

How to Cite

Sekhniashvili, T. (2023). Job crafting among rehabilitation center employees. *International Journal of Health & Medical Sciences*, 6(2), 111-117. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijhms.v6n2.2140>

Job Crafting Among Rehabilitation Center Employees

Tamar Sekhniashvili, MA, BCBA, IBA

Clinical Director of child and adolescent's rehabilitation center "PUZZLE"

Corresponding author email: Tsekhniashvili77@gmail.com

Abstract---*The goal of the present research was to study job crafting among personnel employed at a rehabilitation center in relation to variables such as age, education (bachelor's degree, master's degree) and job position (therapist, supervisor). Hypothesis, which states that any employee, regardless their education and position at work, can master job crafting (Tims et al., 2012) was once again supported by the present study. Analysis showed that data of bachelors, masters, managers and professionals (therapists) were not statistically different from each other. Studies (Lichtenthaler & Fishbach, 2019; Rudolph et al., 2017) have demonstrated the associations between job crafting, job satisfaction and work engagement. Therefore, it was interesting to explore these associations among people employed at a rehabilitation center. The findings showed that job crafting significantly predicted engagement.*

Keywords---*job crafting, job satisfaction, rehabilitation center, therapist, work engagement.*

Literature Review and Hypotheses

Job Crafting

Creating positive climate at an organization, efficient leadership, energetic and proper communication between employees, successfully overcoming stress, and job crafting (Berg et al., 2008) can increase the likelihood of achievements, job satisfaction, and performance in a team. Job crafting is defined as physical and cognitive changes in work made by individual in line with their motivation, aspirations, and needs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg, Dutton, & Wrzesniewski, 2008; Tims et al., 2012). Job crafting is not a change in a job description, but rather a change in one's attitudes towards job. Job crafting is not included in any job description *per se*.

Job crafting, as a continuous process (Berg et al., 2008), does not imply redesigning the performed work, but rather it is a constant correction of the work process, reducing problems, creating opportunities for success, increasing independence and motivation, taking responsibility for one's work, and providing possibilities for perfect work performance (Parker & Ohly, 2008; Berg et al., 2010). Generally, it is considered that job crafting is accessible only for those employed at managerial positions. However, scholars argue that every employee at every position, regardless their job, can engage in job crafting (Tims et al., 2012). Exactly this assumption was the premise of the current study, which sought to explore job crafting among those employed at managerial (supervisors) and non-managerial (therapists) positions. Even though therapists are required to strictly follow the intervention plan, we thought it interesting to understand their perception of work process and their independence in the process. According to Georgian legislation, therapists (behavioral therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, etc.) employed at rehabilitation centers should hold, at least, a bachelor's degree while a supervisor should hold, at least, a master's degree. Usually, managerial position, as compared to non-managerial one, implies more independence and a possibility to manage environment. Wrzesniewski & Dutton (2001) proposed a case of personnel employed at non-managerial positions who were able to engage in job crafting. Specifically, those were nurses who were required to strictly comply with protocols. However, they were successful in changing their work environment in a manner that they could perfectly perform their work and achieve fruitful results such as communication with patients, positive attitudes towards patients, communication with patient's relatives, engagement of patient's relatives in the treatment process (Lazazzara et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2014).

Authors argue that through considering mutual interests [Bakker & Leiter \(2017\)](#) and via positive, proactive intervention of both an employee and an organization it is possible to redesign every complex work process ([Biron et al. 2012](#); [Gordon et al. 2018](#)). It is assumed that changing job demands and resources by means of proactive strategies such as job crafting reduces burnout and increases work-related engagement and health since people are more active in changing and creating their work process in line with their skills, abilities, and strengths ([Tims et al., 2012](#); [Gordon et al., 2018](#)). According to scholars, redesigning work, controlling job demands and resources, and enhancing the quality of independence will improve subjective health of an employee as well as subjective and objective performance ([Gordon et al., 2018](#)).

Engagement

Job crafting is a positive, functional behavior [Ghitulescu \(2007\)](#), directed at improving present tasks at work and can bring about numerous positive consequences such as engagement, resilience, and flourishing at work for both an employee and an organization ([Berg et al., 2008](#)). Job crafting has favorable impact on employee's sense of wellbeing through job satisfaction [Ghitulescu \(2007\)](#), leading to high-quality engagement ([Tims et al., 2012](#)). [Maslach & Leiter \(2008\)](#) presumed that work engagement is determined by certain factors such as job demands, control over performed work, reward, recognition, support from society, fairness, and matching one's principles with job requirements. Work engagement is defined as a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption" ([Schaufeli et al., 2003](#)).

Increasing the quality of work, satisfaction of clients, turnover rates, and absenteeism are all related to work engagement, which is the reason for the growing interest towards this concept ([Crawford et al., 2010](#)). Thus, the present study deemed it interesting to understand the relation between the two of the indicators of wellbeing of those employed at a rehabilitation center, that is, between work engagement and job crafting. Engagement is seen as active motivational state consisting of vigor (high energy, effort, and resilience in the face of difficulties), dedication (enthusiastic commitment to one's job), and absorption (concentration on work process) ([Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004](#); [Gordon et al., 2018](#)).

[Kahn \(1990\)](#) argued that experiencing meaning/value, safety, and availability determines employees' level of engagement, while this psychological condition, in turn, impacts engagement at work, work environment, and individual. According to [Harter \(2002\)](#), clear expectations at work, support from boss and colleagues, and opportunity for professional growth and development are key factors for engagement at work. Authors think that job attributes such as complexity, diversity, and autonomy coupled with personality traits influence an employee's engagement at work ([Macey & Schneider, 2008](#)).

Method

Participants and Procedures

The study was carried out among personnel (behavioral therapists, occupational therapists, speech therapists, physical therapists, supervisors) employed at a rehabilitation center. A total of 115 respondents participated in the study with only 16 men. 33 participants had managerial job positions (supervisors), while 82 were professionals (therapists). 82 of them held master's degrees, 41 – bachelor's degrees, and 15 were bachelor's students. The questionnaire was administered online, via Google Forms. Participation was voluntary, and instructions on how to fill it out, research goals, and information on study's confidential nature were provided in the beginning of the survey. The time required for filling out the questionnaire was 20-25 minutes on average. Prior to administering the questionnaire, participants read the informed consent. IP addresses have been deleted after completing the survey and no emails or names of participants were recorded. Data safety and privacy protection was ensured ([Raziq & Maulabakhsh, 2015](#); [Beebe et al., 2009](#)).

Instruments

Socio-demographic Information included questions on participants' gender, age, marriage status, level of education, and job position. *Job Crafting* was measured by Job Crafting Scale [Tims et al. \(2012\)](#), which consists of 21 items and measures the experience of creating work. Answers are given on 5-points Likert scale with 1 = *never*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *regularly*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *very often*. Items were provided in original sequence. The questionnaire was translated in Georgian language for the present study. Consistency and reliability of the translated scale was tested

through Cronbach's alpha with $\alpha = .81$. The authors of the measure (Tims et al., 2012) assumed that job crafting comprises three conceptually different aspects:

1. Increasing social job resources – reduces negative consequences and increases the level of engagement when the requirements are high for the work to be performed (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Hakanen & Roodt, 2010).
2. Increasing challenging job demands – a work, which is not stimulating, can cause boredom, absenteeism, and dissatisfaction with job (Kass et al., 2001). A work that is challenging and difficult to perform, requires more knowledge, gives an opportunity for mastery, leading to job satisfaction and self-effectiveness (LePine et al., 2005; Gorgievski et al., 2010; Tims et al., 2012). Work can be stressful when there are high job demands, although it is positively related to engagement (Crawford et al., 2010). Job crafting is an important and valuable means for personal growth and job satisfaction (Berg et al., 2008).
3. Decreasing hindering job demands – when there are challenges at work and individual is aware that they cannot meet the demands, they deliberately, proactively strive to reduce these demands. If such high demands are not compatible with resources available to an employee, then, on a personal level, it can have negative effect on an employee's health, leading to burnout. On an organizational level, this can result in negative consequences such as turnover of competent staff (Bakker et al., 2005; Schaufeli et al., 2009; Tims et al., 2012; Kulik et al., 1987).

Work Engagement was measured through the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli et al., 2003). The questionnaire includes 17 items assessing work-related engagement: 1) Vigor – vitality, readiness and ability to resist the difficulties at work; 2) dedication – a sense of value of one's performed work, enthusiasm, and inspiration; 3) absorption – complete engagement in the work process and a sense of happiness gained from the process. Answers are provided on 7-points Likert scale with 0 = *never*, 1 = *almost never* (a few times a year or less), 2 = *rarely* (once a month or less), 3 = *sometimes* (a few times a month), 4 = *often* (once a week), 5 = *very often* (a few times a week), and 6 = *always* (everyday). Items were provided in original sequence. The questionnaire was translated in Georgian language for the present study. Consistency and reliability of the translated scale was tested through Cronbach's alpha with $\alpha = .93$.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and between-Group Differences

Mean score for the job crafting scale was 75.9 ($SD = 10.5$). Using Independent samples T-test, comparisons were made between respondents for job crafting scores in the following variables: 1) Education – bachelor's degree and master's degree; 2) age – 18-30 and 31+ years; 3) job position – professionals (therapists) and managerial positions (supervisors). No significant differences were found between bachelors ($N = 59$, $M = 75.46$, $SD = 10.9$) and masters ($N = 41$, $M = 77.20$, $SD = 8.05$), $t(98) = .87$, $p > .05$. Likewise, no statistically significant differences were found between those aged 18-30 ($N = 73$, $M = 76.42$, $SD = 10.7$) and 31+ ($N = 42$, $M = 75.00$, $SD = 10.2$), $t(113) = .70$, $p > .05$. And no significant differences were found between therapists ($N = 82$, $M = 75.52$, $SD = 11.3$) and supervisors ($N = 33$, $M = 76.85$, $SD = 8.5$), $t(113) = .61$, $p > .05$.

Correlation

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to test the association between job crafting and work engagement (see Table 1).

Table 1
Correlation between Job Crafting and Engagement

Correlations		JCB	UWES
JCB	Pearson Correlation	1	.526**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	115	115
UWES	Pearson Correlation	.526**	1

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	115
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

As the Table 1 shows, statistically significant high positive correlation emerged between job crafting and engagement at work, $r(113) = .526, p < .001$.

Regression

Linear regression was used to further test the association between job crafting and engagement. Specifically, model included job crafting as a predictor variable with engagement as an outcome variable.

Table 2
Regression on Engagement: ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8714.994	1	8714.994	43.207	.000 ^b
	Residual	22792.693	113	201.705		
	Total	31507.687	114			

a. Dependent Variable: UWES
b. Predictors: (Constant) JCB

As the Table 2 shows, the model was statistically significant, $F(1, 113) = 43.207, p < .001$.

Table 3
Regression on Engagement: Beta Coefficients

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.160	9.689		1.049	.297
	JCB	.831	.126	.526	6.573	.000

a. Dependent Variable: UWES

As shown in Table 3, job crafting significantly predicted work engagement, $\beta = .53, t = 6.573, p < .001$.

Given the findings, regression equation can be produced: $UWES = JCB * 0.831$.

Table 4
Regression on Engagement: R-squared

Model Summary					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.526 ^a	.277	.270		14.202

a. Predictors: (Constant) JCB

As the Table 4 shows, job crafting can be accounted for 28% of variability of burnout scores ($R^2 = .28$), that is, 28% of variability in engagement scores can be explained by variability in job crafting scores.

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to explore job crafting and work-related engagement among personnel employed at a rehabilitation center in relation to variables such as education and job position. Although the small size of the sample of the study does not allow for any generalizations, certain prediction can still be made based upon the findings. Adjusting work process to one's own abilities and skills when contextual factors are permanently shifting Gordon et al. (2018) allows an individual to proactively deal with work-related challenges, leading to a better work-life balance (Tims et al., 2012). Therapists who are fully engaged in their work and perform it with high enthusiasm are motivated and proactive Salanova & Schaufeli (2008), and this is crucially important for the development of both children with autism spectrum disorder and rehabilitation centers (Mäkikangas, 2018; Lysaker et al., 2009).

Job crafting is not a single measure, but rather a process in which individual engages in from time to time (Berg et al., 2008). Results of the present study showed that scores for job crafting among therapists and supervisors were not statistically different from each other. These findings suggest that employees who participated in the study can engage in job crafting regardless their job positions and education level (Tims et al., 2012). Work-related engagement and job crafting are key factors in a competitive environment and positively affect the sustainability of an organization, high income, client's satisfaction, reduced turnover rates, employee's mental and physical health (Bakker et al., 2008). Correlational analysis showed that these two variables are strongly and positively related. Leaning upon regression analysis, it can be suggested that job crafting is a significant positive predictor of work-related engagement (Kim, 2012; Suttikun et al., 2018).

Successful management of job demands, resources, one's abilities, and organizational resources in general have an impact on an employee's work-related wellbeing Seligman et al. (2005), motivation, performance, increasing a person's engagement (Harter & Blacksmith, 2009). However, less is known about trainings or interventions that might allow a person to modify their work environment (Hornung et al., 2010). It would be beneficial for future research to plan job crafting interventions for personnel employed at rehabilitation centers – the strategies that would allow them to modify their work environment, and to study the effects of such interventions on work-related engagement and employees' health (Green Jr et al., 2017; Maricutoiu et al., 2017).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The present research has certain limitations. The instruments used in the study were translated in Georgian impromptu for the research without being validated and adapted to Georgian context. Another limitation is the small size of sample not allowing for generalizations to other organizations or larger population in general.

References

- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. (2017). Strategic and proactive approaches to work engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 67-75.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 10(2), 170.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & stress*, 22(3), 187-200.
- Beebe, A., Blaylock, A., & Sweetser, K. D. (2009). Job satisfaction in public relations internships. *Public Relations Review*, 35(2), 156-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.09.016>
- Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). What is job crafting and why does it matter. Retrieved from the website of Positive Organizational Scholarship on April, 15, 2011.
- 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.
- Biron, C., Karanika-Murray, M., & Cooper, C. (2012). *Improving organizational interventions for stress and well-being*. London, UK:: Routledge.
- Chen, C. Y., Yen, C. H., & Tsai, F. C. (2014). Job crafting and job engagement: The mediating role of person-job fit. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 21-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.10.006>
- 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.
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).

- Gordon, H. J., Demerouti, E., Le Blanc, P. M., Bakker, A. B., Bipp, T., & Verhagen, M. A. (2018). Individual job redesign: Job crafting interventions in healthcare. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 104*, 98-114.
- Gorgievski, M. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Work engagement and workaholism: Comparing the self-employed and salaried employees. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 5*(1), 83-96.
- Green Jr, P. I., Finkel, E. J., Fitzsimons, G. M., & Gino, F. (2017). The energizing nature of work engagement: Toward a new need-based theory of work motivation. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 37*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2017.10.007>
- Hakanen, J. J., & Roodt, G. (2010). Using the job demands-resources model to predict engagement: Analysing a conceptual model. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research, 2*(1), 85-101.
- Harter, J. K., & Blacksmith, N. (2009). Employee engagement and the psychology of joining, staying in, and leaving organizations.
- Harter, S. (2002). Authenticity.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Glaser, J., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(2-3), 187-215.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal, 33*(4), 692-724.
- 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.
- Kim, Y. (2012). Music therapists' job satisfaction, collective self-esteem, and burnout. *The Arts in Psychotherapy, 39*(1), 66-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aip.2011.10.002>
- Kulik, C. T., Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (1987). Work design as an approach to person-environment fit. *Journal of vocational behavior, 31*(3), 278-296.
- Lazazzara, A., Tims, M., & De Gennaro, D. (2020). The process of reinventing a job: A meta-synthesis of qualitative job crafting research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 116*, 103267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.01.001>
- 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*(5), 764-775.
- Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2019). A meta-analysis on promotion-and prevention-focused job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 28*(1), 30-50.
- Lysaker, P. H., Davis, L. W., Bryson, G. J., & Bell, M. D. (2009). Effects of cognitive behavioral therapy on work outcomes in vocational rehabilitation for participants with schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Schizophrenia research, 107*(2-3), 186-191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2008.10.018>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3-30.
- Mäkikangas, A. (2018). Job crafting profiles and work engagement: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 106*, 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.01.001>
- Maricuțoiu, L. P., Sulea, C., & Iancu, A. (2017). Work engagement or burnout: Which comes first? A meta-analysis of longitudinal evidence. *Burnout research, 5*, 35-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2017.05.001>
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of applied psychology, 93*(3), 498.
- Parker, S. K., & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating jobs: An expanded framework for linking work characteristics and motivation. In *Work Motivation* (pp. 260-311). Routledge.
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of working environment on job satisfaction. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 23*, 717-725. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00524-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00524-9)
- 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.
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *The international journal of human resource management, 19*(1), 116-131.
- 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: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25*(3), 293-315.

- Schaufeli, W. B., Baker, A. A., & Salanova, M. (2006). Educational and Psychological Measurement. *The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. A Cross-National Study*, 66(4).
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2003). Utrecht work engagement scale-9. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(7), 893-917.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Seligman, M. E., & Steen, T. A. park, N. & Peterson, C.(2005). Positive psychology progress. *Journal of American psychologist*, 5, 410-421.
- Suttikun, C., Chang, H. J., & Bicksler, H. (2018). A qualitative exploration of day spa therapists' work motivations and job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 34, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.10.013>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 80(1), 173-186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., Derks, D., & Van Rhenen, W. (2013). Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(4), 427-454.
- 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.