Indian Journal of Economics and Business
Vol. 21 No. 1 (January, 2022)

http://www.ashwinanokha.com/IJEB.php

Impact of Big Five Personality Factors on Job Crafting

Mahreen Zareef
Lecturer Psychology, GGPGC, Mardan, Email: mahreen_zareef@uop.edu.pk

Roomana Zeb
Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar, Email: roomazeb@uop.edu.pk

Saima Arzeen
Lecturer, Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar, Email: saimaarzeenmehar@uop.edu.pk

Received: 13th October 2021
Revised: 05th December 2021
Accepted: 19th February 2022
Published: 24th February 2022

Abstract: The primary objective of the present study was to assess the influence of the Big Five Personality Factors on Job Crafting, encompassing both its types and forms. We gathered data from a sample comprising 377 teaching professionals employed across diverse educational institutions, including schools, colleges, and universities in Peshawar, representing both the private and public sectors. To collect data, we utilized the Big Five Inventory (John et al., 1991) and the Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2019), both of which are self-report measures. The outcomes of our multiple regression analysis revealed that several personality traits wield significant influence over various facets of job crafting, including its diverse types and forms. Consequently, this study contributes to the existing body of knowledge concerning job crafting by examining the predictive role of the Big Five personality traits. Organizations can use this understanding to formulate effective strategies and interventions to incorporate job crafting aimed at enhancing the well-being of their employees and the organization as a whole.

Keywords: Big five personality factors, Job crafting, Workplace wellbeing, Gender difference

Introduction

In the present era of significant transformation, a notable shift in perspective regarding working conditions has emerged. Historically, organizations tended to prioritize outcomes, often giving minimal attention to their employees, thereby neglecting their needs. However, this perspective has undergone a substantial transformation. Nowadays, employees hold a more prominent position within organizations, resulting in a profound alteration in their approach to work.

In the past, a top-down approach predominantly characterized the work environment, where higher authorities dictated goals and tasks for their employees, as documented by Berg et al. (2013). However, the paradigm has now shifted towards a bottom-up approach, wherein employees take initiative to instigate changes in job design, a phenomenon referred to as "Job crafting," as introduced by Wrzesniewski et al. (2013). While there is a considerable body of research on job crafting in organizational settings, relatively few studies have delved into the realm of job crafting within educational institutions. Consequently, this research is conducted in an educational setting, a context

highly relevant to the study of job crafting behavior. In the field of education, teaching professionals encounter myriad opportunities to fulfill their responsibilities in diverse ways. They must engage with various students within a single class, manage the classroom environment alongside curriculum delivery, and, on occasion, participate in organizing and overseeing co-curricular activities. Consequently, they often find it necessary to adapt their approach to effectively meet their duties and fulfill their job requirements. Furthermore, apart from the core curriculum, teachers impart problem-solving skills, life skills, and social skills, providing ample opportunities for job redesign to cater to both students' needs and their own job satisfaction.

Several decades ago, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) introduced the concept of "Job Crafting," wherein individuals, within the constraints of their job design, proactively modify their work duties. This concept encompasses alterations in work-related tasks (task crafting), interpersonal relationships within the workplace (relationship crafting), perspectives on one's job (cognitive crafting), and the development of skills necessary for job performance (skill crafting). This flexibility in shaping one's work environment aligns with the evolving needs of modern organizational management, which increasingly emphasizes adaptable job designs. Such designs enhance the alignment between individuals and their work context, ultimately contributing to the fulfillment of psychological demands and the promotion of personal well-being (Strauss & Parker, 2014).Bindl et al. (2019) expanded upon the concept of job crafting and included two forms of job crafting that is either focusing on promotion or prevention. They identified eight distinct dimensions within their comprehensive approach. These dimensions encompass various facets of job crafting and provide a valuable framework for understanding the dynamic interplay between employees and their work environments. Different dimensions of Job crafting (Bindl et al., 2019) include four types (cognitive crafting, Relationship crafting, Skill crafting, & Task crafting), accompanied by two form i.e., promotion and prevention, thus giving rise to eight different dimensions.

Numerous scholars have devoted their attention to exploring the drivers behind employees' inclination to tailor their job roles. Given that job crafting is a self-initiated behavior, individual characteristics assume a pivotal role in comprehending it. Recent research, such as that conducted by Bakker et al. (2012) and Teng & Chen (2019), has indicated that proactive individuals actively engage in job crafting.

Feist and Feist (2009) define personality as a set of relatively stable and individual-specific traits that influence one's behavior. The prevailing model for understanding personality is the five-factor model, as proposed by Goldberg (1981). The subsequent discussion elaborates on these five dimensions: *Extraversion* characterizes individuals who exhibit high sociability; *Agreeableness* pertains to those with a proclivity for helping others, *Conscientiousness* describes individuals who are task-oriented ,*Neuroticism* signifies a lower level of emotional stability, encompassing traits such as aggressiveness, fragility, tension, touchiness, instability, nervousness, worry, moodiness, and so on and *Openness to new experiences* denotes a receptivity to novel experiences and a curiosity about them.

Bell and Njoli (2016) delved into the influence of the big five personality traits on job crafting and revealed that, except for extraversion, neuroticism, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness significantly predict job crafting behavior. Another study by Sameer and Priyadarshi (2020) explored the impact of these personality traits on promotion and prevention job crafting. They found that extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience exhibit significantly positive associations with promotion job crafting, while neuroticism and extraversion are positively correlated with prevention job crafting.

Previous research has primarily focused on proactive personality and its correlation with job crafting. For instance, Kammeyer-Mueller and Wanberg (2003) identified that individuals with proactive personalities are more adaptable to their work environments due to increased socialization with colleagues and improved mastery of their tasks. Grant and Ashford's (2008) proactively model emphasizes the essential role of the five personality factors in demonstrating proactive behavior. Similarly, the study observed a positive association between overall job crafting and proactive personality, as well as all the personality dimensions except neuroticism. Job crafting also exhibited positive correlations with both promotion and prevention regulatory focus, suggesting that proactive employees may strive to modify aspects of their jobs that yield suboptimal results (Rudolph et al., 2017).

Furthermore, a study conducted by Bell and Njoli (2016), utilizing multiple regression analysis, determined that except extraversion the other four personality dimensions significantly predict job crafting behavior. Empirical studies of Slemp et al. (2015) confirm the positive effect of job crafting on employee well-being. Their research indicates that job crafting behaviors strongly correlate with improved well-being, extending beyond the mere absence of negative emotions. They suggest that engaging in job crafting leads to heightened positive affect, stronger social connections, and increased trust in the workplace.

Rationale of study

Despite the extensive research conducted on job crafting, our current comprehension remains limited because only a limited number of studies have delved into the influence of the big five personality traits on various types and forms of job crafting behaviors. As a result, this study integrates employee personality as a predictor of overall job crafting and its diverse typologies. Our research contributes to the existing body of knowledge on job crafting by shedding light on the intricate interplay between individual personalities and job crafting practices. Although prior research has acknowledged the significance of personality traits in shaping job crafting behavior, it has predominantly focused on proactive personality as a predictor of job crafting (Bakker et al., 2012; Plomp et al., 2016). However, a comprehensive exploration of the connections between personality traits and the various dimensions of job crafting remains limited. Therefore, it is imperative to investigate how distinct personality traits influence the various facets and configurations of job crafting. The primary objective of this study is to address this research gap by examining the big five personality traits as predictors of diverse job crafting variables.

Objectives

The primary aims of this study encompass:

1. To examine how personality factors predict job crafting behavior.

Hypotheses

1. The five personality factors will have an impact on the type of job crafting behavior employed by employees.
2. The five personality factors will have an impact on the form of job crafting behavior employed by employees.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The present study determined the sample size employing the Raosoft sample size calculator (Raosoft, 2004). Data collection involved a purposive sampling method, resulting in a total of 377 teachers. This sample comprised 49.3% males (n=186) and 50.7% females (n=191), falling within the age range of 25

to 60 years (M=37.30, SD=9.93). These teachers were drawn from various educational institutions in Peshawar, encompassing both the Public sector (n=186, 49.3%) and the Private sector (n=191, 50.7%). The distribution of teachers across educational levels included School (n=148, 39.3%), college (n=128, 34.0%), and university (n=101, 26.8%) levels. Furthermore, the sample exhibited diversity in educational qualifications, comprising individuals with Matriculation (n=2, 0.5%), Intermediate (n=4, 1.1%), Bachelors (n=31, 8.2%), Masters (n=182, 48.3%), M.Phil./M.S (n=93, 24.7%), PhD (n=55, 14.7%), and Postdoctoral (n=10, 2.7%) degrees. Regarding job status, 57.8% (n=218) were classified as permanent employees, while 42.2% (n=159) were engaged on a contractual basis. On average, employees possessed 2.29 years of work experience.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: To be eligible for inclusion in the research sample, participants were required to have a minimum of six months of professional experience. The study did not encompass self-employed individuals or interns.

Instruments:

Demographic Information: Demographic data of the participants, including gender, age, employment status (public or private sector), education level, and prior teaching experience, were collected.

Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2019): In 2019, Bindl et al. developed the Job Crafting Questionnaire, a tool designed to assess employees' engagement in various job crafting strategies. The scale exhibits internal consistency ranging from 0.70 to 0.95 and comprises 28 items that measure four types of job crafting—Relationship, Skill, Task, and Cognitive—as well as the Promotion vs. Prevention forms of job crafting. Response options vary from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a great deal). Lower scores indicate lower levels of engagement in job crafting behavior, and vice versa. The questionnaire investigates eight different dimensions of job crafting, including Prevention-oriented cognitive crafting (reliability range: 0.64 - 0.75, three items), Promotion-oriented cognitive crafting (reliability range: 0.83 - 0.88, four items), Prevention-oriented relationship crafting (reliability range: 0.71 - 0.81, three items), Promotion-oriented relationship crafting (reliability range: 0.86 - 0.92, four items), Prevention-oriented skill crafting (reliability range: 0.80 - 0.84, three items), Promotion-oriented skill crafting (reliability range: 0.89 - 0.93, four items), Prevention-oriented task crafting (reliability range: 0.79 - 0.89, three items), and Promotion-oriented task crafting (reliability range: 0.87 - 0.90, four items). The JCQ's validity has been established through correlations between different job crafting strategies and innovative work performance across a wide range of occupations and industries in the U.S. and U.K. (Bindl et al., 2019).

The Big Five Inventory (BFI): The Big Five Inventory (BFI; John et al., 1991), based on Likert format with five options comprises 44 statements assessing five distinct personality traits: extraversion (8 items, α= 0.88), agreeableness (9 items, α= 0.79), conscientiousness (9 items, α= 0.82), neuroticism (9 items, α= 0.84), and openness to experiences (10 items, α= 0.81). Zamorano et al. (2014) noted excellent reliability (α = 0.72) for the overall scale within Mexican culture, and in a Hispanic college-age sample, BFI scales exhibited convergent validity with the NEO Five Factor Inventory (α = 0.82).

Procedure

Data collection was conducted utilizing a demographic sheet, Job Crafting questionnaire, and Big Five Inventory. To obtain authorization for data collection from teaching employees, the research team contacted the administrations of schools, colleges, and universities. Upon receiving approval, educational staff was briefed about the study's objectives and assured of confidentiality. Participation in the study was entirely voluntary, and individuals could withdraw at any point. Participants were provided with information about each scale, including the demographic information sheet, the Job

Crafting Questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, and the PERMA-Profiler. Following data collection, participants were thanked for their participation.

Additionally, some data was collected using a Google form. Official email addresses of teaching staff were obtained through the respective educational institutions' official websites, and the questionnaires, along with a brief research summary, were shared with them. It took approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete the questionnaires. Subsequently, the collected data were analyzed using SPSS version 22 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

RESULTS

Table 1

Descriptive statistics for BFI, and JCQ

Variables	M	*SD*	Range	A
BFI	151.12	13.57		.73
Extraversion	26.61	4.85	12-40	.60
Agreeableness	35.13	5.14	18-45	.65
Conscientiousness	34.01	5.91	16-45	.73
Neuroticism	22.65	5.55	8-40	.68
Openness to experience	35.34	4.43	18-46	.81
JCQ	99.30	13.23		.81
Pro-JC	58.76	9.43	27-80	.81
Pre-JC	40.54	6.05	23-65	.57
Pro-RC	14.03	3.67	4-40	.75
Pre-RC	8.58	2.67	3-15	.60
Pro-SC	16.29	3.25	4-20	.78
Pre-SC	11.58	2.49	3-15	.65
Pro-TC	13.17	3.49	4-20	.76
Pre-TC	9.79	2.32	3-15	.60
Pro-CC	15.27	3.52	4-20	.75
Pre-CC	10.60	2.62	3-28	.36

*Note:*BFI= Big five inventory, JCQ= Job Crafting Questionnaire, RC=Relationship crafting, SC=Skill crafting, TC=Task crafting, CC=Cognitive crafting, Pro=promotion, Pre=Prevention

Table 2

Multiple Linear Regression predicting impact of personality factors on Relationship crafting(N= 375)

Variable	*B*	*B*	*SE*	*T*	*P*	95% CI
Constant	20.11		2.73	7.36	0.00	[14.74,25.48]
Extraversion	.20	.22	.05	4.08	0.00	[.10,.29]
Agreeableness	-.16	-.19	.05	-3.25	0.00	[-.26,-.06]
Conscientiousness	-.04	-.05	.05	-.76	.45	[-.13,.06]
Neuroticism	-.02	-.03	.04	-.53	.59	[-.11,.06]
Openness to exp.	.13	.14	.06	2.34	.20	[.02-.24]
R^2	.31					
ΔR^2	.08					

Note: Openness to exp. = Openness to experience

According to Table 2 the regression model explained 31% of the variation in the relationship type of job crafting. According to the study, extraversion (β =.22), is a substantial positive predictor (t=4.08, p=0.00) of relationship type whereas agreeableness (β =-.19), is a significant negative predictor (t=-3.25, p=0.00).

Table 3

Multiple Linear Regression showing the impact of personality factors on Skill crafting (N = 375)

Variable	*B*	*β*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95%CI
Constant	5.50		2.84	1.93	.06	[-.11,11.07]
Extraversion	.15	.15	.05	3.08	.00	[.06,.26]
Agreeableness	.13	.13	.05	2.48	.01	[.03,.23]
Conscientiousness	.22	.26	.05	4.50	.00	[.12,.32]
Neuroticism	.01	.01	.05	.27	.79	[-.08,.10]
Openness to exp.	.17	.15	.05	2.02	.00	[.06,.29]
R^2	.51					
ΔR^2	.25					

According to Table 3 the regression model explained 51% of the variation in the Skill crafting, with Extraversion (β =.15),Conscientiousness (β =.26), and Openness to Experiences (β =.15) as significant predictors (p=0.00).

Table 4

The impact of big five personality factors on Task crafting through Multiple Regression (N = 375)

Variable	*B*	*β*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Constant	13.19		2.93	4.50	0.00	[7.43,18.95]
Extraversion	-.01	-.01	.05	-.09	.93	[-.11,.10]
Agreeableness	-.01	-.01	.05	-.17	.86	[-.11,.10]
Conscientiousness	-.04	-.05	.05	-.77	.44	[-.14,.06]
Neuroticism	.05	.06	.05	1.03	.30	[-.04,.14]
Openness to exp.	.30	.29	.06	4.91	.00	[.18,.41]
R^2	.26					
ΔR^2	.06					

The results shown in Table 4 shows the regression model explained 26% of the variation in the Task type crafting with only Openness to experiences (β =.29) as a significant predictor (t=4.91, p=0.00).

Table 5

Impact of personality factors on Cognitive crafting computed through Multiple Regression (N = 375)

Variables	*B*	*B*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Constant	5.81		3.07	1.89	.06	[-.23,11.86]
Extraversion	.07	.07	.05	1.24	.22	[-.04,.17]
Agreeableness	.15	.15	.06	2.61	.01	[.04,.25]
Conscientiousness	.12	.14	.05	2.23	.03	[.01,.22]
Neuroticism	.09	.10	.05	1.86	.06	[-.01,.19]
Openness to exp.	.20	.18	.06	3.17	.00	[.08,.33]
R^2	.37					
ΔR^2	.13					

According to Table 5 the regression model explained 37% of the variation in the Cognitive crafting. The results of the study demonstrate that the cognitive type of job crafting is significantly predicted by agreeableness (β =.15), conscientiousness (β =.14), and openness to experiences (β =.18).

Table 6

Effect of personality factors on Promotion crafting through Multiple Regression(N = 375)

Variable	*B*	*β*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95%CI
Constant	15.90		5.55	2.87	.00	[4.99,26.80]
Extraversion	.42	.22	.10	4.30	.00	[.23,.61]
Agreeableness	.17	.09	.10	1.66	.10	[-.03,.36]
Conscientiousness	.15	.09	.09	1.52	.13	[-.04,.33]
Neuroticism	.04	.03	.03	.51	.61	[-.13,.22]
Openness to exp.	.56	.26	.03	4.93	.00	[.34,.79]
R^2	.48					
ΔR^2	.22					

According to Table 6, the regression model explained 48% of the variation in the Promotion form of job crafting. Extraversion (β =.22) and Openness to Experiences (β =.26) are the significant predictors (p=0.00) .

Table 7

Impact of personality factors on Prevention job crafting computed through Multiple Linear Regression (N = 375)

Variables	*B*	*β*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95%CI
Constant	28.69		3.94	7.29	.00	[20.95,36.43]
Extraversion	-.01	-.01	.07	-.10	.92	[-.14,.13]
Agreeableness	-.06	-.05	.07	-.90	.37	[-.20,.08]
Conscientiousness	.12	.12	.07	1.75	.08	[-.02,.25]
Neuroticism	.08	.08	.06	1.33	.18	[-.04,.20]
Openness to exp.	.24	.17	.08	2.92	.00	[.08,.40]
R^2	.22					
ΔR^2	.03					

According to Table 7 the regression model explained 22% of the variation in the Prevention form of job crafting with only Openness to Experiences (β =.17) as a significant predictors(p=0.00).

DISCUSSION

The objective of the current study is to provide the scientific evidence for the connection between the Big Five personality traits and Job Crafting, encompassing both its types and forms, in order to better understand their potential role in dealing with on-the-job tasks. Previous research has yielded mixed results, highlighting the need for further examination across diverse contexts and settings to

comprehensively grasp the relationships between these variables. Within our cultural context, no prior study has explored the link between the Big Five personality traits and both types and forms of Job Crafting, representing a relatively novel theoretical perspective in the field of Job Crafting. Consequently, this study aims to fill this research gap.

In Hypotheses 1 and 2, it was posited that the five personality traits, as well as all their dimensions, would predict the utilization of different types and forms of job crafting behavior, respectively. The resulting data is presented in Tables 2-5, delineating the impact of these personality traits on job crafting *types*, while Tables 6 and 7 elucidate their influence on job crafting *forms*. The study discerned the distinct contributions of each personality trait to each type and form of Job Crafting.

Tables 2 and 3 demonstrate that Extraversion significantly predicts Relationship Crafting and Skill Crafting, respectively. This suggests that individuals characterized by traits such as being active, talkative, energetic, and outgoing are more inclined to initiate changes in their relationships with coworkers and enhance their skill set. These findings are in line with previous research by Wilmont et al. (2019), which demonstrated that Extraversion correlates with taking initiative for organizational change and altering job characteristics, as observed in Job Crafting. Senderayi et al. (2019) also argued that extraverted individuals exert control over their job tasks and effectively manage job demands. Furthermore, Table 6 reveals that extraversion was a significant predictor of Promotion-oriented job crafting, Sameer and Priyadarshi (2020) as well as Wilmont et al. (2019) provided similar kind of findings in their studies. This suggests that extraverted individuals have a larger interaction circle work that developsproductive relationships. Social, assertive, and talkative individuals typically perform better in their jobs (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Consequently, they are motivated to acquire new skills, attend capacity-building workshops, and enhance their competencies to perform their job effectively. However, there are some inconsistencies in the results regarding the impact of extraversion on job crafting. While Sameer and Priyadarshi (2020) reported a positive association of extraversion and both forms of crafting, this study found a significant relationship with only Promotion Job Crafting. It can be inferred that individuals use social interactions as a means to achieve work-related goals and promote work engagement, positive emotions, and positive workplace relationships.

Tables 3 and 5 indicate that Agreeableness significantly and positively predicts Skill Crafting and Cognitive Crafting, while serving as a negative predictor of Relationship Crafting, as shown in Table 2. This suggests that individuals characterized by traits related to trust, compliance, sympathy, and kindness are less inclined to engage in building and maintaining positive workplace relationships. Instead, they seek opportunities to enhance their skills and capabilities for more efficient job performance. This differs from Barrick and Mount's (1991) argument that Agreeableness is not significantly related to job performance, indicating that traits such as trust and straightforwardness have minimal effects on performance. Nevertheless, limited prior research exists exploring the relationship between these variables, warranting further in-depth investigations.

Tables 3 and 5 demonstrate that Conscientiousness significantly predicts Skill Crafting and Cognitive Crafting, suggesting that individuals characterized by traits like punctuality, dutifulness, and thoroughness are more likely to focus on altering their cognitive perspectives of their job and enhancing their skill set to positively impact job design. Tidwell and Sias (2005) noted that Conscientious individuals are motivated toward success, exhibiting information-seeking behavior. Barrick and Mount (1991) also found a link between Conscientiousness and accomplishing work-related tasks, suggesting that individuals displaying traits of persistence and responsibility generally perform well in their jobs. However, in this study, conscientiousness was not significantly related to Task Crafting and Relationship Crafting, as shown in Tables 4 and 2, respectively. A similar study by Senderayi et al. (2019) proposed that conscientious individuals prioritize their work over extra activities that may

disrupt their planned routines. They tend to be more organized in their tasks and may not engage in additional tasks or socializing with coworkers in the workplace.

Based on the results presented in Tables 3-7, Neuroticism does not emerge as a significant predictor of any Job Crafting type or form. This implies that emotionally unstable individuals exhibit behavioral fluctuations, rendering them less likely to proactively change their job design in any manner. This aligns with the findings of Rudolph et al. (2017) and Bell and Njoli (2016), who reported no significant relationship between neuroticism and job crafting. This could be attributed to the emotional instability experienced by neurotic individuals, leading to decreased engagement in information-seeking behavior (Tidwell &Sias, 2005). Additionally, individuals with neurotic tendencies typically encounter fewer learning opportunities in their careers and fewer chances to participate in decision-making and express creativity (Sutin& Costa, 2010). In contrast, Barrick and Mount (1991) argued that neurotic traits surface in the workplace due to the pressure to perform tasks and display good performance, suggesting that neurotics can excel in their jobs. Given the limited number of studies examining the relationship between these variables, further research is warranted to gain a more profound understanding of the concept.

Tables 3-7 demonstrate that Openness to Experience significantly predicts Skill Crafting, Task Crafting, Cognitive Crafting, Promotion Job Crafting, and Prevention Job Crafting. This implies that individuals characterized by traits such as curiosity, broad interests, creativity, and imagination are more likely to engage in all forms and types of Job Crafting, except for Relationship Crafting, as indicated in Table 2. Proactively, they manipulate various facets of their job, including the necessary skills, cognitive perspectives, job duties, and tasks. They make changes by either expanding certain dimensions of the job or focusing solely on required tasks to align their job with their values and interests. These findings are consistent with Barrick and Mount's (1991) results, which revealed that Openness to Experience is associated with a positive attitude toward learning, willingness to participate in work-related tasks and discussions, and overall positive job performance. Thus, the present study's results resonate with the notion that Openness to Experience positively influences Promotion Job Crafting, as depicted in Table 6. In contrast, Tidwell and Sias (2005) argued that individuals with Openness to Experience traits are less likely to engage in information-seeking behavior. This aligns with the current study's findings that Openness to Experience positively affects Prevention Job Crafting, as shown in Table 7.

Conclusion

In essence, the primary objective of this study was to explore the relationships among the Big Five personality traits, job crafting, and workplace wellbeing. The findings align with existing research, demonstrating that employees can influence job design through the process of job crafting, with the extent of engagement in job crafting varying significantly based on personality traits. This underscores the importance of examining individual differences in job crafting behavior.

Furthermore, the study revealed the crucial role of job crafting in enhancing employees' wellbeing at work. In educational settings, both students and staff place a high value on socialization and maintaining strong relationships. Therefore, the wellbeing of teaching personnel should be a top priority. These findings can inform the development of more effective strategies for promoting various forms of job crafting behaviors, ultimately enhancing employees' wellbeing. By assessing staff wellbeing across various domains, it is possible to improve the welfare of students, staff, and society as a whole.

Significance of the study

This study provides valuable insights into the interplay between personality traits, job crafting, and workplace wellbeing within a collectivist culture, particularly among academic teaching staff. Employers can use this research to identify the diverse types and forms of job crafting behaviors that employees engage in and understand how personality traits influence their approaches to work.

Limitations and Suggestions

The study focused exclusively on teaching staff from educational institutions in Peshawar, both public and private (colleges, universities, and schools). Future research could replicate this study with different samples, such as the banking industry or the healthcare sector, across a broader geographical area. This approach would allow for exploration and investigation of potential connections and make the findings more applicable to the broader workforce.

Given that the study relied on self-report surveys, there is a possibility of social desirability response bias. Using objective measures like job performance, absenteeism, and medical history could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationships among these factors.

The sample primarily consisted of highly educated individuals. Future research could examine the job crafting behavior of individuals with lower levels of education to gain a more comprehensive perspective.

To establish causal relationships more definitively, future research could employ longitudinal or experimental research designs. These designs would enable researchers to draw more robust cause-and-effect conclusions.

References

Bakker, A, B., Tims, M., &Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job Performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human relations*, *65*(10), 1359 –1378. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712453471

Barrick, M, R., & Mount, M, K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology, 44*.

Bell, C., &Njoli, N. (2016). The role of big five factors on predicting job crafting propensities amongst administrative employees in a South African tertiary institution. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, *14*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm. v14i1.702

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., &Wrzesniewski, A. (2013). Job crafting and meaningful work. In B. J. Dik, Z. S. Byrne, & M. F. Steger, *Purpose and meaning in the workplace* (pp. 81–104). American Psychological Association. https://dx.doi.org/10 .1037/14183-005

Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (in press). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. American Psychological Association

Bindl, U, K., Unsworth, K, L., Gibson, C, B., & Stride, C, B. (2019). Job Crafting Revisited: Implications of an Extended Framework for Active Changes at Work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *104*(5), 605-628.

Feist, J., & Feist, G, J. (2009). *Theories of personality* (7th Ed.). McGraw Hill.

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative" description of personality": the big-five factor structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *59*(6), 1216.

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. Research in Organizational Behavior, 28, 3-34. http://doi.org.10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002

Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. The Academy of Management Annals, 3(1), 317-375. http://doi.org.10.1080/19416520903047327

Huppert, F. A., and So, T. T. C. (2011). Flourishing Across Europe: Application of a New Conceptual Framework for Defining Well-Being. *Soc Indic Res, 110*, 837–861. http://doi.org.10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., &Kentle, R. L. (1991). *Big Five Inventory (BFI)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. https://doi.org/10.1037/t07550-000

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., &Wanberg, C. R. (2003). Unwrapping the organizational entry process: Disentangling multiple antecedents and their pathways to adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 779-794

Oprea, B., Iliescu, D., Burtăverde, Burtăverde., Dumitrache, M. (2019). Personality and boredom at work: the mediating role of job crafting. *Personality and boredom at work.*https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2018-0212

Plomp, J., Tims, M., Akkermans, J., Khapova, S, N., Jansen, P, G, W., & Bakker, A, B. (2016). Career competencies and job crafting; How proactive employees influence their well-being. *Career Development International*, *21*(6), 587 – 602.https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2016-0145

Raosoft, I. (2004). *Sample size calculator.* https://www.raosoft .com/samplesize.html

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.*

Senderayi, P., Tshababa, M., Mutanana, N., Nyathi, C. (2019). Big Five Personality Traits and Job Burnout: Testing a Collectivistic Teachers‟ College Lecturer Sample. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 3*(10)

Slemp, G, R., Kern, M, L., & Vella-brodrick, D, A. (2015). Workplace Well-Being: The Role of Job Crafting and Autonomy Support. *Psych Well-Being*, 5(7). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0034-y

Strauss, K., & Parker, S, K. (2014). Effective and sustained proactivity in the workplace: a self-determination theory perspective. *Researchgate.* http:// doi.org.10.13140/2.1.2809.1845

Sutin, A, R., and Costa, Jr, P, T. (2010). Reciprocal Influences of Personality and Job Characteristics across Middle Adulthood. *Journal of Personality* 78:1, http://doi.org.10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00615.x

Teng, H-Y.,& Chen, C-Y. (2019). Proactive personality and job crafting in the tourism industry: Does job resourcefulness matter? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 41,* 110-116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.10.010

Tidwell, M &Sias, P. (2005). Personality and information seeking Understanding How Traits Influence Information-Seeking Behaviors. *Journal of Business Communication,* 42(1), 51-77. http:// doi.org.10.1177/0021943604272028

Wrzesniewski, A., Berg, J, M., Grant, A, M., Kurkoski, J., &Welle, B. (2012). Job crafting in motion: achieving sustainable gains in happiness and performance. *Working paper.*

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *The Academy of Management Review*, *26*(2), 179–201. https://doi.org/10.2307/259118.s

Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. *Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology, 1,* 281-302. http:// doi.org.10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001015