a broad conceptualization and measurement of job crafting as the self-initiated changes employees make to their job with the intention to optimize their functioning in terms of work-related well-being (i.e., high engagement, low burnout, high enjoyment, and a low need for recovery; [Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014](#); [Ryan et al., 2008](#)) and work-related performance (i.e., high autonomous motivation, high in-role performance, and low turnover intentions; [Grant & Parker, 2009](#); [Oldham & Fried, 2016](#); [Wrzesniewski et al., 2013](#)). This conceptualization aims to include the various types of job crafting behavior (i.e., the “what” of job crafting) and reasons employees may craft their jobs (i.e., the “why” of job crafting) that received attention in the perspectives dominating the job crafting literature ([Tims & Bakker, 2010](#); [Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001](#)) or have been raised in other research (e.g., [Bruning & Campion, 2018](#)). Through 5 phases using different longitudinal samples, the scale corresponding with this conceptualization proved to be reliable, predictive valid (both concurrent and over time for vigor, dedication and autonomous motivation) and incrementally valid for work enjoyment and autonomous motivation. Hence, it provides a good and short alternative to investigate job crafting in broad terms, using a short scale that is ideally suited for repeated measurement research. We therefore hope that our scale will be widely used, among scholars and practitioners alike to further our understanding of the antecedents and consequences of job crafting.

## Acknowledgments

Yannick Griep and Els Vanbelle contributed equally to this manuscript and are shared first author. We are also grateful to the two anonymous reviewers who provided insightful comments to further improve the manuscript (Yannick Griep, the second author of this paper, is also Editor-in-chief of *Group & Organization Management*. Griep was not involved in any aspect of its peer review process or revision, nor the decision to accept this manuscript for publication. The initial version of this manuscript was submitted prior to the start of his term as Editor-in-chief).

## Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was supported by FWO Flanders Belgium under Grant G095412.

## ORCID iDs

Els Vanbelle  <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6843-2318>

Yannick Griep  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3508-5635>

Hans De Witte  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6691-517X>

## Data Availability Statement

The [data](#) used in this manuscript can be found on The Open Science Framework using the following DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/3QH6U](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/3QH6U).

## Note

1. The analyses included the four items of the BJCS, 19 items of the JCS (Tims et al., 2012; two items were dropped based on EFA) and 14 items of the JCQ (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; one item was dropped based on EFA). In each CFA, we included two theoretical relevant covariances post-hoc to improve the model fit to the data (Schreiber et al., 2006): (1) the JCQ-item 'I take on additional tasks at work' with the JCS-item 'I regularly take on extra tasks even though I do not receive extra salary for them', (2) the JCQ-items 'I remind myself of the importance of my work for the broader community' and 'I remind myself about the significance my work has for the success of the organization'. Results of the analyses including all items of the JCS and JCQ are available upon request.

## References

- Aiken, L. S., West, S. G., & Reno, R. R. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Sage.
- 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., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2003). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the job demands–resources model. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 12(4), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320344000165>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83–104. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20004>
- Bakker, A. B., Hakanen, J. J., Demerouti, E., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2007). Job resources boost work engagement, particularly when job demands are high. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 274–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.2.274>

- 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/10.1177/0018726712453471>
- Barker, C. B. (2007). *Experience of adversity at work: Toward an identity-based theory of resilience*. University of Michigan.
- Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). *What is job crafting and why does it matter?* University of Michigan
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158–186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.645>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000362>
- 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(2), 499–522. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0604>
- Byrne, B. M. (2012). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus. Basis concepts, application, and programming*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Costantini, A., Demerouti, E., Ceschi, A., & Sartori, R. (2022). Implementing job crafting behaviors: Exploring the effects of a job crafting intervention based on the theory of planned behavior. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 58(3), 477–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320975913>
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 10(7), 1–9.
- Crawford, E. R., Lepine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(5), 834–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019364>
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your own job through job crafting. *European Psychologist*, 19(4), 237–247. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000188>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Gevers, J. M. P. (2015). Job crafting and extra-role behavior: The role of work engagement and flourishing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91, 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.001>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 457–469.
- Dorenbosch, L., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & van Dam, K. (2013). Job crafting: De psychologie van een baan op maat. *Gedrag & Oranistatie*, 26(1), 3–15.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics*. Sage.

- Fong, C. Y. M., Tims, M., & Khapova, S. N. (2022). Coworker responses to job crafting: Implications for willingness to cooperate and conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 138, 103781. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103781>
- Fong, C. Y. M., Tims, M., Khapova, S. N., & Beijer, S. (2021). Supervisor reactions to avoidance job crafting: The role of political skill and approach job crafting. *Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 1209–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12273>
- French, M. (2009). Job crafting. In R. Watkins & D. Leigh (eds), *Handbook of improving performance in the work-place, volume 2, the handbook of selecting and implementing performance interventions* (pp. 555–568). Pfeiffer.
- Gagné, M., Forest, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Crevier-Braud, L., Van den Broeck, A., Aspli, A. K., Bellerose, J., Benabou, C., Chemolli, E., Güntert, S. T., Halvari, H., Indiyastuti, D. L., Johnson, P. A., Molstad, M. H., Naudin, M., Ndao, A., Olafsen, A. H., Roussel, P., Wang, Z., & Westbye, C. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2013.877892>
- Gagné, M., & Panaccio, A. (2014). The motivational power of job design. In M. Gagné (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation, and self-determination theory* (pp. 165–180). Oxford University Press.
- Gagné, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2013). Self-Determination theory's contribution to positive organizational psychology. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (pp. 61–82). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2006). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting*. University of Pittsburgh.
- Gordon, H. J., Demerouti, E., Le Blanc, P. M., & Bipp, T. (2015). Job crafting and performance of Dutch and American health care professionals. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 14(4), 192–202. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000138>
- Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393–417. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24351328>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047327>
- Griep, Y., Vanbelle, E., Van den Broeck, A., & De Witte, H. (2022). Active emotions and personal growth initiative fuel employees' daily job crafting: A multilevel study. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 25(1), 62–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23409444211033306>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24634438>
- Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C. W., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Different types of employee well-being across time and their relationships with job crafting. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 289–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000081>

- Hakanen, J. J., Seppälä, P., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2017). High job demands, still engaged and not burned out? The role of job crafting. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 24(4), 619–627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12529-017-9638-3>
- Hetland, J., Hetland, H., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Daily transformational leadership and employee job crafting: The role of promotion focus. *European Management Journal*, 36(6), 746–756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2018.01.002>
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 967–988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100509>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.44.3.513>
- Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1992). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M. Dunnette & L. Hough (eds), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 165–207). Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978) *The social psychology of organizations* (vol. 2, p. 528). Wiley.
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). Can empowering leaders affect subordinates' Well-Being and careers because they encourage subordinates' job crafting behaviors? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 184–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051817727702>
- Ko, I. (2012). *Crafting a job: Creating optimal experiences at work*. The Claremont Graduate University.
- Kooij, D. T. A. M., van Woerkom, M., Wilkenloh, J., Dorenbosch, L., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2017). Job crafting towards strengths and interests: The effects of a job crafting intervention on person–job fit and the role of age. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(6), 971–981. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000194>
- Kroon, B., Kooij, D. T. A. M., & van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M. (2013). Job crafting en bevlogenheid. Zijn er verschillen tussen teams met een restrictieve dan wel onbegrensd werkcontext? *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 26, 46–65.
- Laurence, G. A. (2010). *Workaholism and expansion and contraction oriented job crafting: The moderating effects of individual and contextual factors*. The Graduate Syracuse University.
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(6), 1169–1192. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.47084651>
- Lyons, P. (2008). The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 23(1-2), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9080-2>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2012). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Muthén & Muthén.
- Nielsen, K., & Abildgaard, J. S. (2012). The development and validation of a job crafting measure for use with blue-collar workers. *Work & Stress*, 26(4), 365–384. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.733543>
- Niessen, C., Weseler, D., & Kostova, P. (2016). When and why do individuals craft their jobs? The role of individual motivation and work characteristics for job

- crafting. *Human Relations*, 69(6), 1287–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715610642>
- Notelaers, G. D., De Witte, H., & Van Veldhoven, M. (2007). Construction and validation on the short inventory to monitor psychosocial Hazards. *Arbeidsgezondheidszorg en Ergonomie*, 44, 11–17.
- Oeser, O. A., & Harary, F. (1964). A mathematical model for structural role theory, II. *Human Relations*, 17(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676401700101>
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(2), 79–93. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009>
- Oldham, G. R., & Fried, Y. (2016). Job design research and theory: Past, present and future. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 136, 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.05.002>
- Oprea, B., Miulescu, A., & Iliescu, D. (2022). Followers' job crafting: Relationships with full-range leadership model. *Current Psychology*, 41(7), 4219–4230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00950-7>
- Parker, S. K. (2014). Beyond motivation: Job and work design for development, health, ambidexterity, and more. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 661–691. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115208>
- Peeters, M. C. W., Arts, R., & Demerouti, E. (2016). The crossover of job crafting between coworkers and its relationship with adaptivity. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 25(6), 819–832. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1160891>
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C. W., 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1783>
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039003>
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). Crafting the change: The role of employee job crafting behaviors for successful organizational change. *Journal of Management*, 44(5), 1766–1792. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315624961>
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Criteria for scale selection and evaluation. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (eds), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 1–16). Academic Press.
- Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 112–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008>
- Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 139–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9023-4>

- Schaufeli, W., & van Dierendonck, D. (2000). *Utrechtse burnout schaal*. Handleiding. Nederland. Swets & Zeitlinger B.V.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Schreiber, J. B., Nora, A., Stage, F. K., Barlow, E. A., & King, J. (2006). Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(6), 323–338. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.99.6.323-338>
- 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(2), 126–146. <http://dx.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(4), 957–977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9458-3>
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(2), 9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 173–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A., & 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>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2015). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 914–928. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.969245>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2014). Daily job crafting and the self—efficacy—performance relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(5), 490–507. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-05-2012-0148>
- Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Job crafting and its relationships with person-job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92(1), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.11.007>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2021-0216>
- Van den Broeck, A., Carpini, J., & Dieffendorf, J. (2018). Work motivation: Where do the different perspectives lead us? In R. M. Ryan, (ed). *The Oxford handbook of human motivation*. OUP USA.

- Van den Broeck, A., De Cuyper, N., De Witte, H., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2010). Not all job demands are equal: Differentiating job hindrances and job challenges in the Job Demands-Resources model. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 19(6), 735–759. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320903223839>
- van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2015). The job crafting intervention: Effects on job resources, self-efficacy, and affective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(3), 511–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12128>
- Van Parys, L. (2016). *On the street-level implementation of ambiguous activation policy. How caseworkers reconcile responsibility and autonomy and affect their clients' motivation*. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Van Veldhoven, M., Meijman, T. F., Broersen, J. P. J., & Fortuin, R. J. (2002). *Handleiding VBBA*. SKB Vragenlijst Services.
- Van Vuuren, M., & Dorenbosch, L. (2011). *Mooi werk. Naar een betere baan zonder weg te gaan. Handboek job crafting*. Uitgeverij Boom.
- Van Wingerden, J., Derks, D., Bakker, A. B., & Dorenbosch, L. (2013). Job crafting in het speciaal onderwijs: Een kwalitatieve analyse. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 26, 85–103.
- Vogt, K., Hakanen, J. J., Brauchli, R., Jenny, G. J., & Bauer, G. F. (2016). The consequences of job crafting: A three-wave study. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 25(3), 353–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1072170>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>
- Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (pp. 281–302). Emerald Group Publishing.
- 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(1), 281–302. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S2046-410X\(2013\)0000001015](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001015)
- Zeijen, M. E. L., Peeters, M. C. W., & Hakanen, J. J. (2018). Workaholism versus work engagement and job crafting: What is the role of self - management strategies. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 28(2), 357–373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12187>

Submitted Date: May 1, 2023

Revised Submission Date: October 2, 2023

Acceptance Date: October 3, 2023

## Author Biographies

**Els Vanbelle** obtained her PhD from the Research Group of Occupational & Organisational Psychology & Professional Learning at KU Leuven. In her PhD project, we clarify the conceptualization of job crafting (what is it about?) and investigated contextual factors, personal factors as well as indicators of optimal functioning in relation to our job crafting construct, e.g. altering one's job in order to optimize one's functioning. My research on job crafting aligns with my interests in job design, coaching, career management, motivation, personal values and identity, the work-nonwork interface, job-related well-being, and well-being in general.

**Yannick Griep** is an Associate Professor at the Behavioural Science Institute at Radboud University and an Extraordinary Full Professor at North-West University. He is the brain behind business brilliance and the maestro of management mishaps. With a Ph.D. in Management and a knack for turning boardroom blunders into teachable moments, he's not your typical prof. Born with a calculator in one hand and a coffee cup in the other, he has spent his life deciphering the cryptic language of spreadsheets and making pie charts laughable. With an infectious laughter that rivals a hyena, he's not just a professor; he's a management magician.

**Anja Van den Broeck** is Full professor at the Faculty of Economics and Business at the KU Leuven. Her research interests include motivation, job design, well-being, engagement, and burnout. Her research goal is to examine how, and under which circumstances individuals may thrive in the broader context of work (including job search and successful return to work).

**Hans De Witte** is full professor at the Department of Psychology of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium. He teaches Work (and Organizational) Psychology and is member of the Research Group Work, Organizational and Personnel Psychology in his department. His research includes the study of the psychological consequences of job insecurity, unemployment, temporary employment and downsizing, as well as mobbing and stress (e.g. burnout) versus engagement at work.