PSYCHOMETRIC VALIDATION OF THE SLOVAK VERSION OF THE JOB CRAFTING SCALE

Emília LAZAROVÁ, Viera ONDRÁŠKOVÁ, Jakub HOLÚBEK, Zoltán RÓZSA

Abstract

In occupational psychology, there is growing interest in the active shaping of work by employees, with job crafting representing a key mechanism for supporting work engagement, well-being, and adaptability in a changing work environment. Despite growing research interest, however, there remains insufficient verification of job crafting measurement tools in the Slovak cultural context. The research gap lies in the absence of empirical evidence on the factor structure and validity of the Slovak translation of the job crafting scale, which limits the reliable measurement of this construct. The study is based on the job demands-resources (JD-R) model, which conceptualizes job crafting as a process of actively adjusting job demands and resources through approach and avoidance strategies with different consequences for work outcomes and employee health.The psychometric properties of the Slovak version of the scale were verified using confirmatory factor analysis on a sample of 500 respondents from various industries who evaluated 21 items of the tool. The translation and adaptation of the scale were carried out using standardized procedures, including back-translation and content validation.The results confirmed the original four-factor structure of the scale and supported a two-factor model distinguishing between approach and avoidance job crafting, with the model showing good fit, high reliability, and convergent validity. The study provides a robust validation framework for measuring job crafting in the Slovak context, extends the empirical support for the JD-R model in the Central European environment, and creates a solid foundation for internationally comparable research and evidence-based interventions in the field of work engagement and well-being.

Key words:
Job crafting, Psychometric validation, JD-R model, Factor structure, Work psychology

JEL Classification M54, J2, J23 https://doi.org/10.52665/ser20250206

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, research in occupational psychology has shifted its focus from a static understanding of work to the dynamic processes through which employees actively shape their work environment (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Wiesman; Nissinen et al., 2024). One of the key concepts in this regard is job crafting, which refers to a set of self-initiated changes through which individuals modify their work tasks, relationships, and demands to better match their abilities, needs, and values (Lanke et al., 2024). This approach reflects a shift from the traditional way of managing work, which focused on optimizing tasks and work systems without emphasizing individual influences (Dhanpat, 2025). Supporting proactive employee behavior in the workplace is considered a key factor in increasing their engagement, satisfaction, and performance, which also has a significant impact on the overall sustainability of the work environment (Irfan et al., 2023).

At the same time, however, there is ongoing debate about the extent to which the approach-avoidance dichotomy is sufficient to capture the measurement structure of job crafting (Lopper et al., 2024). Several studies point out that individual forms of approach job crafting, increasing structural job resources, increasing social job resources, and increasing demanding job requirements may represent qualitatively different strategies that are related but do not necessarily form a single latent construct (Holman et al., 2024). Accurate verification of the factor structure is therefore crucial not only from a theoretical but also from a methodological point of view (Chan et al., 2025).

Valid and culturally adapted measurement tools are a prerequisite for the

further development of job crafting research (Lanke et al., 2024). Despite growing interest in this construct, however, there has been a lack of systematic verification of the factor structure of the frequently used job crafting scale in the Slovak context (Tims et al., 2012). The adaptation and validation of the translation thus represent an important step towards expanding empirical research in this cultural environment (Mukherjee & Dhar, 2023).

The aim of this study is therefore to verify the factor structure of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale using confirmatory factor analysis. Specifically, two competing models were compared: a simplified 2-factor model distinguishing between approach and avoidance job crafting and a more detailed 4-factor model corresponding to the original theoretical arrangement of individual dimensions. The study aimed to assess which of these models provides a more appropriate description of the data and better captures the latent structure of job crafting in the Slovak context.

The structure of the article is divided into the following sections: the introduction presents the theoretical basis of the job crafting construct and its significance in the context of occupational psychology. This is followed by a presentation of the research methodology, including the adaptation and validation of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale, which involves the translation process, verification of the factor structure through confirmatory factor analysis, and evaluation of the psychometric properties of the tool. This section is followed by the results, which present comparisons of different models of factor structure, factor loadings, reliability, and validity, along with a discussion of their suitability. The conclusion summarizes the main findings of the research and recommendations for future studies, including suggestions for verifying the measurement invariance and longitudinal stability of the scale. The entire article thus provides a comprehensive view of the psychometric validation of the job crafting measurement tool in the Slovak environment.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of job crafting emerged as a direct response to the limitations of traditional job design, which was based on a "one size fits all" approach and focused primarily on efficiency through task simplification. Classic job design viewed the employee as a reactive element of the system, while job crafting emphasizes individual differences and the need for self-actualization (Lanke et al., 2024). Its theoretical basis is based on the assumption that employee motivation to actively shape their work stems from three basic psychological needs: the need for personal control over work, the need to maintain a positive self-image, and the need for social connection with others (Dhanpat, 2025; Chan et al., 2025). In the context of today's digital environment, where job roles are constantly changing in collaboration with algorithms and artificial intelligence, job crafting is becoming even more important (Chan et al., 2025).

The concept of job crafting represents a fundamental shift in the field of work design, as it transfers the initiative from the organization directly to the individual (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Chan et al., 2025). The work environment is characterized by rapid technological changes, digitization of work processes, and increasing complexity of work tasks, suggesting that traditional top-down models of work design are no longer sufficient (Nissinen et al., 2024). These approaches were based on the assumption that job roles and tasks are stable, universally defined by management, and that employees act primarily as passive performers of assigned activities (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Mousa & Chaouali, 2023). In response to these limitations, the concept of job crafting began to take shape in organizational psychology, representing a significant shift from static job design to a dynamic, employee-initiated approach (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Chan et al., 2025). Job crafting changes the paradigm of the employee from a passive performer of predefined tasks to an active co-creator and "architect" of their own work, who continuously adapts their job content to better match their abilities, preferences, and psychological needs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Güner et al., 2023; Dhanpat, 2025).

The basic theoretical framework for job crafting was laid down by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), who defined this construct as the physical and cognitive changes that individuals actively make within the boundaries of their job

tasks or relationships (Costantini, 2024; Chan et al., 2025; Nissinen et al., 2024). In this conception, employees are understood not as "pieces of clay" shaped by the organization, but as active job crafters who adapt their job content to better match their abilities, values, and needs (Dhanpat, 2025; Mousa & Chaouali, 2023). Job crafting is therefore a bottom-up process initiated by the employee themselves and often takes place without direct instruction or control from management (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Zhang et al., 2025).

The original concept of job crafting distinguishes three basic areas (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) in which employees implement these active changes (Geldenhuys et al., 2021; Lopper et al., 2024).

1. The first is **task crafting**, which involves changes in the number, scope, or nature of work activities. For example, an employee may expand their job description to include tasks that better utilize their strengths or change the way tasks are performed through new technological tools to increase efficiency (Zhang et al., 2021; Chan et al., 2025).

2. The second area is **relational crafting**, which refers to adjustments in the quality and quantity of social interactions in the workplace. Employees can choose with whom they will collaborate, build support networks, or modify relationships with colleagues, supervisors, or clients (Geldenhuys et al., 2021; Harju et al., 2024). Through these changes, employees create a social environment that better supports their well-being and performance at work (Guo & Hou, 2022; Mousa & Chaouali, 2023; Zhang et al., 2025).

3. The third area is **cognitive crafting**, which represents a change in how employees interpret the meaning and purpose of their work. Work is no longer perceived as just a set of duties but takes on a broader meaning and mission, leading to a greater sense of purpose and intrinsic motivation (Geldenhuys et al., 2021; Yang et al., 2022; Lopper et al., 2024).

Development of the concept and connection to the JD-R model

Although the original understanding of job crafting provided an important qualitative framework for understanding the active role of employees, the gradual development of the concept led to its integration into broader theoretical models of work motivation and well-being. The most significant step in this direction was the linking of job crafting to the JD-R (Job Demands-Resources) model (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Dhanpat, 2025; Irfan et al., 2023). This model is based on the assumption that every work environment can be described using two basic categories: job demands and job resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2014, 2017; Irfan et al., 2023; Lopper et al., 2025). Job demands are the physical, psychological, or social aspects of work that require sustained effort and are associated with certain costs, such as fatigue or stress (e.g., time pressure or emotionally demanding clients). In contrast, job resources are factors that help achieve work goals, reduce the negative impact of demands, and promote learning, growth, and motivation (e.g., autonomy, feedback, social support) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Costantini, 2024; Irfan et al., 2023; Nissinen et al., 2024)

From the perspective of the JD-R model, employees are not just passive recipients of these characteristics of the work environment, but active actors who seek to regulate the balance between demands and resources (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Dhanpat, 2025; Lopper et al., 2024). In this context, Tims and Bakker (2010) redefined job crafting as a set of changes that employees make to better align their job demands and resources with their own abilities and needs (Holman et al., 2024; Tims et al., 2012). Job crafting thus ceased to be understood merely as a change in the "boundaries" of work and began to be perceived as an active mechanism for regulating the energy and motivational characteristics of a job (Irfan et al., 2023; Zhang & Parker, 2019). Within the JD-R model, job crafting plays a dual role: it supports the motivational process leading to higher work engagement and at the same time helps prevent the health-damaging process associated with excessive demands and the risk of burnout (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Nissinen et al., 2024).

The methodological operationalization of the concept within the JD-R model was provided by Tims et al. (2012), who developed a job crafting scale. The original assumption of a three-factor structure was verified on the basis of

factor analysis and modified to a four-dimensional model. These dimensions allow for the quantitative measurement of the frequency of crafting among employees in various professions (Tims et al., 2012; Irfan et al., 2023).

The four dimensions according to Tims et al. (2012) are:

1. **Increasing structural job resources**, which includes activities aimed at developing skills, learning new things, and increasing autonomy. An example is an employee's effort to learn new technologies or change the process of performing a task to make it more meaningful (Zhang et al., 2021).
2. **Increasing social job resources**: this refers to proactively seeking feedback, coaching from superiors, or support from colleagues. Employees actively ask about their performance or seek inspiration from more experienced colleagues (Tims et al., 2012; Nissinen et al., 2024).
3. **Increasing challenging job demands**: This refers to behavior in which employees take on new tasks, assume more responsibility, or voluntarily participate in projects. These challenges are perceived as positive stressors that stimulate personal development and a sense of achievement (Wang et al., 2024).
4. **Decreasing hindering job demands**: This involves efforts to minimize aspects of work that are perceived as hindering performance or mentally exhausting. It involves avoiding emotionally demanding interactions or simplifying unnecessarily complex processes (Tims et al., 2012; Lopper et al., 2024).

This shift has enabled more accurate quantitative measurement of job crafting and a deeper understanding of its implications for engagement, performance, and well-being (Holman et al., 2024). Research shows that strategies aimed at increasing resources and challenges are generally associated with higher engagement, while excessive reduction of demands can have negative consequences for performance if it turns into passive avoidance of work (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Laguía et al., 2024; Lopper et al., 2025).

APPROACH AND AVOIDANCE CRAFTING

Based on empirical findings on the different consequences of individual dimensions of job crafting, current literature distinguishes between two basic behavioral orientations, namely approach and avoidance job crafting (Bruning & Campion, 2022; Lopper et al., 2024; Zhang & Parker, 2019). This conceptual framework provides an even deeper division of these dimensions based on employee orientation, namely approach and avoidance job crafting (Costantini, 2024; Zhang et al., 2025; Zhang & Parker, 2019).

Approach job crafting involves active efforts focused on growth, development, goal achievement, and enhancing the positive aspects of work, as well as seeking out more challenging tasks and challenges (Costantini, 2024; Lopper et al., 2024). In the context of the job demands-resources (JD-R) model, it involves increasing structural resources (e.g., competence development, autonomy) and social resources (e.g., feedback, support) (Tims et al., 2012; Nissinen et al., 2024; Kooij et al., 2022). Approach crafting-oriented employees actively seek out new projects, initiate change, and perceive job demands as learning opportunities rather than threats (Wang et al., 2024). This type of crafting is consistently associated with positive outcomes such as higher work engagement, greater job satisfaction, and higher performance (Holman et al., 2024; Laguía et al., 2024).

Conversely, avoidance job crafting focuses on protecting against stress and escaping negative states by eliminating or reducing undesirable job characteristics (Zhang & Parker, 2019). This strategy corresponds primarily with the dimension of reducing hindering demands and reflects the preventive orientation of the employee (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Laguía et al., 2024). It is motivated by the desire to "avoid something bad" and manifests itself primarily by reducing obstructive work demands, for example by limiting emotionally demanding interactions, avoiding conflict situations, or simplifying cognitively demanding tasks (Bruning & Campion, 2022; Lopper et al., 2025). This type of crafting corresponds to a preventive, often reactive motivational orientation aimed at conserving existing energy resources (Bruning & Campion, 2018; Lu et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2024). However, avoidance crafting is viewed ambivalently in the literature, as its excessive or exclusive use can lead to

passivity, social withdrawal, and a long-term decline in motivation or performance (Hu et al., 2020; Petrou & Xanthopoulou, 2021; Zhang et al., 2025).

The key difference between approach and avoidance job crafting lies in their functional impact on employee well-being and performance. While approach orientation mobilizes energy and generates new resources that support growth and engagement, avoidance orientation focuses on minimizing losses without creating new developmental impulses (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Lopper et al., 2024). Meta-analytic findings show that approach job crafting is consistently associated with positive work outcomes, while avoidance job crafting shows rather weak, insignificant, or negative relationships with these indicators (Demerouti et al., 2021; Kooij et al., 2022; Holman et al., 2024). At the same time, some studies point to the existence of different job crafter profiles that reflect combinations of these strategies. For example, Nissinen et al. (2024) identify passive, average, and active crafters, with active crafters showing the highest levels of engagement and learning in the workplace. At the same time, however, newer person-centered approaches suggest that these two orientations are not mutually exclusive. The most adaptive employee profiles combine a high level of approach crafting with selective and appropriate use of avoidance strategies, which serve as a protective mechanism during periods of increased stress (Demerouti et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2025).

From a methodological point of view, this framework is operationalized through the Approach–Avoidance Job Crafting Scale, which confirms the existence of two independent higher-order factors and emphasizes that job crafting is not a uniform construct but a hierarchically organized system of dimensions (Lopper et al., 2024) . For organizations, this implies that job crafting is not a universally beneficial phenomenon. Supporting approach-oriented forms of crafting can stimulate innovation, engagement, and sustainable performance, while excessive dominance of avoidance strategies may signal low identification with work or early stages of burnout (Demerouti et al., 2021; Dhanpat, 2025; Wang et al., 2024). Research shows that while approach crafting leads to resource expansion, avoidance crafting can be dysfunctional in the long term because it reduces proactivity and can lead to alienation from work (Laguía et al., 2024; Petrou & Xanthopoulou, 2021). Nevertheless, it appears that avoidance crafting may be a necessary survival strategy in extremely demanding conditions, where it serves as a last line of defense against burnout (Harju et al., 2024; Holman et al., 2024).

In the context of constant technological change, digitalization, and the implementation of artificial intelligence, job crafting is increasingly understood as a key adaptive skill that enables employees to maintain their mental well-being and stable employment (Chan et al., 2025; Kooij et al., 2022). Employees with high levels of job crafting agility are able to quickly and effectively adapt their demands and resources in response to unexpected disruptions, such as the COVID-19 pandemic (Dhanpat, 2025). This agility allows them not only to cope with stress, but also to actively seek new opportunities for learning and professional growth. The link between job crafting and the JD-R model also shows that managerial support and autonomy at work are key prerequisites that enable employees to effectively shape their work (Irfan et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2025). When employees feel psychologically empowered, they are more likely to leverage their strengths and interests through crafting, leading to their sustainable employability and overall well-being (Kooij et al., 2022). Job crafting is therefore not just an individual effort, but the result of an interaction between personal characteristics and the design of the work environment (Laguía et al., 2024).

2. GOAL AND METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted as a quantitative questionnaire study. The research sample consisted of 500 working respondents with no missing values in the analyzed variables (Table 1). Most respondents worked in non-managerial positions, with the sample being relatively evenly represented across company size categories. Respondents with secondary education with a high school diploma and university education dominated, with the generational structure of the sample reflecting the predominance of younger and middle-aged cohorts in the current labor market.

Table 1: Sociodemographic and occupational characteristics of the sample (N = 500)

Job position	Frequency	Percent
I work in a management position (I lead a team of people)	155	31.0
I work in a non-managerial position	345	69.0
Type of company	Frequency	Percent
Microenterprise (1 – 9 employees)	69	13.8
Small enterprise (10 – 49 employees)	135	27.0
Medium-sized enterprise (50 – 249 employees)	152	30.4
Large enterprise (250 or more employees)	144	28.8
Education	Frequency	Percent
Secondary education without high school diploma	24	4.8
Secondary education with diploma	166	33.2
Bachelor's degree	74	14.8
Master's degree or combined bachelor's and master's degree	224	44.8
Doctorate	12	2.4
Generation	Frequency	Percent
1945 or earlier	5	1.0
1946 - 1964	16	3.2
1965 - 1980	95	19.0
1981 - 1996	285	57.0
1997 or later	99	19.8

Source: author's processing

Measuring tool. Job crafting was measured using the Slovak version of the job crafting scale based on the original tool by Tims et al. (2012). The scale consists of 21 items, which are divided into four dimensions within the original four-factor model: Increasing structural job resources (IStJR; 5 items), Increasing social job resources (ISoJR; 5 items), Increasing challenging job demands (ICHJD; 5 items), and Decreasing hindering job demands (DHJD; 6 items) (Tims et al., 2012).

Within the two-factor model (Lopper et al., 2024), the items of the IStJR, ISoJR, and ICHJD dimensions are grouped into the approach job crafting factor (15 items), while the items of the DHJD dimension form the avoidance job crafting factor factor (6 items).

Respondents rated individual statements on a 5-point Likert scale.

Translation of the scale. The translation of the job crafting scale into Slovak was carried out in accordance with standard recommendations for the adaptation of psychological measurement tools. The original English version was first independently translated by two bilingual experts with knowledge of occupational and organizational psychology. A consensus Slovak version was created based on a comparison of both translations.

Subsequently, a back-translation into English was carried out by an independent person who was not familiar with the original version of the scale. The back-translation was compared with the original wording of the items,

and no significant differences in meaning were identified. The final version of the scale was revised in terms of language and content to ensure comprehensibility and conceptual equivalence of the items in the Slovak context.

Psychometric validation procedure. The validation of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale was carried out in accordance with standard recommendations for the psychometric evaluation of measurement tools. The factor structure of the scale was verified using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the maximum likelihood (ML) method, which is suitable for testing hypothetical measurement models within structural modeling (Hair et al., 2019). The two-factor model of approach and avoidance job crafting was tested in several specifications as part of the validation process; further analyses present the final version of the model used for comparison with the original four-factor solution.

The quality of the model fit was assessed based on several fit indices, specifically the χ^2/df ratio, CFI and TLI indices, and the RMSEA approximation measure. When interpreting these indicators, the recommended threshold values for acceptable and good model fit were taken into account, as well as their joint interpretative significance, rather than the isolated fulfillment of individual criteria (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

The reliability of latent constructs was assessed using composite reliability (CR), which provides a more accurate estimate of internal consistency compared to traditional item-based coefficients (Hair et al., 2019). Convergent validity was assessed using average extracted variability (AVE), with AVE values interpreted in the context of the simultaneously achieved level of composite reliability (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

The discriminant validity of the constructs was verified using the Fornell–Larcker criterion, according to which the square root of the AVE of each construct should be higher than its correlations with other latent variables (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). This procedure allows for the assessment of the degree of empirical distinctiveness of the individual dimensions of the measured construct.

3. FINDINGS

Data normality. Before performing confirmatory factor analysis, data normality was assessed. Univariate distributions of several items showed mild to moderate skewness and kurtosis. The multivariate normality test indicated a violation of normality (Mardia's coefficient = 196.75). However, given the size of the sample, the maximum likelihood (ML) method was considered appropriate for parameter estimation.

Comparison of models. To verify the factor structure of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale, two competing models were tested: (a) a 2-factor model distinguishing between approach and avoidance job crafting, and (b) a 4-factor model corresponding to the original theoretical structure.

As shown in Table 2, the 2-factor model showed an unacceptable level of fit with the data (CFI = .77, TLI = .75, RMSEA = .106). In contrast, the 4-factor model achieved acceptable to good fit indices (CFI = .91, TLI = .89, RMSEA = .069). The differences in fit indices indicate that the 4-factor model represents not only a statistically but also a practically significantly better solution than the simplified 2-factor model and was therefore chosen as the final measurement model.

Table 2: Comparison of model fit

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
2-factor	1240.51	188	6.60	.77	.75	.106
4-factor	618.34	183	3.38	.91	.89	.069

Source: author's processing

Factor loadings. All items had statistically significant standardized factor loadings ($p < .001$) in both models. However, compared to the 2-factor model, the 4-factor model showed consistently higher and more balanced factor loadings across the dimensions of approach job crafting (see Table 3). This pattern suggests a more accurate distinction between different types of job crafting behavior within a more detailed factor structure.

Table 3: Standardized factor loadings in the 2-factor and 4-factor models

Dimension	**2-factor model (λ)**	**4-factor model (λ)**
Increasing Structural Job Resources (IStJR)	.43 – .74	.51 – .79
Increasing Social Job Resources (ISoJR)	.46 – .76	.58 – .77
Increasing Challenging Job Demands (ICHJD)	.55 – .78	.73 – .77
Decreasing Hindering Job Demands (DHJD)	.61 – .81	.61 – .76

Source: author's processing

Note: The ranges of standardized factor loadings are reported. All loadings were statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Reliability and convergent validity. The reliability of the constructs was assessed using composite reliability (CR) and convergent validity using average extracted variability (AVE) (Table 4). In both models, CR values reached the recommended minimum of .70, indicating good internal consistency of the constructs.

In the 2-factor model, approach job crafting showed high composite reliability (CR = .90), but its AVE value was just below the recommended threshold of .50. In the 4-factor model, the AVE values were in most cases at or close to this limit, which, in combination with sufficiently high CR values, supports the convergent validity of the individual dimensions.

Table 4: Reliability and convergent validity (CR and AVE)

	Factor	**CR**	**AVE**
2- factor	Approach job crafting (APJC)	.90	.49
	Avoidance job crafting (AVJC)	.85	.49
4- factor	Increasing Structural Job Resources (IStJR)	.81	.46
	Increasing Social Job Resources (ISoJR)	.83	.50
	Increasing Challenging Job Demands (ICHJD)	.85	.54
	Decreasing Hindering Job Demands (DHJD)	.85	.49

Source: author's processing

Note: CR = composite reliability; AVE = average extracted variability.

Discriminant validity. Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell–Larcker criterion. In the 2-factor model, discriminant validity was confirmed, as the square roots of the AVE of both constructs exceeded their mutual correlation (Table 5), indicating that approach (APJC) and avoidance (AVJC) job crafting are empirically distinguishable constructs.

Table 5: Discriminant validity – Fornell–Larcker criterion (2-factor model)

Factor	APJC	AVJC
APJC	**.70**	.41
AVJC	.41	**.70**

Source: author's processing

Note: The diagonal contains the square roots of AVE (√AVE). APJC = approach job crafting, AVJC = avoidance job crafting.

In the 4-factor model, most constructs met the Fornell–Larcker criterion, as the AVE square roots were higher than their correlations with other factors (Table 6). The exception was the stronger correlation between increasing social work resources and increasing demanding work requirements. However, this correlation did not exceed the critical value of .85 and is consistent with their common orientation towards active, development-oriented forms of job crafting.

Table 6: Discriminant validity – Fornell–Larcker criterion (4-factor model)

Factor	IStJR	ISoJR	ICHJD	DHJD
IStJR	**.68**	.48	.58	.21
ISoJR	.48	**.71**	.81	.39
ICHJD	.58	.81	**.73**	.38
DHJD	.21	.39	.38	**.70**

Source: author's processing

The results of confirmatory factor analysis support the 4-factor structure of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale. Although the simplified 2-factor model achieved high internal consistency and basic discriminant validity, the 4-factor model provides a more accurate and psychometrically appropriate capture of the latent structure of job crafting. These findings support the understanding of approach job crafting as a heterogeneous construct consisting of several qualitatively distinct strategies.

4. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to verify the factor structure of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale using confirmatory factor analysis (Chan et al., 2025). The results supported the original four-factor structure of the construct and also pointed to the limitations of its simplified division into approach and avoidance job crafting (Lopper et al., 2024).

The findings suggest that approach job crafting is not a homogeneous construct but consists of several qualitatively different strategies aimed at actively changing work (Holman et al., 2024). Although increasing structural job resources, increasing social job resources, and increasing challenging job demands show moderate to strong mutual correlations, their separate modeling allows for a more accurate capture of the latent structure of job crafting. This result is consistent with the theoretical understanding of job crafting as a set of different ways in which employees actively shape their work environment (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, Wiesman).

Although the 2-factor model distinguishing between approach and avoidance job crafting achieved high internal consistency and met the basic criteria for discriminant validity, its overall model fit was significantly weaker compared to the 4-factor model. This suggests that the approach–avoidance dichotomy may have heuristic or descriptive value, but may not be sufficient to accurately capture the measurement structure of the construct. In the context of adapting the measurement tool, it therefore seems more appropriate to retain a more detailed factor structure (Zhang & Parker, 2019; Lopper et al., 2024; Nissinen et al., 2024).

From a methodological point of view, the results point to the importance of systematically comparing alternative measurement models when validating translations of psychological scales (Chan et al., 2025). Although some dimensions of approach job crafting showed AVE values just below the recommended threshold, their high composite reliability values support the convergent validity of the constructs. At the same time, stronger correlations between some dimensions do not necessarily pose a problem of discriminant validity as long as they remain below critical thresholds and are theoretically interpretable.

The study contributes to job crafting research primarily by providing a psychometrically validated Slovak version of a frequently used measurement tool, thereby expanding the possibilities for empirical research on job crafting in the Central European cultural context. The results also support the understanding of job crafting as a multidimensional construct and point to the limits of its simplified classification in measurement models.

From a practical point of view, the validated four-factor structure allows for flexible use of the scale depending on the objectives of research or practice. The limitations of the study include the use of self-assessment data and a cross-sectional research design, which does not allow for assessing the stability of the factor structure over time. Future research should focus on verifying the measurement invariance of the scale across different groups of respondents and on longitudinally verifying the stability of the identified structure.

CONCLUSION

This study successfully confirmed the factor structure of the Slovak version of the job crafting scale, comparing two models: a simpler two-factor model and a more detailed four-factor model. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis showed that both models are appropriately structured, but the more complex four-factor model better reflects the theoretical dimensions of work and provides a more detailed view of the forms of job crafting in the Slovak context. The objectives of the study, focused on verifying the factor structure and validity of the instrument, were thus fulfilled, and the study contributes to the development of empirical instruments for measuring job crafting in the Slovak population.

The contribution of the study is not only the confirmation of the validity of the adapted measurement tool, but also a better understanding of the structural aspects of job crafting in the cultural environment of Slovakia, which is important for further research and practical implementation in the work environment. The limitations of the study include the possible incompleteness of the representation of various occupational sectors and the limited longitudinal perspective, so it is advisable to extend the research to include analyses of measurement invariance across different groups of respondents and time periods.

For future research, it is recommended to examine how the structural and approach-avoidance structure of job crafting changes in

long-term studies, or what factors influence its development, including the influence of the organizational environment and individual characteristics of employees. From a practical perspective, it is necessary to raise awareness of the possibilities of promoting forms of job crafting among employees and managers so that they can effectively implement changes in the workplace in line with individual needs and thus improve well-being at work and the organization as a whole.

At the same time, it is important to emphasize that the availability of relevant and valid tools for measuring job crafting has the potential to promote a better understanding of these dynamics in practice, which can lead to better adaptation of personnel strategy and development of the work environment. This study thus serves as a springboard for further research and practical applications in the field of occupational psychology and human resource management, and its results can help in the development of policies and interventions to support activities that increase job satisfaction and performance. The results can also serve as inspiration for organizations to implement a strategy aimed at expanding awareness, while also monitoring the potential risks associated with the excessive dominance of avoidance strategies, which is key to maintaining a balance between employee development and protection.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by the Scientific Grant Agency of the Ministry of Education, Research, Development and Youth of the Slovak Republic and the Slovak Academy of Sciences 1/0316/26 Workplace of the Future: Leveraging Job Crafting and GPT to Foster Sustainable Organizations in the Digital Age and by the Slovak Research Agency under the contract APVV-24-0607 Development of Multidimensional Models for Assessing Corporate AI Readiness and Adoption Related to the Digital Transformation Strategy of Slovakia 2030.

REFERENCES

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job Demands–Resources Theory. V C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Wellbeing* (1st vyd., s. 1–28). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell019

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A Role–resource Approach–avoidance Model of Job Crafting: A Multimethod Integration and Extension of Job Crafting Theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, *61*(2), 499–522. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0604

Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2022). Assessing job crafting competencies to predict tradeoffs between competing outcomes. *Human Resource Management*, *61*(1), 91–116. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.22081

Costantini, A. (2024). Rethinking work: How approach and avoidance features of cognitive crafting are linked with job crafting behaviors and work engagement. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *30*(5), 1499–1519. https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2022.79

Demerouti, E., Soyer, L. M. A., Vakola, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2021). The effects of a job crafting intervention on the success of an organizational change effort in a blue-collar work environment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *94*(2), 374–399. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12330

Dhanpat, N. (2025). Job crafting agility: A conceptual proposition for rethinking behaviour in organizations. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, *28*(1), 18–33. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-03-2023-0062

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing research*, *18*(1), 39–50.

Geldenhuys, M., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2021). How task, relational and cognitive crafting relate to job performance: A weekly diary study on the role of meaningfulness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *30*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1825378

Güner, B., Güner KiBaroğlu, G., & Basim, H. N. (2023). The Role of Job Crafting and Job Engagement in The Effect of Organizational Commitment on Job Performance. *Ege Akademik*

Bakis (Ege Academic Review). https://doi.org/10.21121/eab.1124876

Guo, Y., & Hou, X. (2022). The effects of job crafting on tour leaders' work engagement: The mediating role of person-job fit and meaningfulness of work. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *34*(5), 1649–1667. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2021-1082

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European business review*, *31*(1), 2–24.

Harju, L. K., Tims, M., Hakanen, J. J., & Khapova, S. N. (2024). Crafting for oneself while considering others: How the relational design of work shapes job crafting. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *35*(1), 67–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2211711

Holman, D., Escaffi-Schwarz, M., Vasquez, C. A., Irmer, J. P., & Zapf, D. (2024). Does job crafting affect employee outcomes via job characteristics? A meta-analytic test of a key job crafting mechanism. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *97*(1), 47–73. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12450

Hu, L. t., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, *6*(1), 1–55.

Hu, Q., Taris, T. W., Dollard, M. F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2020). An exploration of the component validity of job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *29*(5), 776–793. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1756262

Chan, F. K. Y., Thong, J. Y. L., & Venkatesh, V. (2025). Job Crafting in the Context of Enterprise System Implementations. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *42*(2), 564–598. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2025.2487305

Irfan, S. M., Qadeer, F., Abdullah, M. I., & Sarfraz, M. (2023). Employer's investments in job crafting to promote knowledge worker's sustainable employability: A moderated mediation model. *Personnel Review*, *52*(8), 2025–2047. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2021-0704

Kooij, D. T. A. M., De Lange, A. H., & Van De Voorde, K. (2022). Stimulating Job Crafting Behaviors of Older Workers: The Influence of Opportunity-Enhancing Human Resource Practices and Psychological Empowerment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *31*(1), 22–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1899161

Laguía, A., Topa, G., Pocinho, R. F. D. S., & Fernández Muñoz, J. J. (2024). Direct effect of personality traits and work engagement on job crafting: A structural model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *220*, 112518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112518

Lanke, P., Nath, P., Verma, S., & Singh, V. (2024). The past, present and the future of job crafting research: A retrospective review. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, *33*(1), 57–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/10384162241227718

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1527767

Lopper, E., Horstmann, K. T., & Hoppe, A. (2024). The Approach-Avoidance Job Crafting Scale: Development and validation of a measurement of the hierarchical structure of job crafting. *Applied Psychology*, *73*(1), 93–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12466

Lopper, E., Zhang, F., & Tims, M. (2025). The bright and dark side of avoidance crafting: How work design matters. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *98*(3), e70056. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.70056

Lu, W., Liu, S., Wu, H., Wu, K., & Pei, J. (2022). To avoidance or approach: Unraveling hospitality employees' job crafting behavior response to daily customer mistreatment. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *53*, 123–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.09.007

Mousa, M., & Chaouali, W. (2023). Job crafting, meaningfulness and affective commitment by gig workers towards crowdsourcing platforms. *Personnel Review*, *52*(8), 2070–2084. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-07-2021-0495

Nissinen, T. S., Upadyaya, K., Lammassaari, H., & Lonka, K. (2024). How Do Job Crafting Profiles Manifest Employees' Work Engagement, Workaholism, and Epistemic Approach? *Vocations and Learning*, *17*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-023-09334-x

Petrou, P., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2021). Interactive Effects of Approach and Avoidance Job Crafting in Explaining Weekly Variations in Work Performance and Employability. *Applied Psychology*, *70*(3), 1345–1359. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12277

Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *36*(2), 9 pages. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *80*(1), 173–186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009

Wang, Q., Li, S., & Luan, Z. (2024). The "double-edged sword" effect of job crafting from the approach-avoidance perspective. *Current Psychology*, *43*(28), 23846–23858. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06122-1

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. https://doi.org/10.2307/259118

Yang, Y., Yan, X., Zhao, X. (Roy), Mattila, A. S., Cui, Z., & Liu, Z. (2022). A two-wave longitudinal study on the impacts of job crafting and psychological resilience on emotional labor. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *52*, 128–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.05.014

Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *40*(2), 126–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2332

Zhang, F., Tims, M., & Parker, S. K. (2025). Combinations of approach and avoidance crafting matter: Linking job crafting profiles with proactive personality, autonomy, work engagement, and performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *46*(3), 385–400. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2836

Zhang, F., Wang, B., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Job crafting towards strengths and job crafting towards interests in overqualified employees: Different outcomes and boundary effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *42*(5), 587–603. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2517

Appendix

Approach job crafting	Zvýšenie štrukturálnych pracovných zdrojov (IStJR) Increasing Structural Job Resources	Snažím sa rozvíjať svoje schopnosti.	I try to develop my capabilities
		Pracujem na svojom profesionálnom rozvoji.	I try to develop myself professionally
		V práci sa snažím učiť nové veci.	I try to learn new things at work
		Dbám na to, aby som svoje schopnosti využíval / využívala naplno.	I make sure that I use my capacities to the fullest
		Sám / sama sa rozhodujem o tom, ako budem svoju prácu vykonávať.	I decide on my own how I do things
	Zvýšenie sociálnych pracovných zdrojov (ISoJR) Increasing Social Job Resources	Žiadam svojho nadriadeného, aby ma mentoroval alebo koučoval.	I ask my supervisor to coach me
		Overujem si u svojho nadriadeného, či je spokojný s mojou prácou.	I ask whether my supervisor is satisfied with my work
		Môj nadriadený je pre mňa zdrojom inšpirácie.	I look to my supervisor for inspiration
		Pýtam sa ostatných kolegov na spätnú väzbu k môjmu pracovnému výkonu.	I ask others for feedback on my job performance
		Žiadam ostatných kolegov o radu.	I ask colleagues for advice

	Rastúce náročné pracovné požiadavky (ICHJD) Increasing Challenging Job Demands	Keď sa objaví zaujímavý projekt, proaktívne sa ponúknem ako spolupracovník.	When an interesting project becomes available, I proactively offer to participate.
		Ak sa objavia nové trendy alebo zmeny, som medzi prvými, ktorí sa o nich dozvedia a vyskúšajú ich.	When new developments or changes emerge, I am among the first to learn about them and try them out.
		V prípade, keď v práci nemám veľa povinností, vnímam to ako príležitosť začať niečo nové.	When my workload is low, I see it as an opportunity to initiate new tasks or projects.
		Pravidelne si beriem úlohy naviac, aj keď za to nedostávam peniaze.	I regularly take on additional tasks, even when they are not financially rewarded.
		Snažím sa svoju prácu urobiť podnetnejšou tým, že sa vystavujem novým výzvam.	I try to make my work more challenging by exploring new ways of connecting different aspects of my job.
Avoidance job crafting	Znižovanie prekážajúcich pracovných požiadaviek (DHJD) Decreasing Hindering Job Demands	Dbám na to, aby moja práca nevyžadovala príliš veľa sústredenia a premýšľania.	I make sure that my work is mentally less intense
		Snažím sa zabezpečiť, aby moja práca bola emocionálne menej náročná.	I try to ensure that my work is emotionally less intense
		Organizujem si svoju prácu tak, aby môj kontakt s ľuďmi, ktorých problémy ma emocionálne ovplyvňujú, bol minimálny.	I manage my work so that I try to minimize contact with people whose problems affect me emotionally
		Organizujem si svoju prácu tak, aby môj kontakt s ľuďmi, ktorých očakávania sú nereálne, bol minimálny.	I organize my work so as to minimize contact with people whose expectations are unrealistic
		Snažím sa zabezpečiť, aby som v práci nemusel / nemusela robiť veľa náročných rozhodnutí.	I try to ensure that I do not have to make many difficult decisions at work
		Organizujem si prácu tak, aby som nemusel / nemusela sústrediť pozornosť príliš dlho a naraz.	I organize my work in such a way to make sure that I do not have to concentrate for too long a period at once

Contact:
Ing. Emília, Lazarová, Mgr, Viera Ondrášková,
Ing. Jakub Holúbek, PhD., prof. PhDr. Zoltán Rózsa, PhD.
Alexander Dubcek University of Trencin
Faculty of Social and Economic Relations.
Študentská 3, 911 50 Trenčín, Slovakia
Correspondence e-mail: emilia.lazarova@tnuni.sk