Job Crafting and its Outcomes

Abdolzahra Naami, PhD
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz

The goal of this study was to determine the role of job crafting in predicting job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. Participants included 310 employees from an industrial organization who completed Job Crafting Scale (Tims et al., 2012), Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2002), Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985), and Affective Commitment Scale (Meyer and Allen, 1991). The results shown that there are significant simple and multiple relationships between subscales of job crafting (increasing the level of structural resources, increasing the level of social resources, increasing the level of challenging job demands, and decreasing the level of hindrance job demands), and job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. In addition, the results of multiple regression technique showed that 62% of the variance of job engagement, 55% of the variance of job satisfaction, and 31% of the variance of affective commitment was explained by facets of job crafting.

Keywords: job crafting, job engagement, job satisfaction, affective commitment

The phenomenonof job crafting is a proactive work behavior that describes actions employees take to shape their job to fit their personal needs and desires (Tims & Bakker, 2010). Job crafting is a concept recently developed in the organizational literature. Although it is a prevalent phenomenon in all types of jobs, only recently have researchers started to recognize the relevance of job crafting and its important implications for individuals and organizations A common pattern that emerges from the job design literatures is that researchers view individuals primarily as passive receivers of influence from other external factors, such as characteristics of the job itself or the social context of work. Despite the fact that

individuals often craft their jobs in different ways based on individual interpretations, interests, skills, and initiative, most studies of work have focused on work as the employment relationship, and have ignored the actual work practice, or what people actually do in their jobs (Tims & Bakker, 2010). The implicit assumption of previous studies was that work in most organizational settings is done according to written manuals or training programs, and that there is a specific, prescribed way in which work is under taken. In this case, managers are the "crafters" who shape the jobs that individuals perform in organizations. Until recently, changes in job characteristics have typically been studied using a top-down approach that focuses on managerial job redesign interventions (HolmanAxtell, Spirgg, Totted, & Wall, 2010). However, employees may also influence their own job characteristics (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). More recently, researchers have begun to examine the extent to which individuals proactively shape the experience of their jobs in idiosyncratic ways that fit their motivations, interests and skills (Grant & Ashford, 2008).Understanding how employees create a resourceful work environment for themselves has become increasingly important due to current changes in the organizational landscape.

Technological advances have exposed an increasing number of employees to new forms of working (Golden, Veiga, & Dino, 2008). In addition, careers are currently thought to be the responsibility of the individual (Grant & Parker, 2009).Therefore, employees must indicate their needs or goals, such as training opportunities or promotions (Grant & Ashford, 2008). In sum, employees must be able to create a work environment that enables them to achieve both their work and personal goals. Management can also benefit greatly from a better understanding of the effect of employee job redesign on employeewell-being. Management interventions are costly and time consuming (Dugdill & Springett,1994) and may not address every individual's specific needs. An employee-driven approach to job redesign may be better able to meet these personal needs and preferences while using fewer resources (e.g., time and money).

Job crafting is a concept that explicitly focuses on employee job redesign (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). In job crafting, employees independently modify aspects of their jobs to improve the fit between the characteristics of the job and their own needs, abilities, and preferences (Berg, Dutton, &Wrzesniewski, 2008). According to the originators, the phenomenon of job crafting is defined as the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). According to Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), employees can craft their job by changing three aspects of their work boundaries, namely, their task boundaries, their cognitive task boundaries and/or their relational boundaries. Even in very strict and routine jobs employees have some degree of freedom to influence certain aspects of their work. Examples of changing task boundaries are altering the type of tasks or the number of tasks one performs. Changing cognitive task boundaries can be done by altering the view of work. This way not only the job is changed but the way one sees the job. Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) definition of job crafting is limited to those changes that employees may make in their work tasks, relationships at work, and cognitions about work. Some recent studies have suggested that job crafting may take other forms as well. For example, Lyons (2008) found that the salespersons in his study engaged in self-initiated skill development. In addition, research by Grant and colleagues (2010) (as cited in Berg, et al., 2008) showed that employees working in a service job reprimanded or avoided to serve unpleasant clients. The latter acts of job crafting received less attention in the job crafting literature. Although Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) do write about the possibility that employees cut tasks, interactions, or relationships as part of job crafting, it is probably less valued by organizations and therefore hard for employees to report in interviews. However, avoiding unpleasant clients may be a good way for employees to reduce job stress and as a consequence to stay healthy and engaged. In order to capture these and other job characteristics that employees may alter, in this study job crafting was operationalized in

accordance with the job demands–resources (JD–R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). As a result, job crafting is defined as the changes that employees may make to balance their job demands and job resources with their personal abilities and needs (Tims & Bakker, 2010).

According to this conceptualization, job crafters can either shape their job by changing their job resources or by changing their job demands. Moreover, when framed in the JD-R model, job crafting activities can be divided into four conceptually different dimensions; namely, (1) increasing the level of structural resources, (2) increasing the level of social resources, (3) increasing the level of challenging job demands, and (4) decreasing the level of hindrance job demands (Tims & Bakker, 2010). Employees can, for example, increase their own structural resources by increasing their autonomy and seek for learning opportunities and ways to develop their own skills. They can increase their social resources by seeking feedback and social support of colleagues or of their supervisor. Increasing job demands can, for example, be done by taking on more challenging tasks or tasks in line with their talents and interests. Giving up tasks to make sure their work is mentally less stressful is an example of decreasing hindrance job demands (Tims, Bakker & Derk, 2012).

Job crafting provides hope for those who are dissatisfied with their jobs. Unlike the traditional antecedents of job satisfaction, job crafting is directly under the control of the worker. There are several advantages to the use of job crafting rather than circumstance changes because the latter are prone to hedonic adaptation. Job crafting on the other hand may be resistant to this type of adaptation owing to the fact that it is often episodic and transient. Indeed, in certain cases job crafting may present a direct challenge to the adaptation suffered by chronic circumstances. For example, practicing a job crafting activity such as gratitude may present the opportunity to refresh the positive aspects of the chronic job circumstances in one's mind. Taking a moment to appreciate one's current situation may refresh the initial satisfaction boost that the circumstantial change first produced (Lyubomirsky, Sheldonok, & Schkade, 2005). As

mentioned above, job crafting may provide a unique opportunity to people employed in dirty work fields. Clearly, there are troubling aspects of these occupations over which the employees have little direct control.

Job crafting would provide the opportunity to mentally or behaviorally counteract the negative aspects of the workplace. Those working in dangerous jobs, such as a police officer or firefighter may also receive substantial benefits from job crafting to counteract the hazardous or disturbing aspects of work. For example, a crafting activity such as focusing on the positive outcomes of their work may be beneficial to a firefighter. In addition, job crafting provides opportunities to those working outside of their desired career field. Clearly, not all employees are in their ideal job due to many outside influences such as lack of suitable employment in a poor economy, lack of job-relevant skills, or other external pressures. Job crafting may be particularly useful to people who are working in less than ideal jobs and conditions that do not naturally afford much in the way of job satisfaction (Timset al., 2012).

Job engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez–Roma, and Bakker,2002).Vigorrefers to a feeling of high energy and mental hardiness while working, and a willingness to persist in tough situations and make commendable efforts on one's job. Dedication refers to a feeling that one experiences of having a strong connection with one's work, along with feeling of being important, eager, and motivated. Absorption refers to a feeling of being completely concentrated on or immersed in one's work to such an extent that time appears to pass quickly and yet one finds it difficult to detach oneself from one's work.

The positive consequences of job engagement are many and range from positive job-related attitudes to extra-role behavior, and general performance (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2008). Engaged persons experience more job satisfaction, higher commitment to their organizations, have lesser or no intentions to quit their job (Rich, 2006), and enjoy better

mental and psychosomatic health (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006).When people who are more engaged in their jobs are compared to those who are less engaged, the more engaged people have higher job satisfaction, are more committed to the job, and have lower turnover intentions (Christian & slaughter, 2007). Job satisfaction is one of the dominant topics in the field of industrial/organizational (I/O) psychology, with hundreds of studies being published on the subject each year. Job satisfaction is defined as "how people feel about their jobs or the extent to which one likes his or her job". (Spector, 1997). Individual satisfaction is linked to several important organizational behaviors. Higher job satisfaction leads to a decrease in withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism (e.g., Farrell & Stamm, 1988), lateness (e.g., Koslowsky, Sagie, Krausz, & Singer, 1997), turnover (e.g., Tett& Meyer, 1993), and burnout (e.g., Halbesleben, 2006), higher incidences of extra-role behaviors such as organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), (Organ & Ryan, 1995), and decrease in counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs) (Dalal, 2005). Much of the research has examined the antecedents of job satisfaction. Job crafting may provide incremental validity over and above the traditional antecedents of job satisfaction. Environmental factors are only shown to explain about 20% of the variance of job satisfaction (e.g., Judge et al., Bono, & Locke, 2000);whereas, dispositional factors are shown to explain about 30% (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal, & Abraham, 1989). This leaves up to 50% of the variance of job satisfaction unaccounted for and job crafting may be a large contributor to this unexplained variance.

Affective commitment can be defined as when individuals are involved in and satisfied with their membership in an organization (Shore & Wayne, 1993). They may experience a sense of belonging or "identification with and emotional attachment to" the organization (Johnson & Chang, 2006). This facet of commitment has been positively related to organizational identification and citizenship (extra role behavior that is not part of the job description; Shore & Wayne, 1993). In Shore and Wayne's (1993) study, affective commitment was found to be positively

related to organizational citizenship, which includes compliance and altruism. More recently, research has shown that increases in affective commitment are associated with positive work behaviors such as fewer decision-making errors, better risk management, and increased mindfulness (Barrett, Novak, Venette, & Shumate, 2006). Yet, despite the clear connection that has been drawn to show a relationship exists, there is very little research to define exactly what *types* of commitment are related to positive work behaviors.

Several researches have shown that there are significant relationships between job crafting and job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. Job resources foster job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Crawford, LePine, & Rich, 2010; Halbesleben, 2010 ; Salanova, Agut & Peiró, 2005). Job resources foster job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, &Schaufeli, 2009). In addition The second dimension of job crafting (increasing the level of challenging job demands) has positive relationship with job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Kass, Vodanovich, &Callender, 2001; LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005; Gorgievski & Hobfoll, 2008; Berg et al. (2008) and Crawford et al. (2010). The third dimension of job crafting also has positive relationship with job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment (Crawford et al., 2010). LePine et al. (2005), indicated that there was a negative relationship between hindrance demands with job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. The goal of this study was to investigate whether the presence of job crafting is related to the likelihood that increases task job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment in Iranian employees.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis1: there are relationships between dimensions of job crafting and job engagement.

Hypothesis 2: There are relationships between dimensions of job crafting and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: There are relationships between dimensions of job crafting and affective commitment.

Method

Participants

The research population consists of 988 individuals employed in an industrial organization. Questionnaires were distributed to 325 employees that were selected according to the simple random sampling. Three hundred and ten completed questionnaires were received. The sample consisted of 88% male and 12% female participants with an age range from 28 to 49. Of the 310 participants, 10% were single, and 90% were married. In regards to having children, 72% of the participants reported having children. In regards to education, 56% of the participants reported having a high school diploma, and 44% of the participants reported having a graduate degree. Respondents had between 6 to 20 years ofexperience.

Instruments

Job crafting: was measured by a scale of Tims et al. (2012), Measured job crafting dimensions were; (1) increasing structural resources (2) increasing social resources, (3) increasing challenging job demands, and (4) decreasing hindrance job demands. The first dimension consisted of five items. An example of an item is: "I try to learn new things at work". The second dimension was also tested with five items. One example item is: "I ask my colleagues for advice". The third dimension consisted of five items. An example of an item is: "I regularly take on extra tasks, even though I do not receive extra salary for them". Finally, the fourth dimension was tested with six items. An example of an item of this scale is: "I make sure that my work is mentally less intense". The answering

scale for all of the items ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). All subscales showed good reliabilities (increasing structural resources; $\alpha = .84$; increasing social resources; $\alpha = .75$; increasing challenging demands; $\alpha = .81$; decreasing hindrance demands; $\alpha = .82$). The JCS shows convergent validity when correlated with the active constructs proactive personality (+), personal initiative (+), and the inactive construct cynicism (-). In addition, results indicated that self-reports of job crafting correlated positively with colleague-ratings of work engagement, employability, and performance-thus supporting the criterion validity of the JCS. Finally, self-rated job crafting behaviors correlated positively with peer-rated job crafting behaviors (Tims et al., 2012).In the current research the overall fit of the models to the data with the goodness-of-fit index (GFI), the Bentler-Bonett (1980) normed-fit index (NFI), comparative fit index (CFI) and non-normed fit index (NNFI) were assessed. For the CFA model, the goodness-of-fit (GFI) index was .91, the normed-fit index (NFI) was .96, the comparative fit index (CFI) was .97) and the non-normed fit index (NNFI) was .94.Also, this model has a RMSEA of .04; indicating a good fit.Additionally,in this research all internal subscales yielded an internal reliability alpha greater than 0.70 (structural resources; $\alpha = .78$; increasing social resources; $\alpha = .71$; increasing challenging demands; $\alpha = .76$; decreasing hindrance demands; $\alpha = .75$).

Job engagement: was measured with the work engagement scale, consisting of three subscales: Vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Vigor was measured using six items (e.g., when I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work), dedication was measured using five items (e.g., My job inspires me), and absorption was measured using six items (e.g., time flies when I am working). Items were scored on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1"never" to 5 "always". In the present study, vigor yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .90, dedication had a Cronbach's alpha of .91 and absorption yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .90.

Job Satisfactionwas measured with the Job Satisfaction Survey developed by spector (1985). The scale consists of 36 items. The format is

a likert rating scale with six response choices ranging from slightly agree to highly agree, with a possible score range from 36 to 216, where a high score indicates a high degree of job satisfaction. The internal consistency reliability coefficient (alpha), computed on a sample of 2870, was .91. Test–retest reliability (Over an 18 month interval) based on a sub-sample of the original group (N = 43) was .71 (spector, 1985).In the present study, job satisfaction survey yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .91.

Affective commitment: is measured using eight items from the Affective Commitment Scale (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Two example items are -I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization, and -I do not feel like a part of the family at my organization. Responses were made on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This scale also has been used frequently on Iranian employees and results showed that the scale has good psychometric characteristics. In this research Cranach's α value of the scale is.90 which has exceeded the recommended threshold of .70.

Results

Hypothesis1 anticipated that the dimensions of job crafting (Increasing the level of structural resources, increasing the level of social resources, increasing the level of challenging job demands, decreasing the level of hindrance demands) would be related to the job engagement. As shown in Table 1, the correlation coefficients between job engagement andincreasing the level of structural resources (r=.70), increasing the level of social resources (r=.68), increasing the level of challenging job demands (r=.58) and decreasing the level of hindrance demands (r=-.15) were significant. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis findings (Table 2) indicate that the combination of increasing the level of structural resources, increasing the level of social resources, increasing the level of challenging job demands, and decreasing the level of hindrance demands are able to

significantly predict job engagement (F=32. 14, p<.001). The R2 indicated that 62% of the variance of job engagement was explained by this regression model. Multiple stepwise regression analysis was conducted to predict employees' job engagement. Table 2 shows that increasing the level of structural resources was the first and the most salient of the variables that entered in the regression equation (β=.41), and accounted for 50% of the variation in job engagement. At step 2, Increasing the level of social resources entered the regression equation (β=.32) and accounted for an additional 8% of the variation in job engagement. At step 3, increasing the level of challenging job demands entered the regression equation (β=.18) and accounted for an additional 2% of the variation in job engagement.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there are significance relationships between dimensions of job crafting and job satisfaction. As shown in the correlational analysis in Table 1 there are significant (*p*<.05) correlations between job satisfaction with increasing the level of structural resources (r=.55), increasing the level of social resources (r=.62), increasing the level of challenging job demands (r=.53) and decreasing the level of hindrance demands (-r=.35).Therefore, hypothesis 2 was confirmed.

Table 1

Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrixof Job Crafting Facets with Task Job Engagement, Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment

	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Increasing the level of structural resources	20.41	9.21	1	.23*	.26**	-.18*	.70**	.55**	.31**
2	Increasing the level of social resources	21.88	11.23	.23*	1	24**	-.19*	.68**	.62**	.37**
3	Increasing the level of challenging job demands	17.14	10.85	.26**	24**	1	-.21*	.58**	.53**	.30**
4	Decreasing the level of hindrance demands	16.78	4.54	-.18*	-.19*	-.21*	1	-.15*	-.35**	-.35**
5	Job engagement	46.09	11.52	.70**	.68**	.58**	-.15*	1	.31**	.42**
6	Job satisfaction	112.11	53.17	.55**	.62**	.53**	-.35**	.31**	1	.45**
7	Affective commitment	36.98	10.12	.31**	.37**	.30**	-.35**	.42**	.45**	1

*P<.05   **P<.01

Table 2

The Prediction of Employees' Job Engagement by Facets of Job Crafting

Variables	R	R^2	B	β	t	P
Constant			19.20		7.48	.001
Increasing the level of structural resources	.71	.50	.04	.41	4.34	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.76	.58	.13	.32	3.30	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.78	.61	.03	.18	2.19	.03
Decreasing the level of hindrance demands	.79	.62	.005	-.12	-2.19	.05
Stepwise						
Variables	R	R^2	B	β	t	P
Constant			5.66		3.48	.001
Increasing the level of structural resources	.71	.50	.60	.41	4.20	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.76	.58	.42	.32	3.13	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.78	.60	.46	.18	2.41	.003

$F=32.14, p<.001$

Table 3 presents the results of the full regression model containing all four dimensions of job crafting as predictors of job satisfaction. The results show that the combination of increasing the level of structural resources, increasing the level of social resources, increasing the level of challenging job demands, and decreasing the level of hindrance demands were able to significantly predict job satisfaction ($F=32.14$, $p<.001$). $R^2=$ .55, which means 55%of the variance of job satisfaction was attributable to the job crafting facets. In order to assess which dimensions of job crafting are more closely associated with job satisfaction, stepwise

13

multiple regressions were run. Increasing the level of structural resources was the first and the most salient of the variables that entered the regression equation (β=.39), and accounted for 39% of the variation of job satisfaction. At step 2, Increasing the level of structural resources entered the regression equation (β=.34) and accounted for an additional 11% in the variation of job satisfaction. At step 3, increasing the level of challenging job demands entered the regression equation (β=.21) and accounted for an additional 3% of the variation in job satisfaction. At step 4, decreasing the level of hindrance demands entered the regression equation (β=-.13) and accounted for an additional 2% of the variation in job satisfaction

According to hypothesis 3each of the job crafting facets was expected to be correlated with affective commitment. As shown in the correlational analysis in Table 1 there are significant ($p<.05$) correlations between affective commitment andincreasing the level of structural resources (r=.31), increasing the level of social resources (r=.37), increasing the level of challenging job demands (r=.30), and decreasing the level of hindrance demands (-r=.35).The correlation findings confirm hypothesis 3.

Table 4 show that the overall regression model is significant (F = 19.86). R2 indicates that 31 % of the variance of affective commitment was explained by the regression model. Next, attention was focused on determining which of the prediction variables is most closely related to affective commitment. For this purpose the researcher employed the stepwise multiple regression technique. All the dimensions turned out to be significant in explaining affective commitment. Increasing the level of social resources (β=.21), increasing the level of structural resources (β=.30), decreasing the level of hindrance demands (β=-.23, and increasing the level of challenging job demands (β=.19) were the most important variables that entered the regression equation, respectively and accounted for 31% of the variation of affective commitment.

Table 3

The Facets of Job Crafting Regressed on Job Satisfaction

Variables	R	R^2	B	β	t	P
Constant			6.68		6.48	.001
Increasing the level of structural resources	.55	.31	.05	.38	6.92	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.70	.50	.11	.30	4.11	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.73	.54	.02	.21	2.95	.005
Decreasing the level of hindrance demands	.74	.55	.02	-.13	-2.32	.02
Stepwise						
Variables	**R**	**R^2**	**B**	**β**	**t**	**P**
Constant			20.34		3.69	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.62	.39	.25	.29	4.11	.001
Increasing the level of structural resources	.70	.50	.34	.38	6.92	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.73	.53	.43	.21	2.95	.02
Decreasing the level of hindrance demands	.74	.55	-.21	-.13	-2.32	.001

F=54. 10, *p*<.001

Discussion

In the current study three hypotheses about the relationships between job crafting with job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment were investigated. The results showed that job crafting influence employee's job engagement, job satisfaction and affective commitment. These findings are in line with the previous mentioned study of Crawfordet al., 2010 andHalbesleben, 2010).

Research on the JD–R model has shown that job resources are able to buffer the negative effects of job demands and may particularly lead to high levels of job engagement when job demands are high as well (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen & Roodt, 2010). The second dimension of

job crafting concerns increasing the level of challenging job demands. A job that is understimulating may cause boredom that, in turn, may lead to absenteeism and job dissatisfaction (Kass et al., 2001). It is therefore important for work motivation, that employees experience an adequate level of challenging job demands. Challenging job demands stimulate employees to develop their knowledge and skills or to attain more difficult goals (LePineet al., 2005).

Table 4
The Facets of Job Crafting Regressed on Affective Commitment

Variables	R	R^2	B	β	t	P
Constant			36.01		4.67	.001
Increasing the level of structural resources	.31	.10	.03	.30	4.78	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.48	.23	.04	.21	2.93	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.51	.26	.05	.19	2.75	.001
Decreasing the level of hindrance demands	.56	.31	.005	.04	.68	.49
Stepwise						
Variables	R	R^2	B	β	t	P
Constant			36.01		6.48	.001
Increasing the level of social resources	.36	.13	.09	.21	2.93	.004
Increasing the level of structural resources	.48	.23	.77	.30	4.78	.001
decreasing the level of hindrance demands	.53	.28	-.36	-.23	-3.47	.001
Increasing the level of challenging job demands	.55	.31	.11	.19	2.75	.007

F=19. 86, *p*<.001

Challenge demands offer mastery experiences that, in turn, may lead to satisfaction and high levels of self-efficacy (Gorgievski & Hobfoll, 2008).

16

A recent meta-analysis by Crawford et al. (2010) found that challenging job demands were positively related to job engagement even though they can also be appraised as stressful. Crafting more challenges at work may be an important way to increase personal growth and satisfaction with the job (Berg et al., 2008). The third dimension of job crafting refers to decreasing the level of hindering job demands. Employees may proactively lower their job demands when they perceive that their demands have become overwhelming. Prolonged exposure to high demands in combination with low levels of job resources lead to decreasesin job engagement. Meta-analysis by Crawford et al. (2010) indicated that there was a negative relationship between hindrance demands and work engagement. Hindering job demands are considered stressful because they unnecessarily thwart personal growth and goal attainment and hinder optimal functioning (LePine et al., 2005). There are other reasons that confirm job crafting affect job satisfaction. As stated in Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) original conceptualization of job crafting, the activities are specifically enacted in order for the employee to increase person-environment fit. Several studies have shown that job satisfaction is increased when the organizational environment is a good match with the employees' attitudes and values (Scroggins, 2007). By participating in job crafting activities, the employee is actively molding the environment and the job to be a better fit for their individual needs. Engaging in job crafting activities may have a positive impact on the self-image of the employee. Shaping their job in positive ways may cause an employee to feel a stronger sense of self-efficacy and self-esteem which have both been shown to be positively related to job satisfaction (e.g., Judge, Lock & Durham,1998). This may be especially true when the employee takes on extra duties to expand their role boundaries and increase their skill set. An increase in job skills would likely lead to the person feeling more capable and confident in their job and in future endeavors. Job crafting may lead to changes in the perceptions of job characteristics such as autonomy or task significance (Wrzesniewski &

Dutton, 2001). If someone is given the freedom to enact changes in their job environment they would likely feel a strong sense of autonomy, increasing positive feelings because the job is under their control. Job crafting activities enacted to affect task significance can be seen in the actions of employees engaging in some of the dirty work fields described earlier. Increasing task significance would also likely lead to employees feel a greater sense of meaning in their work. Both task significance itself and meaning of work have been shown to be related to job satisfaction (Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Changing these perceptions of work characteristics may allow employees to attain a greater sense of intrinsic satisfaction from their job. Engaging in job crafting activities that increase interactions with customers or coworkers enhances the social element of the job environment. As previously discussed, work relationships are a significant source of job satisfaction (e.g., Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton, 2000). Enhancing these social relationships would likely be an effective job crafting strategy for increasing satisfaction.

Several of the mechanisms by which job crafting is affecting job satisfaction may also hold true for affective organizational commitment. Job crafting may be creating a richer social environment and increasing meaningful relationships. Also, those who do job craft may have a more positive view of the company because of the freedom to job craft. This may be reflected in the negative relationship between affective organizational commitment and constraints. Similarly, job crafting may be increasing person-organization fit in addition to increasing person-job fit, resulting in higher affective organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is an attitude variable.There are several ways in which job crafting activities may have a positive impact. Job crafting may make the employee feel more involved in the organization and foster relationships between organizational members, strengthening affective commitment. Also, job crafting is in some incidences lead to the expression of freedom of work autonomy and may be interpreted as a sign of the organization trusting in its employees and caring about their well-being. If an

organization gives an employee the freedom to shape the job to fit their needs this may increase positive feelings about the organization (Timset al., 2012).

One implication of the study results is that employee job crafting should receive more attention at work because of its positive effect on organizational outcomes. Because job crafting occurs within organizations, managers should be aware of the effects that employees can have on their own work environment. It is the manager's task to manage job-crafting behaviors so that they contribute to personal and organizational goals. In addition, managers could inform their employees about job crafting strategies and stimulate employees to take initiative when they desire more challenging work or less hindering job demands. In other words, managers could provide employees with opportunities to craft their jobs.A methodological limitation of the current study was that all the data were correlational due to the cross-sectional design of the study. Another limitation of the current study was the reliance on self-report data. Future studies should include some longitudinal components to better measure changes in variables over time, testing causal hypotheses more directly.

References

Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1986). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 187-192.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). Job demands-resources model: state of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3)*, 309-328.

Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational Behavior. *Journal of organizational Behavior, 2*, 147-154.

Barrett, M. S., Novak, J. M., Venette, S. J., & Shumate, M. (2006). Validating the high reliability organization perception scale. *Communication Research Reports*, *23(2),* 45-56.

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). *What is job crafting and why does it matter?* Retrieved from: https:// www.bus. umich.edu/ Positive/POS-Teaching-and-Learning/ Job_Crafting Theory_to_Practice-Aug_08.Pdf

Christian, M. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2007). *Work engagement. Paper Presented at the Sixty-Seventh annual meeting of the Academy of Management*, Philadelphia, P. A. Shvaga, O. (2007). Vigor at work. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Aviv University.

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,* 834–848.

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1241–1255.

Dugdill, L., & Springett, J. (1994). Evaluation of workplace health promotion: A review. *Health Education Journal, 53,* 337–347.

Farrell, D., & Stamm, C.L. (1988). Meta-analysis of the correlates of employee absence. *Human Relations, 41,* 211-227.

Gersick, C. J. G., Bartunek, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2000). Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*(6), 1026-1044.

Gorgievski, M. J., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2008). *Work can burn us out or fire us up: Conservation of resources in burnout and engagement.* In J. R. B. Halbesleben (Ed.), Handbook of stress and burnout in health care. Hauppauge NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008).The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28,* 3-34.

Hakanen, J. J., & Roodt, G. (2010).*Using the job demands-resources model to predict engagement*: Analysing a conceptual model. In A. B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), Work engagement: A handbook of

essential theory and research (pp. 102–117). New York: Psychology Press (2010).

Halbesleben, J. R. B. (2006). Sources of social support and burnout: A meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 1134-1145.

Hallberg, U., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment. *European Psychologist, 11*, 119-127.

Holman, D. J., Axtell, C. M., Sprigg, C. A., Totterdell, P., & Wall, T. D. (2010). The mediating role of job characteristics in job redesign interventions: A serendipitous quasi-experiment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31,* 84–105.

Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(5), 1332-1356.

Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C. H. (2006). ''I'' is to continuance as ''we'' is to affective: The relevance of the self-concept for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27.*

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(2), 237-249.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1998). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 19,* 151–188.

Kass, S. J., Vodanovich, S. J., & Callender, A. (2001). State-trait boredom: Relationship to absenteeism, tenure, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business and Psychology,16,* 317–327.

LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 48,* 764–775.

Lyons, P. (2008). The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business Psychology,* 23, 25–36.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9,* 111-131.

Olden, T. D., Veiga, J. F., & Dino, R. N. (2008). The impact of professional isolation on teleworker job performance and turnover intentions: Does time spent teleworking, interacting face-to-face, or having access to communication-enhancing technology matter? *Journal of AppliedPsychology, 93,* 1412–1421.

Organ, D.W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48,* 775-802.

Rich, B. L. (2006). *Job engagement*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Florida, United states.

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 1217–1227.

Scroggins, W. A. (2007). An examination of the additive versus convergent effects of employee perceptions of fit. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *37*(7), 1649-1665.

Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(5), 15-23.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Applications, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tims, M., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Job crafting: towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *36*, 841-849.

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*, 173-186.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: previsioning employees as active crafters of their work. *The Academy of Management Review, 26*, 179-201.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology, 82, 183-20.*