ABSTRACT

NEALE, CATHERINE ANNE. The Relationship between OCB, CWB, Job Crafting, Values, and Personality: The Dark Side of Job Crafting. (Under the direction of Dr. Mark A. Wilson).

In the existing literature, job crafting, the individualized initiative to personalize one’s work, is typically thought of as a positive and beneficial predictor, moderator, mediator, and outcome for organizations (Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker, 2014; Oldham & Hackman, 2010; Tims & Bakker, 2010). In addition, like most performance measurement in the field, existing instruments measure the occurrence of job crafting behaviors without explicitly measuring the intentions behind the behaviors. There is the possibility that an individual could engage in seemingly prosocial behavior, but be doing it for their gain. Doing good for malicious purposes is qualitatively different than doing good for its own sake, and this is not currently measured. Study 1 developed a new measure of job crafting, looking at both “dark” and “bright,” prevention-oriented and promotion-oriented, and task and relationship job crafting using the frame-of-reference effect, allowing for improved understanding of the intentionality behind job crafting behaviors (Lievens, Corte, & Schollaert, 2008). Two independent samples showed support for the hypothesized forms of job crafting strategies (Study 1: n = 452 employees from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk: Study 2: n = 376 employees from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk). Also, Study 2 links the newly constructed job crafting measure with commonly examined predictors and outcomes, including individual needs, the Dark Triad, conscientiousness, counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Results reveal that items with the same stems and different appendages tapping into intentionality operate differently in terms of their relationships with predictors and performance variables. The findings suggest that the intentionality behind job crafting behaviors is predicted differentially by individual needs (relatedness and competence; Deci & Ryan, 2000) as
well as personality traits (the Dark Triad and conscientiousness). Bright job crafting is more associated with engagement in OCBs while dark job crafting is more associated with engagement in CWBs. Interestingly, OCBs and CWBs are significantly related, as are dark job crafting and bright job crafting, further supporting prior research that behavior in individuals is not limited to a continuum of “dark” or “bright,” and behavior that harms and helps the organization can be enacted by the same individual simultaneously (Dalal, 2005; Spector, Bauer, & Fox, 2010). The present paper begins to expand on a previously unexamined dimension behind performance measurement.
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Introduction

The relationship between individuals and organizations is characterized by need fulfillment and reciprocity (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Organizations need human talent and labor to thrive in the competitive market, and people search for jobs to fulfill their fundamental needs in exchange for their talent and labor. When individuals enter an organization and find they have a disparity in what they need and what their job has to offer, job crafting, the individualized initiative to personalize one’s work, is likely to occur (Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker, 2014; Oldham & Hackman, 2010; Tims & Bakker, 2010). For the most part, the literature on the topic of job crafting focuses on the positive predictors, moderators, mediators, and outcomes associated with job crafting (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Variables like Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs; Tims, Bakker, Derks, 2015; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), engagement (Bakker, 2010; Tims et al., 2015), and proactive performance (Bakker et al., 2012; Demerouti, 2014; Tims et al., 2015) are common topics in job crafting literature. This has created a generally positive conception of job crafting as a desirable outcome, but this conception may not portray the full range of possible outcomes. While not generally acknowledged in the literature, job crafting may also result in individuals engaging in behaviors that could be counterproductive to the organization’s interests and/or goals, i.e. counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs; Bennett & Robinson, 2000; Demerouti, Bakker, & Halbesleben; 2015; Spector et al., 2006).

Researchers have examined numerous individual differences in relation to job crafting, looking at both positive (bright) personality traits (Hogan & Hogan, 2001) and negative (dark) personality traits (Bakker et al., 2012; Roczniewska & Bakker, 2016). Despite these investigations, there is a heavy emphasis in the current literature on the positive (bright) side of
job crafting behaviors themselves, with limited attention to the possibility of dysfunctional job crafting behaviors and their resulting negative impact on the organization. Based on the theoretical foundations of job crafting (Bakker et al., 2012; Demerouti & Bakker, 2014; Oldham & Hackman, 2010), individual engagement in job crafting is not exclusively the result of positive and normative intentions; individuals may also engage in job crafting for self-centered or deviant purposes. Here, we make a distinction between deviant-natured job crafting (dark job crafting) and well-intentioned job crafting (bright job crafting). If variations of job crafting can lead to negative organizational outcomes, these outcomes could become exponentially detrimental over time, especially due to the potential for dark job crafting to pose as positive (bright) initially. Researchers have yet to capture the underlying intentions behind engagement in potential dark job crafting; therefore, a new measure is needed to investigate these distinctive types of job crafting. The purpose of the present research is to create a measure of dark job crafting and establish its relationship with known predictors (dark personality), and organizational outcomes (CWBs).

The main forms of job crafting include changing the number, scope, and type of job tasks, changing the quality and amount of interaction with others in the job, and changing the cognitive boundaries of the job (Bakker et al., 2012; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Researchers have examined better ways to define and measure job crafting, relying heavily on regulatory focus theory (Tims & Baker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Promotion-focused individuals are gain-oriented and attempt to satisfy nurturance and growth needs. Prevention-focused individuals are loss-oriented and attempt to satisfy the needs for safety and security (Diefendorff & Chandler, 2011). Promotion-focused job crafting (i.e., adding to the job to grow and achieve goals) represents the vast majority of the job crafting literature while
prevention focused job crafting (i.e., reducing job components to avoid losses) is relatively under-investigated, with the exception of one study (Bindl, Unsworth, Gibson, & Stride, 2018). Both categories of regulatory focus needs will drive the type (task, skill, relationship, cognitive) and form (prevention and promotion) of job crafting (see Figure 1A, Bindl et al., 2018), and these variations should be examined further as they will likely differ in what predicts engagement in job crafting and subsequent outcomes.

Dark side personality characteristics can be seen as dysfunctional versions of bright side characteristics; also, dark side characteristics may appear positive, at least on the surface (Kaiser & Hogan, 2010). For example, narcissists can be seen as popular and charming on an initial or surface level, but then relationships deteriorate as time goes on and intentions come to light (Campbell, Foster & Finkel, 2002; Paulhus, 1998). While job crafting can appear positive and potentially beneficial to the organization, people can engage in these activities with motives that don’t align with the organization’s motives. These seemingly pro-social actions can then negatively impact the organization. For example, someone can broaden their social interactions and support others for the intention of using that influence to manipulate others in the future to the detriment of the organization. Further, there are different job crafting scales available, but none of them differentiates between the underlying intentions of individual’s actions (Bindl et al., 2018; Tims, Bakker, Derks, 2012). Much of the phrasing incorporated into these scales have a positive connotation, which may unduly influence test takers and fails to address the precise nature of the targeted behaviors. The current literature views job crafting as a construct that predicts performance, but job crafting measures consist of items that describe behaviors. The items, especially ones regarding relationship and task crafting, appear reflective of items typically seen in measures of task performance, OCBs, and potentially CWBs, depending on the
intention behind the behaviors (Bindl et al., 2018; Tims et al., 2012). Consequently, there is an opportunity to re-conceptualize job crafting as an outcome variable, one that will feasibly operate as another dimension of job performance. Thus, I propose to re-conceptualize job crafting as bright and dark dimensions of performance (see Figure 1b) and develop a new measure of job crafting that seeks to measure the bright and dark intent of job crafting behaviors. I will then re-examine the relationships with a more complete performance space and common predictors.

Reconceptualization of Job Crafting

After the development of bright and dark measures of job crafting (see Figure 1b), we propose to examine their relationships with other dimensions of performance and common predictors of crafting. As seen in Figure 2, needs and personality are depicted as being related to OCBs (behaviors that are considered discretionary, and facilitate the goals and values of the organization and may or may not be recognized and rewarded by the organization; Dalal, 2005; Organ, 1997), CWBs, and the revised approach to job crafting. For this study, individual needs will include relatedness (the desire to feel connected and close to others) and competence (the desire to feel that one can engage in activities and have a positive impact on the environment around them; Gagne & Deci, 2005). Personality will include conscientiousness (exhibited through being dependable, careful, responsible, achievement-oriented, and persevering; Barrick & Mount, 1991) and the Dark Triad, Machiavellianism (manipulativeness, a lack of morality, and general suspicion of others’ intentions), psychopathy (lack of remorse, callousness, impulsivity, and egocentricity), and narcissism (entitlement, superiority, vanity, arrogance, and self-sufficiency; Jones & Paulhus, 2009). We also expect to see a relationship between OCBs and bright job crafting and CWBs and dark job crafting, and we will examine the opposite relationships as well, as depicted in Figure 2.
There have been many studies focusing on the predictors of job crafting engagement. Ghitulescu (2006) found that the skills of employees predicted task crafting, task complexity predicted cognitive job crafting, and both task complexity and discretion predicted relationship crafting. In addition, literature has examined individual needs and job characteristics to predict the engagement in job crafting efforts including: person-job fit, task independence, regulatory focus, and needs outlined by self-determination theory (Bindl et al., 2018; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Tims et al., 2012). Across two studies, Bindl and colleagues (2018) found that the need for competence predicted both prevention and promotion focused job crafting. The need for relatedness predicted engaging in relationship job crafting; one of their studies predicted promotion and prevention relationship job crafting, and one of their studies only predicted promotion job crafting. Also, needs predicted promotion and prevention cognitive (changing the mindset of the job) job crafting, but with varying results across studies. These dissimilar results prompt a need for reexamination as well as further investigation of individual differences in the endorsement of different forms of job crafting strategies based on individual levels of needs. The current study will focus on job crafting that looks at relationships (how people make changes on the job in terms of relationships with others) and tasks (how people change the number, scope, or type of tasks performed on the job). In result, we are opting to examine the needs most related to those forms of job crafting: relatedness and competence (Bindl et al., 2018). More specifically, do individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work have differing relationships with dark promotion, dark prevention, bright promotion, bright prevention job crafting engagement, such that individual needs (when met) will have a positive relationship with bright job crafting (both forms) and a negative relationship with dark job crafting (both forms; see Figure 2, arrows 4, 5, 8, & 9)?
When individual needs are not met, the individual cannot thrive in the organization (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Needs spur behavior when an individual lacks balance between a current state and the desired state (Mitchell & Daniels, 2003). Needs encompassed by self-determination theory have a positive association with OCBs when met; positive feelings attributed to having needs met will then transfer beneficially to the organization (Gagne & Deci, 2005; Roche & Haar, 2013). Thus, we anticipate that individuals with needs met will be more likely to engage in OCBs. Alternatively, when needs are not met, frustration can influence individuals to engage in CWBs (Demerouti et al., 2015; Lian, Ferris, Brown; 2012), therefore we anticipate that individuals with needs not being met will engage in CWBs. More specifically, do individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work have unique relationships with OCBs and CWBs such that there is a positive relationship with OCBs and a negative relationship with CWBs (see Figure 2, arrows 3, 6, 7, & 10)?

The literature is sparse when it comes to addressing the potential link between personality and job crafting, with the limited literature focusing on clusters of composites of facets from different traits rather than facets themselves such as proactive personality (Tims et al., 2012) and approach temperament (Bipp & Demerouti, 2015). As the current study is looking at the dark and bright sides of job crafting and performance, it is appropriate to look at bright and dark personality as predictors. The Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality is considered a bright side model as it does not address traits associated with deviance, which makes its domain appropriate for examining the “bright” side of job crafting (Costa & McCrae, 1995). The five domains of the FFM include extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Costa & McCrae, 1995). Conscientiousness has been linked to heightened engagement in OCBs and a reduction in CWBs (Bowling, 2010; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007;
As conscientious employees are task-oriented and persistent, they will be likely to engage in more job crafting activities (Costa & McCrae, 1995). In addition, previous literature has shown a positive relationship between conscientiousness and general job crafting; however, to the knowledge of the author, researchers have yet to examine conscientiousness and promotion/prevention job crafting (Rudolph, Katz, Lavingne, & Zacher, 2017). More specifically, is conscientiousness positively related to bright job crafting (see Figure 2, arrow 2)? Is conscientiousness positively related to engagement in OCBs (see Figure 2, arrow 1)?

It appears that only one study has examined dark personality traits and their relationship with job crafting. Roczniewska and Bakker (2016) examined the relationship between Dark Triad personality and job crafting and discovered that narcissism was positively related to seeking social job resources and reducing job demands. Moreover, the authors found that psychopathy was negatively related to seeking social job resources. Individuals may engage in job crafting to fulfill their needs but then become frustrated with the amount of energy they expended meeting their needs and retaliate against the organization (Demerouti et al., 2015). Further, and perhaps more interestingly, individuals with high levels of the Dark Triad’s constructs are likely to engage in behaviors that may appear positive and beneficial to the organization. However, the positive actions that they are engaging in are done to facilitate a personal need that may be completely misaligned with the organization’s needs and goals. As such, the motivational processes underlying these individuals’ behaviors are distinct from those reacting to the exhaustion of an imbalance of demands and needs and should not be measured and modeled in the same manner. Doing good for malicious purposes is qualitatively/meaningfully different than doing good for its own sake. Current measures of OCBs
and CWBs don’t capture this element. The extant literature employs measures that inherently assume “good” actions are done for good purposes and will have positive results. We believe this untested assumption bears scrutiny. Further, the Dark Triad has been used as a possible explanation for the predisposition of individuals to engage in unethical and deviant behavior such as CWBs (Cleckley, 1941; Jones & Paulhus, 2009; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The present research intends to continue to investigate the contrasting relationships between dark and bright personality and their influence on discretionary work behaviors (CWBs). More specifically, is the endorsement of the Dark Triad positively related to engagement in dark job crafting (see Figure 2, arrow 11)? Is the endorsement of the Dark Triad positively related to engagement in CWBs (see Figure 2, arrow 12)?

In the current study, we propose to examine various performance outcomes. Job performance is multidimensional (Motowidlo, 2003; Rotundo & Sackett, 2002), and consists of three unique but related content domains: task performance, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs). Task performance includes activities that directly transfer raw materials into products: activities that service or maintain the technical core (activities to help the organization run efficiently; Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Coleman & Borman, 2000). CWBs have been conceptualized in some instances as reactive behaviors to stress or discomfort in the workplace (Spector & Fox, 2005). Failure to obtain individual needs can cause distress for employees; individuals may engage in certain job crafting behaviors in an attempt to balance the stressors and the amount of effort they expend (Demerouti et al., 2015). The nature of this crafting may represent a type of counterproductive behavior, depending on the employee’s intentions and whether the behaviors harm the organization or the stakeholders (self-directed or organizationally-directed). To best display the distinction between dark and bright job
crafting, we will compare both relationships to determine the strength of their individual relationships with OCBs and CWBs. More specifically, Are the relationships between OCBs, CWBs, bright, and dark job crafting significantly different or meaningful (see Figure 2, arrows 13-18)? Are there counterintuitive relationships between the dark and bright side of crafting, OCBs, and CWBs?

In summary, the current studies develop a bright and dark measure of job crafting (see Figure 1b) as well as examine the relationships included in the new conceptual model of bright and dark job crafting (see Figure 2). More specifically, the following research questions will be examined (See Table 9 for a summary of research questions and paths). Do individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work have differing relationships with dark promotion, dark prevention, bright promotion, bright prevention job crafting engagement, such that individual needs (when met) have a positive relationship with bright job crafting (both forms) and a negative relationship with dark job crafting (both forms)? Do individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work have unique relationships with OCBs and CWBs such that there is a positive relationship with OCBs and a negative relationship with CWBs? Is conscientiousness positively related to bright job crafting? Is conscientiousness positively related to engagement in OCBs? Is the endorsement of the Dark Triad positively related to engagement in dark job crafting? Is the endorsement of the Dark Triad positively related to engagement in CWBs? Lastly, are the relationships between OCBs, CWBs, bright, and dark job crafting significantly different or meaningful? Are there counterintuitive relationships between the dark and bright side of crafting, OCBs, and CWBs?
Study 1 – Job Crafting Measure Construction - Method

Participants

A total of 578 participants from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) attempted to complete the study. Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age, residents of the United States, and work a minimum of 30 hours per week. Removal of participants from the sample occurred if the participants failed a careless responding attention check (e.g., “please select ‘agree’ for this item; Meade & Craig, 2012). Participants who failed to meet all requirements were removed from the dataset (126 participants across careless responding and incomplete requirements). The final sample consisted of 452 participants, the majority of whom were male (52%). The mean age of participants was 34 (median 31) with a minimum age of 21 and a maximum age of 75. The distribution of race was 69% White (310), 12% Black (55), 8% Hispanic/Latino (34), 6% Asian/Pacific Islander (29), 3% Native American/American Indian (15), and 2% “Other” (9). The sample had representation from all 23 job sectors established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with the majority coming from Technology (62), Finance or Insurance (52), and Manufacturing (43) and the least coming from Mining (3).

Procedure

Participants read a summary of the study on MTurk, and then MTurk directed participants to the questionnaire on Qualtrics. Qualtrics provided participants with informed consent, and then participants completed the demographics section of the survey. Participants then completed the survey, which included the measures below. Following the completion of the survey items, all participants were thanked and debriefed. Participants received compensation of $0.50 for completing the study.
Measures

The measures were comprised of the newly-created job crafting items. Items were composed of the promotion and prevention relationship and the promotion and prevention task crafting items from Bindl and colleagues’ (2018) job crafting survey, which were revised to reflect bright and dark intent (See Appendix G). For a dark intentioned example, “I actively sought to meet new people at work” was modified to read, “I actively sought to meet new people at work to better manipulate them.” For a bright intentioned example, “I actively sought to meet new people at work” was modified to read “I actively sought to meet new people at work to better complete the tasks for my team.” All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale.

Item Generation

The basis for the multistage process approach to measure construction used in this study followed Hinkin’s (1998) guidelines. Initially, researchers create a large pool of items that sufficiently cover the breadth of the construct. However, as there are already numerous scales that measure job crafting in various types and forms, I reviewed and revised existing items rather than generating new items. The construction of this measure followed the rationale that contextualized measures using the frame-of-reference effect will allow for improved understanding of the previously concealed mechanisms driving the engagement in job crafting efforts (Lievens, Corte, & Schollaert, 2008). Conventional job crafting questionnaires with items relating to relationship and task crafting and prevention and promotion orientation (Bindl et al., 2018) were adapted with the frame-of-reference appendage being either Dark Triad or conscientiousness related rationale. I held a focus group with three subject matter experts (SMEs) with graduate training in industrial-organizational psychology to help develop the appendages for the items. The response format for both scales was a 7-point Likert scale (1 =
strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). Hinkin (1998) suggests generating twice as many items as will be desired in the final measure, and three or four is the suggested number of items needed to test the homogeneity of items within a latent construct (Hinkin, 1995). Desired item dispersion can be seen in Table 1. I developed three times as many items as desired.

Study 1 Results

Item Review

The newly-generated items underwent an assessment of content validity using Lawshe’s (1975) content validation ratio (CVR). SMEs (5 SMEs per item; Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995) rated each item on (1) the extent to which the items corresponded to bright and dark job crafting and (2) the clarity of the items. According to Lawshe (1975), content validity of an item requires a content validity ratio (CVR) based on the number of SMEs involved in the process. I calculated the CVR with the equation below:

\[ CVR = \frac{n_c - N/2}{N/2} \]

Any items with a CRV below the calculated value (.99) were removed. As a result, 59 items from the dark job crafting item pool (out of 300 items) and 48 items from the bright job crafting item pool (out of 158 items) were retained and administered to participants via MTurk.

Item Validation

I randomly split the data using the “CreateDataPartition” function from the Caret package in R (Kuhn, 2018) and used 225 participants to conduct the initial item reduction. Prior to
running Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFAs), I examined the inter-item correlations of the eight hypothesized factors and removed any items that correlated less than .4 with the other items (as items belonging to the same domain should be correlated; Hinkin 1998). I then conducted eight separate single-factor EFAs examining dark and bright, prevention and promotion, and task and relationship job crafting and selected the top loading items identified (items with factor loadings under .45 were eliminated). The items that remained were then used to conduct two EFAs, one with bright job crafting items and one with dark job crafting items, under the assumption that four factors would emerge for each (promotion-oriented relationship, promotion-oriented task, prevention-oriented relationship, and prevention-oriented task). Four factors emerged for bright job crafting in the assumed manner; two factors emerged for dark job crafting (prevention-oriented items on one factor and promotion-oriented items on one factor; see Table 2 and 3 for the items retained and their factor loadings). After dimensionality was determined, internal consistency reliabilities were assessed for the factors to determine that the sampling domain was captured (Churchill, 1979).

In order to address the assumed factor structure, I then used the remaining 225 participants to run Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFAs) per Hinkin’s (1998) scale development guidelines on the items associated with each factor from the EFAs to assess the quality of the new measures for both bright and dark job crafting. The lavaan package in R (Rossel, 2012) was used to conduct the CFAs. I ran six CFAs on the bright and dark job crafting items separately (see Table 4 for model fit indices). I first conducted two single-factor models with all the items (bright and dark job crafting separately) loading onto one overarching factor as well as two (bright and dark job crafting separately) two-factor models where prevention-oriented job crafting and promotion-oriented job crafting were represented, and two (bright and dark job
crafting separately) four-factor models (promotion-oriented relationship, promotion-oriented task, prevention-oriented relationship, and prevention-oriented task). Based on the model fit indices, for both the dark and the bright job crafting scales, the four-factor model was the most appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 349.39, 322.04, df = 203, 203$, CFI = .973, .960, TLI = .969, .955, RMSEA = .053, .048, SRMR = .024, .047; Hu & Bentler, 1999). Means, standard deviations, internal consistencies, and correlations for the subfactor variables appear in Table 5.

Summary

Study 1 provides initial support for the distinct forms of bright and dark, promotion and prevention, and task and relationship job crafting. While the first half of the sample only showed partial support for the assumed factor structure, as the dark job crafting measure only separated promotion-oriented and prevention-oriented job crafting and combined task and relationship, the second sample showed full support for the assumed 4-factor structure for both bright and dark job crafting (see Figure 1b). Study one allows for the importance of intentionality to be gleaned as the same item stems are operating completely differently with appendages tapping into different intents. The second study further investigates the assumed factor structure as well as examines relationships with other variables commonly associated with job crafting.

Study 2 - Conceptual Model - Method

Participants

A total of 502 participants from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) attempted to complete the study. Participants were required to be at least 18 years of age, residents of the United States, and work a minimum of 30 hours per week. Removal of participants from the sample occurred if the participants failed a careless responding attention check (e.g., “please
select ‘agree’ for this item; Meade & Craig, 2012). Participants who failed to meet all requirements were removed from the dataset (121 participants across careless responding and incomplete requirements). The final sample consisted of 381 participants, the majority of whom were female (51%). The mean age of participants was 36 (median 34) with a minimum age of 19 and a maximum age of 69. The distribution of race was 69% White (258), 13% Black (48), 11% Asian/Pacific Islander (41), 5% Hispanic/Latino (17), 1% Native American/American Indian (7), and 1% “Other” (5). The sample had representation from all 23 job sectors established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with the majority coming from Technology (41), Finance or Insurance (40), and Health Care or Social Assistance (39) and the least coming from Mining (2).

**Procedure**

Participants read a summary of the study on MTurk, and then MTurk directed participants to the questionnaire on Qualtrics. Qualtrics provided participants with informed consent, and then participants completed the demographics section of the survey. Participants then completed the survey, which included the measures below. Following the completion of the survey items, all participants were thanked and debriefed. Participants received compensation of $0.50 for completing the study.

**Measures**

**Individual Needs: Competence, Relatedness Survey.** Individuals’ need strength for competence (e.g., “I was successfully completing difficult tasks and projects”; $\alpha = .71$) and relatedness (e.g., “I felt close and connected with other people who are important to me”; $\alpha = .64$) was measured using a 12-item established measure by Sheldon and Hilpert (2012). The response format was a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat
disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). A list of all items is in Appendix B.

**The Short Dark Triad Scale (SD3).** I used the 27-item Short Dark Triad scale by Jones and Paulhus (2014) to assess Machiavellianism ($\alpha = .85$), narcissism ($\alpha = .76$), and psychopathy ($\alpha = .86$). Example items include, “It’s not wise to tell your secrets” (Machiavellianism), “Many group activities tend to be dull without me” (narcissism), and “Payback needs to be quick and nasty” (psychopathy). The response format was a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). A list of all items is in Appendix C.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB-C-10).** I used the short form 10 item OCB-C-10 checklist ($\alpha = .89$) by Spector and colleagues (2010) to assess OCBs. Participants were prompted, “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?” Then participants were instructed to rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = once or twice, 3 = once or twice per month, 4 = once or twice per week, 5 = every day). A list of all items is in Appendix D.

**Counterproductive Work Behaviors (CWB-C-10).** I used the short form 10 item CWB-C-10 checklist ($\alpha = .95$) by Spector and colleagues (2010) to measure CWBs. Participants were prompted, “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?” Then participants were instructed to rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = once or twice, 3 = once or twice per month, 4 = once or twice per week, 5 = every day). A list of all items is in Appendix E.
**Conscientiousness.** I used the 20 conscientiousness items from the Big-Five Factor Markers ($\alpha = .92$) by Goldberg (1992) to assess conscientiousness. An example item includes, “Am always prepared.” The response format was a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). A list of all items is in Appendix F.

**Bright and Dark Job Crafting Survey.** There were two versions of the job crafting scale developed in Study 1, dark and bright both looking at prevention-oriented task crafting ($\alpha = .90; \alpha = .86$), promotion-oriented task crafting ($\alpha = .93; \alpha = .89$), prevention-oriented relationship crafting ($\alpha = .93; \alpha = .89$), promotion-oriented relationship crafting ($\alpha = .92; \alpha = .89$). Alphas are reported from Study 2. The response format for both was a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = somewhat agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree). A list of all items is in Appendix G.

**Study 2 - Results**

Table 6 reports the means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and internal consistencies for the measures examined. To further support the factor structure identified in study one, six CFAs, on the bright and dark job crafting items separately, were run (see Table 7 for model fit indices). I conducted two single-factor models with all the items (bright and dark job crafting separately) loading onto one overarching factor as well as two (bright and dark job crafting separately) two-factor models where prevention-oriented job crafting and promotion-oriented job crafting were represented, and two (bright and dark job crafting separately) four-factor models (promotion-oriented relationship, promotion-oriented task, prevention-oriented relationship, and prevention-oriented task). Based on the model fit indices, for both the dark and the bright job crafting scales, the four-factor model was the most appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 =$
I used latent variable modeling (a form of structural equation modeling) to analyze path coefficients and test the proposed conceptual model (See Figure 2) and the resulting research questions using the lavaan package in R (Rossel, 2012). Due to the intricacies of the model, the research questions were tested separately, resulting in seven models being tested.

To test, which asked if individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work have differing relationships with dark promotion, dark prevention, bright promotion, bright prevention job crafting engagement, such that individual needs (when met) will have a positive relationship with bright job crafting (both forms) and a negative relationship with dark job crafting (both forms) was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 3). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 842.20, df = 346, CFI = .945, TLI = .935, RMSEA = .062, SRMR = .06$; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model partially supported the research question’s expectations for relatedness (dark promotion-oriented relationship job crafting: $B = .04, SE = .03, ns$; dark prevention-oriented relationship crafting: $B = -.16, SE = .03, p < .001$; bright promotion-oriented relationship crafting: $B = .33, SE = .05, p < .001$; bright prevention-oriented relationship crafting: $B = -.09, SE = .05, ns$) and competence (dark promotion-oriented task job crafting: $B = -.09, SE = .03, p < .001$; dark prevention-oriented task crafting: $B = -.13, SE = .03, p < .001$; bright promotion-oriented task crafting: $B = .08, SE = .05, ns$; bright prevention-oriented task crafting: $B = -.22, SE = .05, p < .001$).

Research Question 2, which asked if individual needs (relatedness and competence) have unique relationships with OCBs and CWBs such that there is a positive relationship with OCBs and a negative relationship with CWBs was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure
4). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 688.16, df = 205, CFI = .902, TLI = .89, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .065; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model partially supported the research question’s assumptions for OCBs (relatedness: $B = .16, SE = .68, p < .05$; competence: $B = .01, SE = .07, ns$) and CWBs (relatedness: $B = -.17, SE = .07, p < .05$; competence: $B = -.44, SE = .0, p < .001$).

Research Question 3, which asked if conscientiousness is positively related to bright job crafting was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 5). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 248.2, df = 84, CFI = .94, TLI = .925, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .046; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model partially supported the research question’s assumptions for conscientiousness (bright promotion-oriented relationship crafting: $B = .52, SE = .07, p < .001$; bright prevention-oriented relationship crafting: $B = .11, SE = .08, ns$; bright promotion-oriented task crafting: $B = .29, SE = .08, p < .001$; bright prevention-oriented task crafting: $B = .05, SE = .07, ns$).

Research Question 4, which asked if conscientiousness is positively related to engagement in OCBs was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 6). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 548.12, df = 186, CFI = .904, TLI = .892, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .056; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model supported the research question’s assumptions for conscientiousness (OCBs: $B = .399, SE = .06, p < .001$).

Research Question 5, which asked if the endorsement of the Dark Triad is positively related to engagement in dark job crafting was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 7). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 707.019, df = 289, CFI = .95, TLI = .944, RMSEA = .062, SRMR = .041; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model supported the research question’s assumptions for the Dark Triad (dark promotion-oriented task

Research Question 6, which asked if the endorsement of the Dark Triad positively related to engagement in CWBs was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 8). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 174.307, df = 64, CFI = .97, TLI = .963, RMSEA = .068, SRMR = .034$; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model supported the research question’s assumptions for the Dark Triad (CWBs: $B = 1.201, SE = .104, p < .001$).

Research Question 7, which asks if the relationships between OCBs, CWBs, bright, and dark job crafting are significantly different or meaningful was evaluated with latent variable modeling (see Figure 9). The subsequent model appeared to be an appropriate fit for the data ($\chi^2 = 4013.819, df = 2001, CFI = .892, TLI = .887, RMSEA = .052, SRMR = .08$; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model tested covariances between bright job crafting and OCBs ($B = .571, SE = .04, p < .001$), bright job crafting and CWBs ($B = .50, SE = .045, p < .001$), dark job crafting and CWBs ($B = .681, SE = .03, p < .001$), dark job crafting and OCBs ($B = .337, SE = .05, p < .001$), bright job crafting and dark job crafting ($B = .869, SE = .02, p < .001$), and CWBs and OCBs ($B = .301, SE = .051, p < .001$).

**Discussion**

The vast majority of measures of performance in the current literature do not tap into the intentionality behind the behaviors measured. Behaviors that have the appearance of being beneficial, altruistic, or “good” can be done for reasons that are not aligned with organizational goals and can be detrimental to the organization and its employees. Without explicitly measuring
intentionality, we can only make assumptions, which hinders the scientific understanding of performance relationships. The purpose of these studies was to develop new measures of job crafting that could identify previously-concealed mechanisms by measuring intentionality of both the bright and dark nature, as well as to re-examine traditional job crafting relationships with the newly-formed measures. The discussion will include a review of the factor structure of the newly-developed measures and the research questions tested.

Study 2 provided further evidence of the factor structure assumed and displayed in Study 1 and showed that dark and bright, prevention and promotion, and task and relationship job crafting are distinct job crafting strategies and that when items are adjusted to tap into intentionality, they will operate differently.

In addition, Study 2 further identified variables associated with these newly-identified jobs crafting strategies. The research questions proposed were partially supported by the data. It was thought that individual needs (relatedness and competence) at work would have positive relationships with both prevention-oriented and promotion-oriented bright job crafting (relationship and task) and negative relationships with prevention-oriented and promotion-oriented dark job crafting (relationship and task), but this was only partially the case. In terms of dark job crafting, the anticipated relationships were not significant between relatedness and promotion-oriented relationship job crafting. This result could be attributed to the fact that the stems associated with the promotion-oriented relationship job crafting items all deal with engaging and connecting with others, thus people could still feel as if their needs of relatedness were fulfilled while engaging in devious or dark behaviors and would not have the negative relationship previously assumed. In terms of bright job crafting, prevention-oriented job crafting (task and relationship) had negative relationships with individual needs, which were the opposite
of the assumed relationships. This could be attributed to the fact that the wording of the stems insinuated some form of removal of relationship or task leading to negative and in some cases, non-significant relationships (bright prevention-oriented relationship crafting). Also, the relationship between competence and bright promotion-oriented task crafting was positive, as assumed, but not significant. This potentially occurred due to the competence items examining whether people were feeling comfortable and competent in their job role and may not be predictive of whether or not individuals will actively seek to add more to their roles in terms of tasks, regardless of intentions.

OCBs were related significantly and positively to the feeling of relatedness in individuals, but not to the feeling of competence, which could be because the competence items examined whether individuals felt competent in their jobs, so those who felt competent would not necessarily feel the need to go beyond the parameters of their job to help the organization or their coworkers further than what is in their job description. CWBs were related negatively and significantly, as expected with both individual needs.

Prevention-oriented items again presented an issue in the assumed relationships between conscientiousness and bright job crafting as only items for promotion-oriented job crafting had positive and significant relationships with conscientiousness, which is most rationally due to the wording of the stems insinuating some form of removal of relationship or tasks. Conscientiousness was positively associated with engagement in OCBs, which supported previous literature and my assumptions (Bowling, 2010; Lapierre & Hackett, 2007; Sackett et al., 2006).

The endorsement of the Dark Triad was positively associated with dark job crafting, supporting the rationale that those who endorsed Dark Triad traits also indicated that they
engaged in job crafting behaviors with devious intentionality. Further supporting previous
literature and my assumptions, the Dark Triad was positively associated with engagement in
CWBs (Cleckley, 1941; Jones & Paulhus, 2009; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Raskin & Terry,
1988).

The relationships examined in Research Question 7 allow for a deeper understanding of
why intentionality is important to continue examining across the field. The same job crafting
stems with different appendages have different relationships with performance outcomes even
though they are highly related (covariance of .869). Bright job crafting has a covariance of .571
with OCBs and a lower but still significant covariance of .498 with CWBs. Dark Job Crafting
has a covariance of .681 with CWBs and a lower but still significant covariance of .337 with
OCBs. Also, CWBs and OCBs are significantly related as well with a covariance of .301. This
gives support to the emerging idea that OCBs and CWBs, and seemingly dark and bright job
crafting, are not opposites on a continuum and can be engaged in by the same individuals
simultaneously (Dalal, 2005; Spector et al., 2010). Perhaps instead, the reasoning or intention
behind engaging in these activities is the determining factor in why these behaviors are seen
correlated to each other. In truth, individuals could be engaging in high levels of seemingly
positive, altruistic performance as well as high levels of devious performance for the same
“dark” intentions, but are being measured in a way that doesn’t take this into account.

Limitations, Implications, and Directions for Future Research

One of the limitations of these studies is that the data from both studies was self-report.
While both surveys emphasized anonymity and encouraged honesty, I am limited in getting a
multidimensional look at behaviors (e.g., supervisor/peer ratings) and dependent on the
participants giving accurate accounts of their attitudes and behaviors, which they may have been deterred from due to the devious nature of some of the constructs examined. A second limitation is the source of the data and sample for both studies. While MTurk has been shown to provide samples that are of comparable quality to more traditional samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, Gosling, 2011) there are certain limitations in ensuring that all participants are being honest in terms of whether they are English-speaking, 18 years of age or older, and working a minimum of 30 hours a week. Also, as this was a paid survey, participants could have responded carelessly or dishonestly to receive payment with minimal effort. To mitigate the possibility of this, I removed participants who did not indicate they were English-speaking, 18 years of age or older, and working a minimum of 30 hours a week. Also, longstring values (40 consecutive responses) were evaluated and removed (Meade & Craig, 2012).

In light of these findings, several avenues for future research are possible. Instead of assigning appendages before the initial data collection, appendages could have been developed separately and used as a drop down for individuals to assign to the statements themselves. The only risk is that individuals may have leaned into social desirability and not responded in an honest way, thus distorting the results. Nevertheless, this may have allowed for more rich and authentic combinations of stems and appendages that was limited in this case by the SMEs’ judgments. Additionally, looking at intentionality across other dimensions of performance, such as OCBs and CWBs, could advance the field’s understanding of performance. Lastly, it would be fruitful to look at the interaction or indirect effect of personality on the relationship between individual needs and job crafting behaviors. The results did not operate as assumed, and this may be because of an underlying relationship that wasn’t examined.
Conclusion

These studies developed and tested new measures of job crafting that explore deeper than behavior by tapping into the bright and dark intentions behind job crafting behaviors. Individual needs (relatedness and competence) were related differently to the job crafting measures based on intentionality. Personality (the Dark Triad and conscientiousness) also related differentially with bright and dark job crafting. In addition, while bright and dark job crafting were related, they related to outcome variables differently; Bright job crafting is more associated with engagement in OCBs, while dark job crafting is more associated with engagement in CWBs. In the field of industrial-organizational psychology, there is a reliance on measures of behavior without considering the intentionality motivating these behaviors. The current paper explicitly linked job crafting behaviors with intentionality of both the constructive/bright and destructive/dark nature and explored these behaviors with commonly-examined predictors and outcomes, showing the differential operations of items with the same stems and different appendages tapping into rationality. This study begins to shed light on a previously unexamined dimension behind performance measurement.
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Table 1.  
*Desired Item Dispersion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellianism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.
Dark Job Crafting Items Retained and Factor Loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Wording</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading 2 Factor Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion-focused Relationship Dark Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them because I want to gain a higher status in the organization</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I actively sought to meet new people at work in an effort to ensure all of my colleagues know I am special</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I actively sought to meet new people at work so they could know to respect my position</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I made efforts to get to know other people at work better because I want more status among my colleagues</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to spend more time with a wide variety of people at work so that everyone would know how great I am</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I made efforts to get to know other people at work better because I want others to admire me</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention-focused Relationship Dark Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I minimized my interactions with people at work that I did not get along with because I won't be able to influence them to do what I want</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people because that doesn't help me in the long run</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I minimized my interactions with people at work that I did not get along with so to avoid conflict with them in case I wanted to use them in the future</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because those people are easier to manipulate</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because I want influence over the people I interact with</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people because I don't want them to know my secrets</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people unless I think I can influence them</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention-focused Task Dark Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on in order to focus on my own interests instead</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because I don't need anyone's approval</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because I don't gain anything from doing the task</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on so that I can direct others to do tasks for me</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

**Dark Job Crafting Items Retained and Factor Loadings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Wording</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading 2 Factor Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on in order</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to focus on my own interests</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on by</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convincing my coworkers to do them for me</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion-focused Task Dark Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work in order</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to increase my importance</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I actively took on more tasks in my work because I want</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more attention</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because I want to seem superior to my colleagues</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequence in order to gain attention from my supervisor</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work because I</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>want to appear more competent than my colleagues</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                     | $X^2$ $df$ | 325         |
|                     | $X^2$      | 5366.75     |
|                     | BIC        | -956.41     |
|                     | TLI        | .94         |
|                     | RMSEA      | .068 [.056-.072] |
|                     | Alpha      | .98         |
Table 3.

Bright Job Crafting Items Retained and Factor Loadings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Wording</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion-focused Task Bright Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging because I want to be able to help my organization</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence because I have the skills to help</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence in order to do better work</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging because I think it will help my team</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work in order to become an asset to the organization</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence so that I could help other people complete their tasks on time</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion-focused Relationship Bright Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I actively sought to meet new people at work because I want others to be able to depend on me</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them because I value others</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to spend more time with a wide variety of people at work because I want people to know they can count on me</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I made efforts to get to know other people at work better so that people can depend on me</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I actively sought to meet new people at work so that I can be more efficient at my job with teamwork</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them so that I can be a proactive member of the company</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention-focused Task Bright Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on to make it more likely that I'll complete all of my tasks on time</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because they were detracting from me achieving my goals</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because they were causing distractions from other work</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sought to make some of my work mentally less intense to make sure I could get everything done</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I sought to make some of my work mentally less intense so that I could be more dependable in completing my tasks</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

**Bright Job Crafting Items Retained and Factor Loadings.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item Wording</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loading 4 Factor Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention-focused Relationship Bright Job Crafting</strong></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with so that we could complete more work</td>
<td>-0.05 0.29 0.50 -0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because satisfaction within a group will help us work faster and better</td>
<td>0.10 0.03 0.67 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with to create a more positive atmosphere at work</td>
<td>0.06 0.01 0.71 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with so that I could avoid social conflict</td>
<td>-0.05 -0.01 0.73 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with in order to create a dependable work team</td>
<td>0.18 -0.03 0.71 -0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2 df</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X^2</td>
<td>2815.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>583.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.05 [0.03-0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Descriptives</td>
<td>X²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting 1 factor</td>
<td>364.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting 2 factors</td>
<td>386.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3 – Hypothesized</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting 4 factors</td>
<td>349.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Bright Job Crafting 1 factor</td>
<td>1028.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>Bright Job Crafting 2 factors</td>
<td>650.146*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 6 – Hypothesized</td>
<td>Bright Job Crafting 4 factors</td>
<td>322.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .001
Table 5.  
*Study 1 - Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. BPT</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. BPR</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. BPRT</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. BPRR</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DPT</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DPRT</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DPRR</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parentheses along the diagonal represent scale alphas. BPT = bright promotion-oriented task job crafting, BPR = bright promotion-oriented relationship job crafting, BPRT = bright prevention-oriented task job crafting, BPRR = bright prevention-oriented relationship job crafting, DPT = dark promotion-oriented task job crafting, DPR = dark promotion-oriented relationship job crafting, DPRT = dark prevention-oriented task job crafting, DPRR = dark prevention-oriented relationship job crafting.
Table 6.
Study 2 - Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nar</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mac</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psy</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cons</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rel</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Comp</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BPT</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. BPR</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BPRRT</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. BPRR</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. DPT</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. DPR</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. DPRT</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. DPRR</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CWB</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. OCB</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parentheses along the diagonal represent scale alphas. BPT = bright promotion-oriented task job crafting, BPR = bright promotion-oriented relationship job crafting, BPRRT = bright prevention-oriented task job crafting, BPRR = bright prevention-oriented relationship job crafting, DPT = dark promotion-oriented task job crafting, DPR = dark promotion-oriented relationship job crafting, DPRT = dark prevention-oriented task job crafting, DPRR = dark prevention-oriented relationship job crafting.
### Table 7.
#### Study 2 – Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting 1 factor</td>
<td>1284.846*</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.110 [.105-</td>
<td>.116]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting 2 factors</td>
<td>673.702*</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.072 [.066-</td>
<td>.08]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Model 3 - Hypothesized | Dark Job Crafting 4 factors   | 500.605*   | 224 | .963 | .958 | .057 [.051- | .032]
| Model 4                | Bright Job Crafting 1 factor  | 1749.387*  | 209 | .679 | .645 | .140 [.134- | .156]|
| Model 5                | Bright Job Crafting 2 factors | 947.023*   | 231 | .846 | .829 | .097 [.091- | .104]|
| Model 6 - Hypothesized | Bright Job Crafting 4 factors | 391.126*   | 203 | .961 | .955 | .05 [.042-  | .057]|

*Note. *p*<.001
### Table 8.
**Study 2 – Latent Variable Modeling Fit Indices.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
<td>IN ~ JC</td>
<td>842.20*</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>IN ~ OCBs/</td>
<td>688.16*</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CWBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 3</td>
<td>Con ~ BJC</td>
<td>248.2*</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
<td>Con ~ OCB</td>
<td>548.12*</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 5</td>
<td>DT ~ DJC</td>
<td>707.02*</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 6</td>
<td>DT ~ CWB</td>
<td>174.31*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 7</td>
<td>OCBs, CWBs, DJC, BJC</td>
<td>4013.92*</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.001$ Note: IN = Individual Needs, JC = Job Crafting, OCBs = Organizational Citizenship Behavior, CWB = Counterproductive Work Behavior, DT = Dark Triad, DJC = Dark Job Crafting, BJC = Bright Job Crafting.
Table 9. 
*Research Questions and Corresponding Paths.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>Hypothesized Direction</th>
<th>Regression/Covariance Estimate (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bright Relationship Crafting ~ Relatedness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Promotion .33 (.05)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prevention -.09 (.05) ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bright Task Job Crafting ~ Competence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Promotion .08 (.05)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prevention -.22 (.05)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dark Job Relationship Crafting ~ Relatedness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Promotion .04 (.03)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prevention -.16 (.03)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dark Job Task Crafting ~ Competence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Promotion -.09 (03) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Prevention -.13 (.03)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OCBs ~ Relatedness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.16 (.68)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OCBs ~ Competence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.01 (.07) ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CWBs ~ Relatedness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.17 (.07)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CWBs ~ Competence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.44 (.00)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bright Job Crafting ~ Conscientiousness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pro-Rel .52 (.07)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prev-Rel .11 (.08) ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pro-T .29 (.08)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prev-T .05 (.07) ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OCBs ~ Conscientiousness</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>.39 (.06)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dark Job Crafting ~ Dark Triad</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pro-Rel 1.01 (.10)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prev-Rel 1.78 (.18)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Pro-T 1.22 (.11)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Prev-T 1.28 (.12)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. *Research Questions and Corresponding Paths.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>Hypothesized Direction</th>
<th>Regression/Covariance Estimate (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 6</td>
<td>12 CWBs ~ Dark Triad</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1.20 (.10)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 7</td>
<td>13 OCBs ~~ Bright Job Crafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57 (.04)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Bright Job Crafting ~~ Dark Job Crafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87 (.02)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Dark Job Crafting ~~ CWBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.68 (.03)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 OCBs ~~ Dark Job Crafting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34 (.05)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 Bright Job Crafting ~~ CWBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50 (.05)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 OCBs ~~ CWBs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.30 (.05)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Pro-Rel = promotion-oriented relationship job crafting, Prev-Rel = prevention-oriented relationship job crafting, Pro-T = promotion-oriented task job crafting, Prev-T = prevention-oriented task job crafting. *p < .05
Figure 1a. Previous Conceptualization of Job Crafting (Bindl et al., 2018).
Figure 1b. Proposed Job Crafting Model.
Figure 2. Conceptual Model of Dark and Bright Job Crafting.
Figure 3. Research Question 1 - Types of needs and job crafting. N = 381; Model fit: CFI = .945; TLI = .935, RMSEA = .062, SRMR = .062. *p < .05.
Figure 4. Research Question 2 - Types of needs and performance (OCBs and CWBs). $N = 381$; Model fit: CFI = .90; TLI = .89, RMSEA = .079, SRMR = .065. *$p < .05$. 

Figure 4: 
- Relatedness to CWB: -0.17* 
- Competence to OCB: 0.16* 
- Relatedness to OCB: -0.44* 
- Competence to CWB: 0.01 ns
Figure 5. Research Question 3 – Conscientiousness and bright job crafting. $N = 381$; Model fit: CFI = .94; TLI = .93, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .046. *$p < .05$. 
Figure 6. Research Question 4 – Conscientiousness and OCBs. N = 381; Model fit: CFI = .90; TLI = .89, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .056. *p < .05.
Figure 7. Research Question 5 – Dark Triad and dark job crafting. $N = 381$; Model fit: CFI = .950; TLI = .944, RMSEA = .062, SRMR = .041. *$p < .05$. 
Figure 8. Research Question 6 – Dark Triad and CWBs. $N = 381$; Model fit: CFI = .97; TLI = .963, RMSEA = .068, SRMR = .034. *$p < .05$. 
Figure 9. Research Question 7 – Job crafting and OCBs and CWBs. $N = 381$; Model fit: CFI = .892; TLI = .887, RMSEA = .052, SRMR = .08. *$p < .05$. 
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Job Crafting Questionnaire

Bindl, Unsworth, Gibson, and Stride (2018)

Prompt: “Indicate your agreement with the following statements”

Scale Anchors: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), 7 (strongly agree).

Promotion-oriented relationship crafting

1. I actively sought to meet new people at work.
2. I made efforts to get to know other people at work better.
3. I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them.
4. I tried to spend more time with a wide variety of people at work.

Prevention-oriented relationship crafting

5. I minimized my interactions with people at work that I did not get along with.
6. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with.
7. I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people.

Promotion-oriented task crafting

8. I actively took on more tasks in my work.
9. I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence.
10. I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging.
11. I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work.

Prevention-oriented task crafting

12. I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on.
13. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on.

14. I sought to make some of my work mentally less intense.
Appendix B

The Balanced Measure of Psychological Needs

Sheldon and Hilpert (2012)

**Prompt:** “Indicate your agreement with the following statements when at work”

**Scale Anchors:** 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), 7 (strongly agree).

**Relatedness**

1. I felt a sense of contact with people who care for me, and whom I care for.
2. I was lonely.
3. I felt close and connected with other people who are important to me.
4. I felt unappreciated by one or more important people.
5. I felt a strong sense of intimacy with the people I spent time with.
6. I had disagreements or conflicts with people I usually get along with.

**Competence**

7. I was successfully completing difficult tasks and projects.
8. I experienced some kind of failure, or was unable to do well at something.
9. I took on and mastered hard challenges.
10. I did something stupid, that made me feel incompetent.
11. I did well even at the hard things.
12. I struggled doing something I should be good at.
Appendix C

The Short Dark Triad

Jones and Paulhus (2014)

Prompt: “Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements”

Scale Anchors: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), 7 (strongly agree).

Machiavellianism

1. It’s not wise to tell your secrets.

2. I like to use clever manipulation to get my way.

3. Whatever it takes, you must get the important people on your side.

4. Avoid direct conflict with others because they may be useful in the future.

5. It’s wise to keep track of information that you can use against people later.

6. You should wait for the right time to get back at people.

7. There are things you should hide from other people to preserve your reputation.

8. Make sure your plans benefit yourself, not others.

9. Most people can be manipulated.

Narcissism

10. People see me as a natural leader.

11. I hate being the center of attention. (R)
12. Many group activities tend to be dull without me.

13. I know that I am special because everyone keeps telling me so.

14. I like to get acquainted with important people.

15. I feel embarrassed if someone compliments me. (R)

16. I have been compared to famous people.

17. I am an average person. (R)

18. I insist on getting the respect I deserve.

Psychopathy

19. I like to get revenge on authorities.

20. I avoid dangerous situations. (R)

21. Payback needs to be quick and nasty.

22. People often say I’m out of control.

23. It’s true that I can be mean to others.

24. People who mess with me always regret it.

25. I have never gotten into trouble with the law. (R)

26. I enjoy having sex with people I hardly know

27. I’ll say anything to get what I want.
Appendix D

OCB-C-10

Spector, Bauer, & Fox (2010)

Prompt: “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?”

Scale Anchors: 1 (Never), 2 (Once or twice), 3 (Once or twice/month), 4 (Once or twice/week), 5 (Every day)

1. Took time to advise, coach, or mentor a co-worker.

2. Helped co-worker learn new skills or shared job knowledge.

3. Helped new employees get oriented to the job.

4. Lent a compassionate ear when someone had a work problem.

5. Offered suggestions to improve how work is done.

6. Helped a co-worker who had too much to do.

7. Volunteered for extra work assignments.

8. Worked weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.

9. Volunteered to attend meetings or work on committees on own time.

10. Gave up meal and other breaks to complete work.
Appendix E

CWB-C-10

Spector, Bauer, & Fox (2010)

Prompt: “How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?”

Scale Anchors: 1 (Never), 2 (Once or twice), 3 (Once or twice/month), 4 (Once or twice/week), 5 (Every day)

1. Purposely wasted your employer’s materials/supplies.
2. Complained about insignificant things at work.
3. Told people outside the job what a lousy place you work for.
4. Came to work late without permission.
5. Stayed home from work and said you were sick when you weren’t.
6. Insulted someone about their job performance.
7. Made fun of someone’s personal life.
8. Ignored someone at work.
9. Started an argument with someone at work.
10. Insulted or made fun of someone at work.
Appendix F

Conscientiousness – Big-Five Factor Markers

Goldberg (1992)

Prompt: “Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements”

Scale Anchors: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), 7 (strongly agree).

1. Am always prepared.
2. Pay attention to details.
3. Get chores done right away.
4. Like order.
5. Follow a schedule.
6. Am exacting in my work.
7. Do things according to a plan.
8. Continue until everything is perfect.
9. Make plans and stick to them.
10. Love order and regularity.
11. Like to tidy up.
12. Leave my belongings around.
13. Make a mess of things.
14. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
15. Shirk my duties.
17. Waste my time.

18. Do things in a half-way manner.

19. Find it difficult to get down to work.

20. Leave a mess in my room.
Appendix G

Bright and Dark Job Crafting

Neale (2019)

Prompt: “Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements”

Scale Anchors: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (somewhat disagree), 4 (neither agree nor disagree), 5 (somewhat agree), 6 (agree), 7 (strongly agree).

Promotion-focused Relationship Dark Job Crafting

1. I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them because I want to gain a higher status in the organization

2. I actively sought to meet new people at work in an effort to ensure all of my colleagues know I am special

3. I actively sought to meet new people at work so they could know to respect my position

4. I made efforts to get to know other people at work better because I want more status among my colleagues

5. I tried to spend more time with a wide variety of people at work so that everyone would know how great I am

6. I made efforts to get to know other people at work better because I want others to admire me

Prevention-focused Relationship Dark Job Crafting

7. I minimized my interactions with people at work that I did not get along with because I won't be able to influence them to do what I want
8. I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people because that doesn't help me in the long run

9. I minimized my interactions with people at work that I did not get along with so to avoid conflict with them in case I wanted to use them in the future

10. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because those people are easier to manipulate

11. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because I want influence over the people I interact with

12. I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people because I don't want them to know my secrets

13. I tried to avoid situations at work where I had to meet new people unless I think I can influence them

Prevention-focused Task Dark Job Crafting

14. I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on in order to focus on my own interests instead

15. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because I don't need anyone's approval

16. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because I don't gain anything from doing the task

17. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on so that I can direct others to do tasks for me

18. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on in order to focus on my own interests
19. I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on by convincing my coworkers to do them for me

Promotion-focused Task Dark Job Crafting

20. I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work in order to increase my importance

21. I actively took on more tasks in my work because I want more attention

22. I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging because I want to seem superior to my colleagues

23. I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence in order to gain attention from my supervisor

24. I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work because I want to appear more competent than my colleagues

Promotion-focused Task Bright Job Crafting

1. I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging because I want to be able to help my organization

2. I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence because I have the skills to help

3. I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence in order to do better work

4. I changed my tasks so that they were more challenging because I think it will help my team
5. I increased the number of difficult decisions I made in my work in order to become an asset to the organization

6. I added complexity to my tasks by changing their structure or sequence so that I could help other people complete their tasks on time

---

Promotion-focused Relationship Bright Job Crafting

7. I actively sought to meet new people at work because I want others to be able to depend on me

8. I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them because I value others

9. I tried to spend more time with a wide variety of people at work because I want people to know they can count on me

10. I made efforts to get to know other people at work better so that people can depend on me

11. I actively sought to meet new people at work so that I can be more efficient at my job with teamwork

12. I sought to interact with other people at work, regardless of how well I knew them so that I can be a proactive member of the company

---

Prevention-focused Task Relationship Job Crafting

13. I actively reduced the scope of tasks I worked on to make it more likely that I'll complete all of my tasks on time
14. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because they were detracting from me achieving my goals

15. I tried to simplify some of the tasks that I worked on because they were causing distractions from other work

16. I sought to make some of my work mentally less intense to make sure I could get everything done

17. I sought to make some of my work mentally less intense so that I could be more dependable in completing my tasks

Prevention-focused Relationship Bright Job Crafting

18. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with so that we could complete more work

19. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with because satisfaction within a group will help us work faster and better

20. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with to create a more positive atmosphere at work

21. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with so that I could avoid social conflict

22. I changed my work so that I only interacted with people that I felt good about working with in order to create a dependable work team