Analyzing Antecedents and Consequence of Job Crafting
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The purpose of this study was to investigate the antecedents and consequence of job crafting in the context of education sector and high-power distance societies, such as Indonesia where most people seem hesitant to seize on job crafting due to their appreciation to organizational hierarchies. Specifically, we examined perceived organization support, job demand, and job autonomy as the antecedents to job crafting. Further, we tested the effect of these associations on job engagement as the consequence. According to job demand resources theory, employees voluntarily modify their job aspects (job crafting) when they perceive organization support, experience high work demand, and satisfy with the degree of autonomy. Consequently, this leads to the enhancement of employee’s engagement level. To investigate these relationships, a survey was conducted among 287 early childhood and primary school teachers working in 16 schools in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. We used path analysis to test the hypothesized models. The results indicate that perceived organization support, job demand, and job autonomy are positively associated to job crafting. In addition, we found that when job crafting is present, it increases the level of employee engagement. This study highlights the importance of job crafting for early childhood and primary school teachers working in the high-power distance societies.
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The global transformation continues to change and revolutionize the way we work and live. It is also increasing pressure on organizations to attain sustained competitive advantage and also influences organizational practices to design jobs in more effectively. Consequently, there is an increase in popularity of self-managing teams, flexibility in work arrangements, job reengineering, changes in working environment conditions, changes in the form of work contracts, greater diversity, advances in the use of technology, and various innovations in organizations (Klindzic and Marić, 2019).

Furthermore, these changes include a shift in perspective regarding work design from top–down to bottom–up approach. Demerouti and Bakker (2014) stated that the current top–down approach in improving employee motivation, company performance, and designing work is irrelevant. Nowadays, companies emphasize on the active role of employees in modifying aspects of their job to increase employees’ satisfaction. This is supported by previous studies that increasingly focus on the policies...
and extra-role behaviors at workplace and how employees determined to be their own “job crafters”.

The bottom-up work redesign approach is known as job crafting. Job crafting is a proactive work behavior that is initiated by employees to change certain aspects of their work (Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001). The concept of job crafting emerged in the early 2000s as a perspective of employees regarding job redesign where employees become their own job crafters and have an adequate freedom to change their work as per requirements (Vanbelle, Van Den Broeck, and De Witte, 2017). Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) argued that job boundaries, meaningful work, and work identity are not fully formed by formal job requirement but require employees to redesign certain aspects of their jobs and revise how they see the jobs and work meaningfully. This perspective illuminates the main role of individual employees to improve work practices.

There are some intriguing research results about job crafting conducted in various industries and occupations. Leana et al. (2009) found that, among teachers in childcare centers, job crafting increases organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Teachers in childcare centers who collaborate to do job crafting create better classroom quality, thereby increasing teacher–children performance (Leana et al., 2009). Furthermore, a research conducted by Kim et al. (2018) targeting frontline employees of hotels in Korea found that employees who practice job crafting create better fit with the organization which lead to higher job fulfillment. In addition, Karatepe and Eslamlou (2017) found that job crafting foster flight attendants’ work engagement because flight attendance who are able to optimize their performance by adjusting their job demands and resources are more engaged in their job. Lyons (2008) found that salesperson in his study engaged and self-initiated skill development when they perceive opportunity to modify their job.

Several studies have indeed confirmed some potential antecedents of job crafting. Job crafting is influenced by organization support (Kim et al., 2018), employees personality (Gong et al., 2018; Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001), task interdependence (Leana et al., 2009), job control (Lyons, 2008), and job demand (Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001). Also, task complexity and challenging job were positively associated with job crafting which indicate that situational aspects of the job stimulate proactive behavior (Berg, Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2010). Debus, Gross and Kleinmann (2019) also found that employee abilities like qualification as an antecedent to job crafting.

We conducted our research in the education setting, particularly for teachers in early childhood centers and elementary schools. The context that we contend are particularly appropriate for the investigation of job crafting because ongoing improvisation is inherent in this job. Working as a teacher requires active behavior to improve certain aspects of work every day. Therefore, teachers are needed to be more active in designing, crafting, and modifying their work in order to produce a better classroom environment. Teachers are responsible for introducing life skills, social skills, and
knowledge to students according to the curriculum as an interesting activity. So, the curriculum in the classroom is dependent on how teachers design, craft, and modify their work to suit the needs of students and increase the meaningfulness of the work for teachers. Moreover, as mentioned before, research on job crafting in the education, especially for teachers in early childhood centers and elementary schools, is still in its infancy. We also highlight Indonesia as another interesting context in this study. Many studies indicate that Asian countries, including Indonesia, are considered as high-power distance societies (Riasnugrahani et al., 2019). It means that the society focuses on organizational hierarchies. As a result, they tend to be passive in modifying their works and less independent in problem solving (Hofstede, Hofstede and Minkov, 2010).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This research attempts to fill the knowledge gap about antecedents of job crafting in education and high-power distance societies settings where most people hesitate to engage in job crafting because of their concerns on organizational hierarchies. Investigation about antecedents and outcome of job crafting in education setting is relevant to policy and practice at school management.

Job Crafting

Job crafting is a mechanism reflecting employees’ proactive behaviors to redesign and change the boundaries of their job (Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001). The change includes physical and cognitive aspects of the job. Meanwhile, Tims and Bakker (2010) defined job crafting as adjustment initiated by employees to balance job demands and resources that fit with employees’ needs, abilities, and personal preferences. Therefore, job crafting is an active action, which is categorized as an employee’s extra role behavior at work.

In line with the job demand–resources (JD–R) model, job crafting is reflected in three dimensions, namely increasing job resources, increasing challenge job demands, decreasing hindrance job demand (Tims, Bakker, and Derks, 2012). JD–R model argues that job characteristics consist of two main factors i.e., job demands (physical, social or organizational aspects of the job), and job resources (aspects to achieve work goals) (Demerouti et al., 2001). On the basis of JD–R model, the interaction between job demands and job resources can enhance work engagement and increase performance.

1. Increasing Job Resources. When job demands are high, increasing job resources can buffer the negative effects of job demands and will lead to higher levels of work engagement (Bakker et al., 2007; Van Wingerden, van der Stoep, and Poell, 2018). Increasing job resources by seeking feedback, advice from colleagues or manager, or maximizing job autonomy will enhance employee intrinsic
motivation. While employees increase job resources, they are dealing with high job demands or achieving goals and completing tasks.

2. Increasing Challenging Job Demand. It is important to understand that employees’ satisfaction stems from an experience of a satisfactory degree of challenging job demand. A job that is under stimulating may cause boredom that in turn may prompt to absenteeism and job dissatisfaction. Increasing challenging at work will stimulate employees’ knowledge and expertise in completing their work or to deal with more difficult job demands (Podsakoff, LePine and LePine, 2007).

3. Decreasing Hindrance Job Demands. Employees may reduce job demands when they feel that the number of requests is very large (Tims et al., 2012). Reducing demand can include behaviors that minimize aspects of work emotionally, mentally and physically or reduce workload and time pressure at work.

Perceived Organizational Support
Perceived organizational support (POS) demonstrates the degree to which employees perceive and experience that the organization cares in relation to their well-being at work (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). The literature explains that there are numerous ways organizations demonstrate their commitment to employees, including: fairness (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), adequate opportunities for developing employees (Yew, 2011), supervisor support (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002).

Research on the impact of perceived organizational support has been carried out previously. Ahmed and Nawaz (2015) found that organizational support/perceived organizational support increases employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and deceases intention to leave.

Job Demand
The job crafting model developed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) explains that one of the motivations to modify certain aspects of the work is job demands. This happens because some types of jobs require employee to make changes and innovations regularly. Therefore, to remain competitive and respond to changes in the environment and work demands, employees must continue to adjust and address changes in aspects of their work.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) conducted research on job crafting in various types of jobs. For example, in salon workers (hairdresser), job crafting is needed because in order to create more pleasant jobs, hairdressers are required to make adjustments and relationships with consumers. They change the boundaries of relations in their work by establishing communication with consumers, asking consumers’ opinions, and even communicating on topics that are not related to the work.
Job Autonomy

Job autonomy is one of several job characteristics developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). Job autonomy indicates that the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling work and deciding the procedures and methods to be used in carrying it out. Lyons (2008) stated that the freedom in modification of certain aspects of work will lead to job crafting. For example, employee can proactively adjust the sum, scope, boundaries, or types of their daily tasks to become more closely aligned with their ability, preference and motivation.

Job Engagement

Schaufeli et al. (2002) defined job engagement as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. This concept was first introduced by the Gallup research group and statistically has shown a link with higher productivity, profitability, employee maintenance, security and customer satisfaction (Endres and Mancheno-Smoak, 2008).

Saks (2006) stated that employee engagement has three aspects: cognitive, emotional, and behavioral. The cognitive aspect comprises employees’ beliefs about the organization, leadership and working conditions. The emotional aspect involves employees’ positive or negative feelings about each factor in organization and their attitude towards the organization and leaders. Additionally, the behavioral aspect of employee engagement is a component of added value to the organization and consists of efforts to freedom of choice of bound employees brought to their work in the form of overtime, devoting strength and intellect to tasks and the company.

Job Crafting: Antecedents and Consequence

Perceived organizational support (POS) reflects the degree to which employees perceive that the organization cares about their well-being. POS enhances employees’ intrinsic motivation because they believe that organization will provide comfortable work environment and support to build positive relationship with peers and managers. This is consistent with Broaden-and-build theory which posits that positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires (Fredrickson, 2001). A positive treatment at workplace can create employees’ positive emotions that support employees to perform positive voluntary behaviors (e.g., job crafting) for organization (Caesens, Stinglhamber and Marmier, 2016). Thus, POS is considered as an antecedent to job crafting because POS encourages employees to be more creative, obtain more resources and change the meaning of their job (Kim et al., 2018).

Further, positive treatment from organization that gives a satisfactory degree of autonomy is also related to individual positive outcomes and job engagement (Ryan and Deci, 2017; Vanbelle et al.,
Job autonomy allows employees to take action and modify their job in a self-directed manner. Job autonomy provides opportunities for employees to choose what paths are accessible in how they enact their jobs. Hence, if employees find themselves qualified/overqualified and have higher autonomy, they may take appropriate steps to actively manage their job situation, such as change aspects of work in constructive ways (Debus et al., 2019; Vanbelle et al., 2017; Wu, Luksyte and Parker, 2015). Therefore, job autonomy creates positives emotions by performing extra role behavior and job crafting (Debus et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2018; Lyons, 2008; Wu et al., 2015).

As described earlier, job crafting reflects the changes that employees make (physical and cognitive) to balance their job demands and job resources with their personal preferences, needs and abilities. Job demands–resources theory (JD-R model) explained that job demands (aspects of the job that require physical and psychological efforts) are associated with long working hours, working overtime, amount of work, work pressure, work speed, and workload. In addition, job resources refer to the functional aspects of the job in achieving work goals, such as autonomy and performance feedback that can reduce job demand and enhance job motivation (Bakker et al., 2007; Petrou, Demerouti and Xanthopoulou, 2017; Van Wingerden et al., 2018). Align with job demands–resources model, a high level of job demand provides opportunities for employee to change the environment as a proactive coping mechanism through changing aspects of their job according to their needs which reduces negative outcomes (Singh and Singh, 2018). Therefore, job demand is precursor to job crafting because when job does not meet employees’ skills or needs or preference, they will change aspects of the job to optimize their job. For example, Petrou et al. (2012) showed that employees engage in job crafting by asking feedback and social support when needed, and by actively searching for job challenges.

In sum, we propose that employees who perceive organizational support, a satisfactory level of job autonomy, and a high level of job demand are likely to demonstrate job crafting. Based on discussed theory and literature review, the following hypotheses are proposed:

\[ H_{1a}: \] Job demand is significantly related to job crafting.

\[ H_{1b}: \] Job autonomy is significantly related to job crafting.

\[ H_{1c}: \] Perceived organizational support is significantly related to job crafting.

JD-R theory views that perceived organizational support, job demand, and job autonomy enhance job engagement. When employees work with better organizational supports, challenge job demands and job autonomy, it will fulfil their basic psychological needs, such as positive self-image and job engagement (Saks, 2006; Singh and Singh, 2018; Tims and Bakker, 2010). In a demanding work
environment, employees with personal resources and perceived support will voluntarily modify some
aspects of their job based on their ability and preference. Consequently, it will enhance their
engagement level. Employees who are able to craft their job in line with their needs, skills and
preferences will find their task interesting, meaningful and will engage more to their job (Bakker,
Rodriguez-Muñoz and Sanz Vergel, 2016; Karatepe and Eslamlou, 2017; Lu et al., 2014; Petrou et al.,
2012). For instance, Van Wingerden et al. (2018) found that teachers who work in a demanding work
environment, and they perceive a satisfactory level of autonomy and support from their supervisor are
associated with job engagement. They tend to ask for feedbacks and resources because they will feel
capable to handle the situations. Karatepe and Eslamlou (2017) reported that job crafting fosters flight
attendants’ work engagement because flight attendants who can optimize their work environment by
redesigning their job demands and resources are more engaged in their job. Accordingly, the following
hypotheses are proposed:

\[ \begin{align*}
H_{2a} & : \text{Job demand is significantly related to job engagement.} \\
H_{2b} & : \text{Job autonomy is significantly related to job engagement.} \\
H_{2c} & : \text{Perceived organizational support is significantly related to job engagement.} \\
H_{3a} & : \text{Job demand is related to job engagement with job crafting as an intervening variable.} \\
H_{3b} & : \text{Job autonomy is related to job engagement with job crafting as an intervening variable.} \\
H_{3c} & : \text{Perceived organizational support is related to job engagement with job crafting as an} \\
& \quad \text{intervening variable.}
\end{align*} \]

Source: Authors’ Presentation

**Figure 1. Conceptual Model**

**METHODOLOGY**

A survey questionnaire was designed to collect data from early childhood teachers and primary
teachers working in Bandung, Indonesia. The participants were contacted through the principles or
admission staff of each school. Teachers were selected as participants for this study due to their job characteristics, such as inherent ongoing improvisation, demanding job environments which require them to collaborate with students, parents, and schools. We surveyed 300 participants from 16 schools. These schools were selected to represent the main areas/districts in Bandung to ensure the scope of the study. After deleting incomplete data, the final sample contained 287 observations included in the analysis.

The majority of the participants were female (88.7%) and teaching at the elementary school level (29.8%), with the majority having age over 43 years (16.3%), and 23–28 years (12.9%). In general, respondents had bachelor’s degree (46.9%) with permanent employment status (37.2%). Furthermore, respondents in this study had also worked as teachers for more than 10 years (35.6%). In addition, 45.4 percent of respondents in this study taught for 10–25 hours a week with the number of students ranging from 15–25 people/ class (63.2%).

Measures
Job crafting was assessed with a 21 items scale developed by Tims et al. (2012) which constitutes the following dimensions: increasing structural job resources ($\alpha = 0.82$), increasing social job resources ($\alpha = 0.77$), increasing challenging job demands ($\alpha = 0.75$), and decreasing hindering demands ($\alpha = 0.79$). For present study, the reliability of 0.73 was estimated. All the items were rated on a 5-points Likert scale ranging from 1= seldom to 5 = always. Sample items are: I try to develop myself professionally; I manage my work so that I try to minimize contact with people whose problems affect me emotionally.

Job engagement is measured by an instrument developed by Saks (2006) consisting of 5 questions ($\alpha = 0.82$). For present study, the reliability of 0.74 was estimated. Sample of the questions are: My work preoccupies me, and I am truly in it; I am highly engaged in this job.

To measure job autonomy, we adopted instrument developed by Breaugh (1999) consisting of 9 questions. The sample items are: I am free to determine the method for doing my work; I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities. The reliability of this measure was relatively high, range from $\alpha = 0.85–0.93$ (Breaugh, 1999). For present study, the reliability of 0.84 was estimated.

Job demand consists of three dimensions, namely workload, mental demand at work, and emotional demand. These three dimensions were measured using a short version of instrument developed by van Veldhoven et al. (2005) (17 questions, $\alpha = 0.80$). For present study, the reliability of 0.73 was estimated. Sample questions are: I have to work very fast; I have too much to do.

Finally, in this study organizational support was measured using an instrument developed by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) consisting of 8 questions ($\alpha = 0.97$). For present study, the reliability
of 0.79 was estimated. Some of the question are: My organization cares about my opinion; the organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.

RESULTS

As reported above, the Cronbach alpha from the internal consistency reliability test yielded above the cut-off score as recommended by Hair et al. (2006). In addition, validity testing was carried out by using Pearson correlations. Validity means testing the degree of accuracy of research measuring devices about the actual content or meaning measured (Hair et al., 2006). This test will show the accuracy of a measuring instrument in carrying out its measurement function. All items in the questionnaire were valid because they correlate with the total construct score, except 2 items (Job Demand 11 and 13).

Means, standard deviation, reliabilities, and zero-order correlations are displayed in Table 1.

| Variables        | M   | Std. Dev. | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    |
|------------------|-----|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Agea             | 3.11 | 1.56      | -0.039 | .733** | .045 | .231** | .204** | .237** | .256** |
| Work Tenureb     | 2.05 | .83       | -0.004 | -0.008 | .223** | .182** | .278** | .206** |
| Genderc          | 1.89 | .31       | -0.020 | 0.004 | -0.081 | -0.007 | 0.073 |
| POSupport        | 3.72 | .51       | (.79) | .354** | .162** | .196** | .324** |
| EEEngage         | 3.86 | .42       | (.74) | .429** | .485** | .465** |
| JCraft           | 3.68 | .37       | (.73) | .413** | .210** |
| JAuto            | 3.93 | .46       | (.84) | .393** |
| JDemand          | 3.74 | .56       | (.73) |

Source: Authors’ Computation
Note: ** denotes level of significance at 1%. a1 = 23-28 y, 2 = >28-33 y, 3 = >33-38 y, 4 = >38-43 y, 5 = >=43 y; b1 = <5 years, 2 = > 5-10 years; 3= >10 years; c1 = male, 2 = female; n = 287.

Table 1. Correlation Matrix

Furthermore, we tested the hypotheses by conducting path analysis in AMOS 26. The main model is shown in Figure 2. There are three substructures in the model tested. H1a,b,c indicate that job demand, job autonomy, and perceived organizational support (POS) contribute to job crafting behavior. The result showed that job demand ($\beta = 0.286$, $p = 0.008$), and job autonomy ($\beta = 0.299$, $p = 0.009$) have a significant positive impact on job crafting (see Table 2). However, the perceived organizational support ($\beta = 0.015$, $p = 0.773$) is not statistically significant. The model’s goodness-of-fit is 0.172, which means that that 17.2 percent of job crafting is explained by job demand, and work autonomy. (H1a,b are supported). The results are consistent with Ahmed and Nawaz (2015), and Wrzesniewski and
We tested the effects of job demand, job autonomy, and POS on job engagement. Table 2 reports that job demand ($\beta = 0.252, p = 0.005$), job autonomy ($\beta = 0.284, p = 0.008$), and POS ($\beta = 0.208, p = 0.008$) are positively related to job engagement. The $R^2$-squared is 29.3 percent. Thus job demand, job autonomy, and POS have a direct effect on job engagement ($H_{2,a,b,c}$ are supported). The findings are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Saks, 2006; Singh and Singh, 2018).

Next, we examined the mediating effect of job crafting on the relationship between job demand, job autonomy, POS, and job engagement using bootstrapping method. Table 2 showed that the indirect effect of job demand ($\beta = 0.173, p = 0.005$, 90% CI= 0.079–0.268), job autonomy ($\beta = 0.297, p = 0.008$, 90% CI= 0.151–0.461), and POS ($\beta = 0.221, p = 0.008$, 90% CI= 0.0955–0.347) on job engagement are significant. Hence, Hypothesis $3_{a,b,c}$ are supported. The results are consistent with prior studies (Harju, Hakanen and Schaufeli, 2016; Wu et al., 2015).

**DISCUSSION**

The findings from the survey among 287 early childhood and primary school teachers manifest that ongoing improvisation is inherent to their work. Firstly, they are active in designing, crafting and modifying their work in order to produce a better classroom environment. They modify the way they interact with students, parents, seeking resources, reduce workload to balance their job demands and resources that fit with their preferences. They are job crafter for themselves. Secondly, research on job crafting in preschool and primary school teachers’ context has not been fully addressed in Indonesia.

Our findings also found that job crafting is positively associated with job engagement. Job crafting is restricted to those changes that employee may take in specific work tasks, relationship at work, and
Job Demand → Job Crafting

| Path                          | Direct Effect | Indirect Effect | Confidence Interval | p-Value | Conclusion   |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|--------------|
| Job Demand → Job Crafting     | 0.286         |                 |                     | 0.008   | H₁a is supported |
| Job Autonomy → Job Crafting   | 0.299         |                 |                     | 0.009   | H₁b is supported |
| Perceived Organisation Support → Job Crafting | 0.015 |                 |                     | 0.773   | H₁c isn't supported |
| Job Demand → Job Engagement   | 0.252         |                 |                     | 0.005   |               |
| Job Autonomy → Job Engagement | 0.284         |                 |                     | 0.008   |               |
| Perceived Organisation Support → Job Engagement | 0.208 |                 |                     | 0.008   | H₂a, b, c are supported |
| Job Demand → Job Crafting → Employee Engagement | 0.173 | 0.079 | 0.268 | 0.005 |               |
| Job Autonomy → Job Crafting → Employee Engagement | 0.297 | 0.151 | 0.461 | 0.008 |               |
| Perc. Organisation Support → Job Crafting → Employee Engagement | 0.221 | 0.095 | 0.347 | 0.008 | H₃a, b, c are supported |

Source: Authors’ Computation using AMOS 23
Note: Unstandardized coefficients reported.

Table 2. Path Analysis and Mediation Analysis Results

cognitions about work. Employees change aspects of a job (balancing job demands and job resources) to align them with their own needs. They find their task interesting, meaningful and engage more at their work (Bakker et al., 2016; Karatepe and Eslamlou, 2017; Lu et al., 2014; Petrou et al., 2012). For example, a research conducted by Karatepe and Eslamlou (2017) found that job crafting fosters flight attendants’ work engagement because flight attendants who are able to optimize their work environment by redesigning their job demands and resources are more engaged with their job. By being proactive, early childhood and primary school teachers find challenges as a work motivation and engage in effective problem solving and work processes.

Moreover, this study shows that job demand, job autonomy, and perceived organizational support have significant positive impact on job engagement. Job engagement can be predicted using JD–R model. Job engagement occurs when employees have control over their job (job autonomy), perceived organizational support and have a challenging level of job demands (Debus et al., 2019; Van Wingerden et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2015). In a demanding work environment, employees with sufficient personal resources and perceived support from organization will change some aspects of their job with confidence in their ability, and control things required to improve performance. Teachers’ positive experiences at workplace generate an feeling of attachment to their job and enhance their job engagement (Bakker, Demerouti and Sanz–Vergel, 2014; Harju, Hakanen and Schaufeli, 2016).
Consistent with our prediction, job crafting plays a significant role as a mediating variable between perceived organizational support, job demand, job autonomy, and job engagement. Job crafting in early childhood and primary school is important because when the teachers redraw the boundaries of their jobs, modify certain aspects of the job to fit to their own conceptions of the work and the best way to carry out work, they will find their task interesting, meaningful which will enhance their creativity to deliver the curriculum in effective way (Bakker et al., 2007; Leana et al., 2009; Petrou et al., 2017; Van Wingerden et al., 2018).

CONCLUSION

Job crafting has been a critical research topic in education setting because it is closely associated with quality of care and education. Besides that, research on job crafting in the education sector, especially for teachers in early childhood centers and elementary schools in Indonesia, is still in its infancy and unique. The context of Indonesia allows us to examine the antecedents and the consequence of job crafting in high-power orientation setting. This research showed that high quality care and education have positive effects on children’s cognitive development and school success. Therefore, a bottom–up approach in designing a job is more relevant. Teachers who actively change the design of their jobs by choosing tasks, negotiating a different job content, and assigning meaning to their task fulfil their basic need, intrinsic motivation. It is worth noting to mention that perceived organizational support, job demand, and job autonomy serve as the main antecedents for teachers to revise their jobs and to fit their individual work orientations and motivation. Teachers who are motivated intrinsically not only enjoy the work but also engage themselves in more expansive job crafting.

IMPLICATIONS

Since the finding suggests that job autonomy has stronger effect on job crafting, we suggest organizations to facilitate a better level of autonomy for teachers. Job autonomy provides opportunities for employees to choose what paths are accessible in how they enact their jobs. (Debus et al., 2019; Vanbelle et al., 2017). As a result, it will enable teachers to have a greater sense of responsibility and encourage them to invest more in job crafting. Another suggestion for institutions is to create programs that demonstrate care and support for teachers. This will enhance the engagement of the teachers in the future because they experience organizations’ support. Our study also contributes to the literature in several ways. First, this study examined the antecedents and consequence of job crafting in a sample of high-power distance orientation setting. It fills the gap in literature and provides an empirical evidence in a setting where people concern on the hierarchies and tend to avoid job
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crafting. Second, we also examined the association between job crafting and job engagement in early education setting (early childhood centers and elementary schools) that have specific job characteristics, such as high job demand, and inherent job improvisation.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Like every research study, this study also has some limitations. The study sample is relatively small as compared to the population. However, in view of our focus to understand the role of job crafting in early childhood setting, the sample is deemed suitable. Second, because our data had a nested structure, multilevel analysis was more appropriate analysis method. Though we tested the direct effects of study independent variables and mediating role of job crafting, we did not test nesting effects into our model. Given the limitations stated earlier, further research is needed to explore the motivation for job crafting based on large sample size because in the future, employees will have greater opportunities to shape their work experiences.
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