

The Formation and Impact Mechanisms of Team Job Crafting

Authors: Wang Zhen, Wang Zhen

Date: 2019-12-25T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Team job crafting represents a critical factor influencing team effectiveness. Drawing upon work design theory and team operation models, this study proposes a theoretical model delineating the antecedents and consequences of team job crafting, aiming to establish a logical network of relationships. First, the concept and connotation of team job crafting are analyzed, and the dimensions of measurement instruments are explored. Subsequently, from a multi-level analytical perspective, the influences of leadership behavior, job characteristics, team personality composition, and human resource management systems on team job crafting are examined, together with the mediating role of team proactive motivational states. Finally, the mechanisms through which team job crafting impacts team effectiveness are analyzed.

Full Text

The Antecedents and Outcomes of Team Job Crafting

WANG Zhen

School of Labor and Human Resources, Renmin University of China, Beijing, 100872, China

Abstract

Team job crafting is a critical factor influencing team effectiveness. Based on job design theory and team dynamic models, this paper proposes a theoretical model of the antecedents and consequences of team job crafting, aiming to establish a nomological network for this construct. First, we analyze the conceptualization and measurement dimensions of team job crafting. Then, from a multilevel perspective, we examine how leadership behaviors, job characteristics, team personality composition, and human resource management systems influence team job crafting, with team proactive motivation serving as a mediator.

Finally, we analyze the mechanisms through which team job crafting affects team effectiveness.

Keywords: team job crafting; team proactive motivation; team effectiveness; job design

1. Introduction

With the rapid development of information technology and deepening economic globalization, environmental complexity continues to intensify, placing higher demands on organizational adaptability. Enterprises must swiftly transform management practices and continuously develop high-quality new products and services to establish competitive advantages. This requires not only wisdom and insight from management but also the full mobilization of employee and team proactivity [?]. Meanwhile, as socio-economic conditions evolve, Chinese employees' educational levels and autonomy needs have risen substantially, altering their value judgments about work. Employees increasingly desire jobs that align with their interests, leverage their strengths, and fulfill personal value aspirations [?]. Chinese organizations must respond to these trends by paying greater attention to employee needs and stimulating work motivation to achieve organizational performance [?].

In organizational management, work design has long been used to enhance employee motivation and improve individual, team, and organizational performance [?]. Work design primarily concerns how organizations structure, formulate, and modify jobs, tasks, and roles to generate positive impacts on individuals, groups, and organizations [?]. However, traditional work design adopts a top-down approach with limited employee participation, failing to fully leverage employee proactivity [?]. Moreover, work design applications target all employees in a position without considering individual suitability [?]. Most work design models also demand substantial managerial time for employee support, yet managers rarely have sufficient time for sustained, high-quality work design [?]. As environments and job content change rapidly and employee autonomy increases, the effectiveness of traditional work design faces significant challenges [?]. To address these dynamic work environments, employees' personal initiative must be harnessed to spontaneously modify job characteristics, thereby improving performance and satisfaction. Consequently, Wrzesniewski and Dutton [?] introduced the concept of job crafting, defined as employees' self-initiated behaviors to make physical or cognitive changes in their task and relational boundaries.

Over the past decade, research on job crafting has produced substantial theoretical and empirical contributions regarding its conceptualization, antecedents, and outcomes [?, ?, ?]. However, this research has predominantly focused on the individual level, with team job crafting receiving scant attention [?, ?]. Team job crafting (or collaborative job crafting) refers to team members collectively determining changes to work content or methods through close collaboration and

communication [?]. Compared to the comprehensive body of individual-level research, only a handful of empirical studies have examined team job crafting [?, ?, ?]. Researchers have yet to adequately investigate its conceptualization, measurement, antecedents, and mechanisms. This research gap urgently needs addressing, as systematic investigation of team job crafting is warranted from both practical and theoretical perspectives.

First, team job crafting is a common organizational phenomenon. Teams have become fundamental work units in modern organizations, enabling complex tasks, increasing flexibility, and improving overall performance [?]. In practice, employees rarely work in complete isolation and typically collaborate to complete tasks, meaning individual job crafting behaviors affect colleagues' work. Consequently, employees must discuss crafting approaches with others rather than considering only personal preferences [?]. Thus, team job crafting is prevalent in organizational settings.

Second, team job crafting may better serve organizational needs. Team job crafting differs from individual job crafting and is not simply the sum of individual crafting behaviors [?]. Individual job crafting is employee-driven, aiming to achieve better person-job fit and personal meaning. However, its self-serving nature may negatively impact the collective when personal and organizational goals conflict [?]. In contrast, team job crafting involves the entire team collectively changing work boundaries, better serving overall team interests [?]. Therefore, team job crafting aligns with organizational needs and achieves a better balance between organizational and individual interests.

Third, team job crafting represents a frontier in team research. As task complexity and environmental uncertainty increase, organizations require teams to demonstrate initiative and proactivity [?]. Team job crafting has become an important means to stimulate team vitality and enhance performance. However, Oldham and Hackman [?] note that “when work design is ill-suited for teamwork—for instance, when team tasks are poorly designed or teams lack adequate support—teams often still accept and passively execute” these designs, negatively impacting team and organizational performance. Thus, examining the formation and effects of team job crafting is essential.

Overall, research on team job crafting remains in its infancy. This study focuses on team job crafting to conduct systematic investigation. We first analyze its conceptualization and develop corresponding measurement tools. Then, based on team dynamic models and using a combination of longitudinal and cross-sectional designs from a multilevel perspective, we examine how leadership behaviors, job characteristics, team personality composition, and human resource management systems influence team job crafting, exploring the mediating role of team proactive motivation. Finally, we analyze the mechanisms through which team job crafting affects team effectiveness, thereby establishing a nomological network. The findings will contribute significantly to work design and team research while providing practical guidance for building high-performance teams.

2.1 The Conceptualization of Job Crafting

The conceptualization of job crafting has been subject to debate, primarily divided into North American and European schools. The North American school, represented by Wrzesniewski and Dutton [?], grounded in role theory, originally defined job crafting as employees' self-initiated physical or cognitive changes to their task and relational boundaries. They identified three dimensions: (1) **task crafting**—adding, dropping, expanding, or narrowing tasks or changing work methods; (2) **relational crafting**—changing the quality and quantity of interpersonal relationships inside and outside the organization; and (3) **cognitive crafting**—altering perceptions and value judgments about work.

The European school, represented by Tims and Bakker [?], based on the Job Demands-Resources model [?], defines job crafting as behavioral changes employees make to balance job demands and resources according to their abilities and preferences. Tims and Bakker [?] identified three types: increasing job resources, decreasing job demands when they exceed capacity, and increasing job demands when employees seek more challenge. Later, Tims et al. [?] further distinguished four dimensions through factor analysis: increasing structural job resources, increasing social job resources, increasing challenging job demands, and decreasing hindering job demands.

Recently, researchers have sought to integrate these perspectives, proposing that promotion-prevention regulatory focus theory or approach-avoidance motivation theory could serve as an integrative framework [?, ?]. These theoretical lenses offer a solid foundation for integration. For instance, Bruning and Campion [?] categorized job crafting into approach and avoidance forms. In a meta-analysis, Lichtenthaler and Fischbach [?] distinguished promotion-focused and prevention-focused job crafting. Similarly, Zhang and Parker [?] and Bindl et al. [?] adopted regulatory focus theory to differentiate promotion-focused and prevention-focused job crafting. Given these conceptual controversies, adopting a new framework for integration is necessary, with regulatory focus theory providing a promising direction.

2.2 Antecedents and Outcomes of Job Crafting

Antecedents of job crafting can be categorized into four types: individual differences, job characteristics, motivation, and external social contextual factors [?]. Regarding individual differences, promotion regulatory focus positively correlates with promotion-focused job crafting [?, ?]. A meta-analysis by Rudolph et al. [?] revealed that proactive personality, extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness positively relate to promotion-focused job crafting. For job characteristics, job autonomy, job enlargement, career development opportunities, task identity, task significance, and leader support all positively correlate with promotion-focused job crafting [?]. In terms of contextual variables, high-commitment human resource management systems (e.g., extensive training, empowerment, decision participation) positively relate to promotion-focused job

crafting [?]. Leadership behavior also emerges as an important contextual factor, with empowering leadership, servant leadership, and employee-oriented leadership all positively associated with promotion-focused job crafting [?].

Research on prevention-focused job crafting shows that proactive personality, conscientiousness, openness, work engagement, and job autonomy negatively correlate with it, while prevention regulatory focus, neuroticism, and burnout positively correlate [?, ?, ?]. Importantly, promotion-focused and prevention-focused job crafting are not opposite ends of a single continuum but independent types. Consequently, some variables positively influence both, including agreeableness, promotion focus, prevention focus, and directive leadership [?, ?].

Outcomes of job crafting fall into four categories: individual attitudes, behaviors, well-being, and other indicators [?]. Empirical research demonstrates that promotion-focused job crafting positively correlates with job performance, work engagement, job satisfaction, subjective well-being, and positive affect, while negatively correlating with burnout, depression, and physical illness [?, ?]. Career development research further shows positive relationships with employability, career competence, career satisfaction, and objective promotion [?]. Conversely, prevention-focused job crafting negatively correlates with work engagement and job satisfaction while positively correlating with work stress [?]. Longitudinal research by Petrou and Demerouti [?] reveals interactive effects between prevention-focused job crafting and emotional exhaustion. Additionally, Demerouti, Bakker, and Halbesleben [?] find that prevention-focused job crafting, by reducing job demands, can undermine performance. Meta-analytic results confirm negative relationships with performance and positive relationships with turnover intentions [?].

Overall, research on job crafting antecedents and outcomes is well-established. However, most studies examine only direct relationships, leaving deeper mediating mechanisms unexplored. Additionally, most research relies on cross-sectional designs, limiting causal inference. Reviewing Chinese job crafting research reveals that while some scholars have begun investigating the topic, most studies remain limited to introducing and reviewing foreign research, with relatively few empirical studies examining mechanisms within the Chinese organizational context.

2.3 Current State of Team Job Crafting Research

Team job crafting is a relatively new concept in job crafting research, though the phenomenon was recognized early. When Wrzesniewski and Dutton [?] introduced job crafting, they primarily referred to individual behavior but acknowledged that work involves interaction and collaboration with others. Thus, individual job crafting inherently affects workplace colleagues. Leana et al. [?] subsequently introduced collaborative job crafting, defined as team members collectively determining changes to work content or methods through close collaboration and communication. Considering social embeddedness, Leana et

al. [?] argued that team members share contexts, similar tasks, common experiences, and knowledge exchange, leading them to collaboratively craft task, relational, or cognitive boundaries. Subsequent scholars used different labels, such as Tims et al. [?], who termed it team job crafting and operationalized it as four team-level behaviors: increasing structural resources, increasing social resources, increasing challenging demands, and decreasing hindering demands. Drawing on prior research, we adopt the term team job crafting, defining it as team members' collective physical or cognitive changes to their team's task and relational boundaries.

Only a few scholars have studied team job crafting. Leana et al. [?] pioneered the concept and conducted empirical research with 62 early childhood education centers and 232 teachers, demonstrating that team job crafting and individual job crafting are distinct concepts. They found positive relationships between work decision autonomy and team job crafting, and between team job crafting and team performance, satisfaction, and commitment. While this study defined team job crafting and expanded its scope, it did not deeply examine its drivers and had limited generalizability due to the specialized sample of preschool teachers.

Tims et al. [?], based on 54 teams, found that team job crafting positively related to team performance, with team work engagement mediating this relationship. Team job crafting influenced individual job crafting, which in turn affected individual work engagement and performance. Mäkikangas, Aunola, Seppälä, and Hakonen [?] used the same scale with Finnish teams, finding that team job crafting positively related to team performance and moderated the relationship between individual work engagement and perceived team performance. However, some items in Tims et al.'s [?] scale inadequately capture the core feature of team job crafting—collective communication and boundary changes.

McClelland et al. [?] studied 242 call center teams, finding team job crafting opportunities even in low-control environments. Team job crafting positively correlated with member work engagement and team performance, influencing team control, interdependence, and collective efficacy, which subsequently affected member engagement and team performance. However, this study used cross-sectional design, limiting causal inference.

Research on antecedents of team job crafting is even scarcer. Mäkikangas, Bakker, and Schaufeli [?] used diary methods to examine daily team job crafting antecedents. They found that at the within-team level, team work self-efficacy and positive affect positively related to daily team job crafting; at the between-team and within-team levels, supportive climate and relational leadership positively related to daily team job crafting. However, their sample of female-dominated rehabilitation teams lacked sufficient between-team variance, rendering between-team effects non-significant.

2.4 Current Research Gaps

Overall, team job crafting research remains in its infancy with several unresolved issues. First, the conceptual operationalization of team job crafting needs clarification, including its dimensional structure. Current measurement tools are inadequate, with high sample specificity making them difficult to apply to general organizational teams. Some measures simply adapt individual-level questionnaires to the team level without systematic development and validation.

Second, the formation mechanisms of team job crafting remain unclear, with deep mediating mechanisms unexplored. Few studies have examined antecedents, and those that do focus only on simple direct relationships. The deep mediating mechanisms through which team composition, job characteristics, and leadership behaviors influence team job crafting remain largely unexamined. Cross-level studies examining organizational factors' influence on team job crafting are virtually nonexistent.

Third, the effect mechanisms of team job crafting are insufficiently understood. Previous outcome research is limited and predominantly cross-sectional. While these studies attempt to demonstrate mechanisms, their causal inferences are weak. Scholars have called for longitudinal research to control for common method variance and better establish causality. Thus, longitudinal methods represent a future priority for team job crafting research.

This study systematically investigates team job crafting by first analyzing its conceptualization and developing measurement tools. Based on team dynamic models and using a combination of longitudinal and cross-sectional designs from a multilevel perspective, we examine how leadership behaviors, job characteristics, team personality composition, and organizational HR systems influence team job crafting, exploring the mediating role of team proactive motivation. We then analyze how team job crafting affects team effectiveness, establishing a comprehensive nomological network. The findings will significantly contribute to work design and team research while providing practical guidance for building high-performance teams.

3. Research Framework

This study focuses on analyzing the conceptualization, antecedents, and outcomes of team job crafting to establish its nomological network. The research comprises three studies: Study 1 examines the conceptualization and develops a valid measurement tool; Study 2 investigates formation mechanisms from multiple levels (leadership, composition, job characteristics, HR systems) and the mediating role of team proactive states; Study 3 examines effect mechanisms using longitudinal designs.

3.1 Conceptualization and Measurement of Team Job Crafting

Job crafting research features two main schools—North American and European—with distinct conceptualizations and measures [?]. Leana et al. [?] focused on task crafting, viewing job crafting as individually-driven proactive behavior while acknowledging that team members influence each other and collaboratively decide work changes. In their study, individual and collaborative job crafting items were identical except for subject wording. However, their scale excluded relational and cognitive crafting and had strong industry limitations. Tims et al. [?] conceptualized team job crafting as collective changes to team job resources and demands, including increasing structural resources, increasing social resources, increasing challenging demands, and decreasing hindering demands. Their 8-item scale (two items per dimension) yielded two factors via factor analysis: one combining increased structural/social resources and challenging demands, and another for decreased hindering demands.

Recently, researchers have sought to integrate these perspectives using promotion-prevention regulatory focus theory or approach-avoidance motivation theory as an integrative framework [?, ?]. These theoretical lenses provide a solid foundation for integration. Early on, Wrzesniewski and Dutton [?] noted that job crafting includes both expansion and reduction activities. Subsequently, Tims et al. [?] proposed four dimensions, with increasing resources and challenging demands representing promotion-focused crafting, and decreasing hindering demands representing prevention-focused crafting. Recent work has further developed this framework [?, ?, ?, ?].

Regulatory focus represents how individuals approach goals and potential threats, influencing preferences and choices [?, ?]. It comprises two motivational systems: promotion focus (emphasizing nurturance, growth, and achievement) and prevention focus (emphasizing protection, safety, and responsibility) [?]. While initially an individual-level theory, regulatory focus has been successfully applied to team-level phenomena [?]. Drawing on individual-level research that distinguishes promotion- and prevention-focused job crafting [?], this study categorizes team job crafting into promotion-focused and prevention-focused types. Promotion-focused team job crafting includes increasing job resources and challenging demands, while prevention-focused team job crafting includes decreasing hindering demands. Following individual-level research, we treat these as independent variables rather than opposite ends of a continuum [?], allowing for configurations where both are high, both are low, or one is high while the other is low.

3.2 Antecedent Mechanisms of Team Job Crafting

According to the IMOI (Input-Mediator-Outcome-Input) team dynamic model, individual-, team-, and organizational-level inputs influence team outputs through team mediating processes [?]. Inputs include team member char-

acteristics, team task features, and leadership styles at the team level, and HR management systems and organizational climate at the organizational level. Mediators include team processes, emergent states, and hybrid variables that transform inputs into outputs such as team performance, innovation, and viability [?]. Team job crafting—collective changes to team task and relational boundaries—represents such a mediating process influenced by inputs and affecting outputs. For instance, Leana et al. [?] examined how task interdependence, supportive leadership, and autonomy influenced collaborative job crafting and subsequent team performance. Tims et al. [?] and McClelland et al. [?] investigated team job crafting’s effects on team performance. Thus, team job crafting mediates the relationship between team inputs and outputs.

The IMO model identifies leadership behavior, team task characteristics, and team personality composition as typical inputs. Additionally, because teams are nested in organizations, management systems significantly influence team processes [?]. Therefore, this study examines how transformational and transactional leadership, team task characteristics (autonomy, interdependence), team personality composition (regulatory focus, proactive personality), and collaborative HR systems influence team job crafting.

To deepen understanding of job crafting formation mechanisms, we introduce the proactive motivation perspective. Job crafting represents proactive change in work design [?]. While most antecedent research examines direct effects, deep mediating mechanisms remain unexplored, particularly at the team level. We apply proactive motivation theory [?], which has recently been extended to explain team-level proactivity [?]. We examine how team proactive motivation states mediate relationships between inputs and team job crafting.

3.2.1 Leadership and Team Job Crafting

We propose that transformational and transactional leadership influence both promotion- and prevention-focused team job crafting. Transformational leaders articulate organizational vision, inspire work motivation, encourage pursuit of higher-level goals beyond self-interest, and promote novel perspectives [?]. Driven by promotion focus, they enact change agent roles, encouraging teams to experiment, grow, and improve [?, ?, ?]. Under such leadership, teams are more likely to set high goals, seek opportunities and challenges, expand task scope, and secure resources—exhibiting more promotion-focused team job crafting.

Conversely, transactional leaders clarify roles, establish goals, and monitor behavior through rewards and punishments to ensure compliance [?]. Driven by prevention focus, they enact supervisory roles emphasizing duty fulfillment and norm adherence, encouraging stability and safety [?, ?, ?]. Under transactional leadership, teams are more likely to set modest goals, reduce job demands, narrow work scope, and avoid challenges—exhibiting more prevention-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 1a: Team leaders' transformational leadership is positively related to promotion-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 1b: Team leaders' transactional leadership is positively related to prevention-focused team job crafting.

3.2.2 Team Member Regulatory Focus, Proactive Personality, and Team Job Crafting

Drawing on regulatory focus theory, we examine team personality composition effects. Team job crafting is a proactive team behavior, making team proactive personality composition relevant. Team personality composition can be calculated via mean levels and variability. While mean levels and variability may interact, prior literature has not addressed this topic. As an exploratory study, we first examine mean-level effects, with variability and interactions to be examined in subsequent phases. For model parsimony, we focus on mean-level effects.

Regulatory focus, concerning fundamental needs and goals, likely influences job crafting behavior. Brenninkmeijer and Hekkert-Koning [?] found promotion focus positively related to increasing resources and challenging demands, while prevention focus positively related to decreasing hindering demands. Their study of 383 employees across occupations revealed that promotion-focused individuals, concerned with growth, show stronger work aspirations and are more likely to adjust job content for fulfillment and achievement by increasing resources and challenges. Prevention-focused individuals, concerned with safety and responsibility, are more likely to actively create opportunities to reduce hindering demands. Petrou and Demerouti [?] similarly found promotion focus related to resource seeking and challenge seeking, while prevention focus related to demand reduction. In related work, Bipp and Demerouti [?] found approach temperament related to increasing resources and challenges, while avoidance temperament related to decreasing hindering demands.

Hypothesis 2a: Team mean level of promotion focus is positively related to promotion-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 2b: Team mean level of prevention focus is positively related to prevention-focused team job crafting.

Proactive personality reflects a stable tendency to take initiative in influencing one's environment [?]. Proactive employees actively create more favorable work conditions, balancing work environments with personal needs and abilities, and exhibit more job crafting behaviors [?]. When proactive individuals encounter factors that hinder efficiency or performance, they are more likely to make changes and take crafting actions until successful [?]. Bateman and Crant [?] found proactive employees less constrained by environments and more innovative. This innovative behavior represents active participation in making work changes, as they continuously explore new approaches and more easily identify and act on crafting opportunities.

Hypothesis 3a: Team mean level of proactive personality is positively related to promotion-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 3b: Team mean level of proactive personality is negatively related to prevention-focused team job crafting.

3.2.3 Job Characteristics and Team Job Crafting

Team task characteristics also influence team job crafting. We focus on team job autonomy and task interdependence. Job autonomy refers to freedom in scheduling work and determining work methods [?]. Greater autonomy creates more job crafting opportunities and enables teams to decide what to do and how based on preferences, demonstrating responsibility for improving capabilities and problem-solving, thereby exhibiting more team job crafting.

Task interdependence refers to the degree of interaction required among individuals to complete work [?]. It describes relationships among members, affecting interaction, coordination needs, and social-psychological processes. In low-interdependence teams, members require minimal interaction to integrate efforts. In high-interdependence teams, members must coordinate closely to complete tasks, enhancing collaborative effectiveness and team performance. Bizzi [?] showed that employee job crafting is influenced by connected colleagues. Based on role theory, connectors communicate role expectations based on their task activities, influencing incumbents' job crafting. When task interdependence is high, team members must communicate closely and collectively discuss work changes, thereby triggering team job crafting.

Hypothesis 4: Team job autonomy is positively related to both promotion-focused and prevention-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 5: Team task interdependence is positively related to both promotion-focused and prevention-focused team job crafting.

3.2.4 Organizational Collaborative HR System and Team Job Crafting

Organizational environments can support or inhibit employee job crafting. Research indicates that supportive organizational climates foster positive work attitudes and behaviors, and perceived organizational support creates conditions for innovation beyond traditional work paradigms [?]. These factors provide a 宽松 external environment conducive to job crafting. This study focuses on how collaborative HR systems positively influence team job crafting.

Lepak and Snell [?] proposed four HR system types: commitment-based, market-based, control-based, and collaborative. Collaborative HR systems emphasize developing employees' collaborative capabilities and teamwork skills, incorporating practices across job design, selection, training, performance evaluation, and compensation that foster cooperative relationships and team building. Collaborative HR management develops internal human capital for teamwork and cross-functional collaboration, promoting knowledge flow and organizational innovation. As a formal management mechanism, collaborative HR practices fa-

facilitate cooperative relationships, encouraging mutual support, trust, information sharing, and employee participation [?]. Implementing collaborative HR practices promotes employee interaction, mobilizes knowledge and skills, and facilitates information and resource sharing within teams, thereby influencing team job crafting.

Hypothesis 6a: Organizational collaborative HR system is positively related to promotion-focused team job crafting.

Hypothesis 6b: Organizational collaborative HR system is positively related to prevention-focused team job crafting.

3.2.5 Mediating Role of Team Proactive Motivation

Researchers conceptualize job crafting as proactive behavior [?, ?]. At the individual level, antecedents are categorized as distal (individual differences, job characteristics, leadership) and proximal (proactive motivation) [?]. Proactive motivation theory proposes that proactive motivation mediates between distal antecedents and job crafting. Based on proactive motivation theory [?], research shows that employees' "can do" (general self-efficacy, core self-evaluation), "reason to" (organizational embeddedness, affective commitment), and "energized to" (work engagement, workaholism) motivations predict job crafting [?, ?, ?, ?].

Recently, team proactivity has become a research frontier [?], with team job crafting representing a specific form of team proactive behavior [?]. Proactivity researchers argue that proactive motivation theory similarly explains team-level proactive behavior, with team proactive motivation states serving as proximal mediators between distal antecedents and team proactive behavior [?]. At the team level, Cai et al. [?] identified distal antecedents including leadership, personality traits, task characteristics, and HR systems—aligning closely with our antecedents.

Similar to the individual level, team proactive motivation states include "can do," "reason to," and "energized to" [?]. **Team collective efficacy**—shared beliefs about the team's capability to succeed—represents the "can do" motivation. **Team identification**—recognition of belonging to a team and its emotional/value significance—represents the "reason to" motivation, as high identification leads members to internalize team norms and values, prompting proactive behavior. **Team positive affective tone**—consistent positive emotions among members—represents the "energized to" motivation [?]. Based on the team proactive motivation model, these states mediate between distal antecedents and team job crafting [?, ?]. Given the numerous antecedents and three motivation states, we present a general hypothesis for parsimony, with specific relationships to be tested in full.

Hypothesis 7: Team proactive motivation states mediate the relationships between team leadership behaviors, team job characteristics, team personality composition, and collaborative HR systems and team job crafting.

3.3 Mechanisms Linking Team Job Crafting to Team Effectiveness

While team job crafting differs structurally from individual job crafting, they may share functional consistency with similar outcomes and mechanisms at their respective levels [?]. In team research, team effectiveness is a key outcome [?], comprising team performance and member affective quality [?]. Team performance refers to goal achievement, while affective quality includes member satisfaction and team viability [?]. This study examines team performance and member satisfaction as outcomes, with team work engagement and team cohesion as mediators.

Team work engagement refers to a shared positive, fulfilling, work-related state comprising vigor, dedication, and absorption, emerging through member interaction and shared experiences [?]. Tims et al. [?] found that team job crafting positively related to team performance, with team work engagement mediating this relationship. Mäkikangas et al. [?] replicated these findings and showed that team job crafting moderated the relationship between individual work engagement and perceived team performance. McClelland et al. [?] found that team job crafting influenced team control, interdependence, and collective efficacy, which affected member engagement and team performance. Based on the JD-R model, promotion-focused team job crafting provides more structural and social resources and opportunities, benefiting team work engagement. Prevention-focused team job crafting represents contraction—reducing demands, lowering goals, and acquiring fewer resources—thereby harming team work engagement.

Hypothesis 8a: Promotion-focused team job crafting is positively related to team work engagement.

Hypothesis 8b: Team work engagement mediates the relationship between promotion-focused team job crafting and team performance.

Hypothesis 8c: Team work engagement mediates the relationship between promotion-focused team job crafting and team member satisfaction.

Hypothesis 9a: Prevention-focused team job crafting is negatively related to team work engagement.

Hypothesis 9b: Team work engagement mediates the relationship between prevention-focused team job crafting and team performance.

Hypothesis 9c: Team work engagement mediates the relationship between prevention-focused team job crafting and team member satisfaction.

Team cohesion refers to the dynamic process of members uniting to pursue common goals and tasks, reflecting integrated beliefs about shared goals and values, willingness to help the team, and mutual attraction [?]. As a crucial team characteristic and strong predictor of team behavior, cohesion profoundly impacts team operations and performance. High-cohesion teams share features like “tight-knit group” and “sense of us.” Through team job crafting, members extend task boundaries, facilitating smoother collaboration, easier communication,

and more efficient teamwork, strengthening commitment [?]. Team job crafting promotes interaction, work support, and high-quality relationships, fostering trust, respect, and positive cohesion. High-cohesion teams demonstrate higher performance and satisfaction [?, ?]. Both promotion- and prevention-focused team job crafting involve close communication and coordination, differing only in direction of change, so both should positively relate to team cohesion.

Hypothesis 10a: Promotion-focused team job crafting is positively related to team cohesion.

Hypothesis 10b: Team cohesion mediates the relationship between promotion-focused team job crafting and team performance.

Hypothesis 10c: Team cohesion mediates the relationship between promotion-focused team job crafting and team member satisfaction.

Hypothesis 11a: Prevention-focused team job crafting is positively related to team cohesion.

Hypothesis 11b: Team cohesion mediates the relationship between prevention-focused team job crafting and team performance.

Hypothesis 11c: Team cohesion mediates the relationship between prevention-focused team job crafting and team member satisfaction.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton [?] view job crafting as a dynamic, ongoing reconstruction process. Team work engagement and team cohesion are emergent states that also change over time [?]. Therefore, reciprocal relationships may exist between team job crafting and these states. The IMO model suggests that previous team interaction outcomes influence subsequent team processes, creating spiral interactions [?]. Team job crafting may enhance team work engagement and cohesion, which in turn influence subsequent job crafting. Bakker et al. [?] found reciprocal effects between job crafting and work engagement. In high-cohesion teams with shared values and goals, members trust and support each other, facilitating active sharing of experiences, skills, and knowledge, which promotes team job crafting.

Hypothesis 12a: Over time, promotion-focused team job crafting and team work engagement exhibit a spiraling reciprocal positive relationship.

Hypothesis 12b: Over time, promotion-focused team job crafting and team cohesion exhibit a spiraling reciprocal positive relationship.

Hypothesis 13a: Over time, prevention-focused team job crafting and team work engagement exhibit a spiraling reciprocal negative relationship.

Hypothesis 13b: Over time, prevention-focused team job crafting and team cohesion exhibit a spiraling reciprocal positive relationship.

4. Theoretical Framework

This study focuses on team job crafting as a team process variable. Team job crafting is the team-level counterpart of individual job crafting but differs substantially from simple aggregation. It is a common organizational phenomenon that may better serve organizational needs and represents a frontier in team re-

search [?, ?]. However, compared to rich individual-level research, only a handful of empirical papers have examined team job crafting [?, ?, ?]. Researchers have inadequately investigated its conceptualization, measurement, antecedents, and mechanisms. This gap urgently needs addressing from both practical and theoretical perspectives. Therefore, this study systematically examines team job crafting based on job design and team dynamic models.

[Figure 1: see original paper] Research Theoretical Model

First, we systematically examine the conceptualization and measurement of team job crafting. Previous research has primarily operated at the individual level, with conceptualizations and measures divided between North American and European schools. Team-level measurement tools are scarce, with existing measures being context-specific and difficult to apply to general organizational teams. Building on Leana et al. [?], we define team job crafting as team members' collective physical or cognitive changes to their team's task and relational boundaries.

We then introduce regulatory focus theory to differentiate dimensions. According to this theory, promotion focus emphasizes growth and achievement, while prevention focus emphasizes safety and responsibility [?]. Although originally an individual-level theory, it has been extended to team-level phenomena [?]. At the individual level, research supports distinguishing promotion- and prevention-focused job crafting [?, ?]. Based on regulatory focus theory, we categorize team job crafting into promotion-focused (increasing resources and challenges) and prevention-focused (decreasing hindering demands) types, treating them as independent variables [?]. We propose developing a measurement tool based on this framework and validating it through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses.

Second, we systematically examine formation mechanisms. Based on team dynamic models, we propose that antecedents include leadership behaviors (transformational and transactional), team personality composition (regulatory focus, proactive personality), team job characteristics (autonomy, interdependence), and organizational collaborative HR systems. **Transformational leadership**, driven by promotion focus, encourages experimentation and growth, leading teams to set high goals and seek challenges (promotion-focused crafting). **Transactional leadership**, driven by prevention focus, emphasizes duty fulfillment and stability, leading teams to reduce demands and avoid challenges (prevention-focused crafting).

For **team personality composition**, we propose mean-level effects. Promotion-focused individuals, concerned with growth, adjust job content to gain fulfillment by increasing resources and challenges [?]. Prevention-focused individuals, concerned with safety, actively reduce hindering demands. Thus, team mean promotion focus relates positively to promotion-focused crafting, while team mean prevention focus relates positively to prevention-focused crafting. **Proactive personality** involves actively creating favorable condi-

tions and exhibiting innovative behavior [?]. Therefore, team mean proactive personality relates positively to promotion-focused crafting and negatively to prevention-focused crafting.

Regarding **job characteristics**, greater **job autonomy** creates more crafting opportunities and enables teams to decide what and how to work based on preferences, demonstrating responsibility for improvement [?]. High **task interdependence** requires close coordination and communication about work changes, triggering team job crafting. Both should positively relate to both types of crafting.

Considering teams' nested structure, **collaborative HR systems**—which emphasize teamwork, mutual support, trust, information sharing, and employee participation [?]-promote interaction, mobilize knowledge and skills, and facilitate information and resource sharing, thereby positively influencing team job crafting.

Most antecedent research examines only direct effects, leaving mediating mechanisms unclear. We introduce **proactive motivation theory**, recently extended to team-level proactivity [?]. Compared to distal antecedents like personality and leadership, team proactive motivation is a more proximal predictor [?]. We propose that team proactive motivation states—“can do” (team collective efficacy), “reason to”(team identification), and “energized to”(team positive affective tone) [?, ?]—mediate relationships between inputs and team job crafting [?, ?].

Third, we adopt a dynamic perspective to examine team job crafting' s effects on team effectiveness. We propose that **team work engagement** and **team cohesion** mediate relationships between team job crafting and effectiveness. Additionally, as job crafting is a dynamic reconstruction process [?] and both engagement and cohesion are emergent states that change over time [?], we propose reciprocal relationships where team job crafting influences engagement and cohesion, which subsequently influence future crafting behavior.

This project offers theoretical and practical innovations. First, it addresses a research frontier. Previous job crafting research has been predominantly individual-level, with team-level research scarce despite its prevalence and importance [?]. This study makes cutting-edge contributions to both job crafting and team process research. Second, it introduces team proactivity perspectives. Proactivity scholars have increasingly recognized the value of team-level proactivity [?], and team job crafting represents a specific form. Examining team proactive motivation states deepens understanding of formation mechanisms. Third, practically, this project will provide effective management policies and recommendations for Chinese organizations to improve work design, enhance team management, and build positive leadership-team relationships. The findings will offer valuable references for establishing sound team management systems and building high-performance organizations in China.

References

- Hou, X., Li, Y., & Tu, Y. (2014). Development of a new generation' s work values scale and its impact on performance. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 46(6), 823-840.
- Hu, R., & Tian, X. (2015). Reconstructing work identity and meaning: A review of job crafting research. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 37(10), 69-81.
- Liu, S., Feng, J., & Wang, H. (2016). A study on the relationship between employee network embeddedness and extra-role behavior based on collaborative HR practices. *Chinese Journal of Management*, 13(11), 1641-1647.
- Tian, Q., & Guan, H. (2017). The work design revolution: Progress and prospects in job crafting research. *Human Resources Development of China*, 34(3), 6-17.
- Tian, X., Peng, X., & Guo, X. (2017). Job crafting interventions: Concept, design, and effects. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 39(12), 112-126.
- Wang, Y., Jiang, X., & Tian, S. (2019). How do teams self-organize and adapt? Concept, measurement, antecedents, and consequences of team job crafting. *Human Resources Development of China*, 36(6), 62-78.
- Zhang, C., Wei, J., Chen, X., & Zhang, J. (2012). A new perspective on job design: Employee job crafting. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 20(8), 1305-1313.
- Zhang, H., Li, W., & Lang, Y. (2019). The application of regulatory focus in leadership from a paradox perspective. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 27(4), 711-725.
- Zhou, R., Long, L., & Zhang, J. (2018). Self-sacrificial leadership and team performance: The roles of cohesion, psychological capital, and psychological entitlement. *Science of Science and Management of S.&T.*, 39(8), 145-160.
- Akkermans, J., & Tims, M. (2017). Crafting your career: How career competencies relate to career success via job crafting. *Applied Psychology*, 66(1), 168-195.
- Bakker, A., Albrecht, S., & Leiter, M. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20, 4-28.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40.

- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 103-118.
- Bindl, U. K., Unsworth, K. L., Gibson, C. B., & Stride, C. B. (2019). Job crafting revisited: Implications of an extended framework for active changes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000362>
- Bipp, T., & Demerouti, E. (2015). Which employees craft their jobs and how? Basic dimensions of personality and employees' job crafting behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 631-655.
- Bizzi, L. (2017). Network characteristics: When an individual' s job crafting depends on the jobs of others. *Human Relations*, 70(4), 436-460.
- Brenninkmeijer, V., & Hekkert-Koning, M. (2015). To craft or not to craft: The relationships between regulatory focus, job crafting and work outcomes. *Career Development International*, 20(2), 147-162.
- Bruning, P., & Champion, M. (2018). A role-resource approach-avoidance model of job crafting: A multi-method integration and extension of job crafting theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 499-522.
- Cai, Z., Parker, S. K., Chen, Z., & Lam, W. (2019). How does the social context fuel the proactive fire? A multi-level review and theoretical synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40, 209-230.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 457-469.
- Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 317-375.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hakanen, J., Peeters, M., & Schaufeli, W. (2018). Different types of employee well-being across time and their relationships with job crafting. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 23(2), 289-301.
- Harris, T. B., & Kirkman, B. L. (2017). Teams and proactivity. In U. Bindl & S. Parker (Eds.), *Proactivity at Work: Making Things Happen in Organizations* (pp. 530-558). New York: Routledge.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52(12), 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social*

Psychology (Vol. 30, pp. 1-46). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Johnson, P. D., Smith, M. B., Wallace, J. C., Hill, A. D., & Baron, R. A. (2015). A review of multilevel regulatory focus in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 41, 1501-1529.

Kark, R., & Van Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 500-528.

Kark, R., Dijk, D. V., & Vashdi, D. R. (2018). Motivated or demotivated to be creative: The role of self-regulatory focus in transformational and transactional leadership processes. *Applied Psychology*, 67(1), 186-224.

Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(6), 1169-1192.

Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (2002). Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 28, 517-543.

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.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854-864.

Mäkikangas, A., Aunola, K., Seppälä, P., & Hakanen, J. (2016). Work engagement-team performance relationship: Shared job crafting as a moderator. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89, 772-790.

Mäkikangas, A., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Antecedents of daily team job crafting. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 26(3), 421-433.

Mathieu, J. E., Hollenbeck, J. R., Knippenberg, D., & Ilgen, D. R. (2017). A century of work teams in the Journal of Applied Psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 452-467.

Mathieu, J. E., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 410-476.

McClelland, G. P., Leach, D. J., Clegg, C. W., & McGowan, I. (2014). Collaborative crafting in call center teams. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(3), 464-486.

- Meijerink, J. G., Bos-Nehles, A. C., & de Leede, J. (2018). How employees' pro-activity translates high-commitment HRM systems into work engagement: The mediating role of job crafting. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1475402>
- Oldham, G. R., & Fried, Y. (2016). Job design research and theory: Past, present and future. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, 136, 20-35.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 463-479.
- Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 827-856.
- Parker, S. K., & Bindl, U. K. (2017). Proactivity at work: A big picture perspective on a construct that matters. In S. K. Parker & U. K. Bindl (Eds.), *Proactivity at Work: Making Things Happen in Organisations* (pp. 20-44). London, UK: Routledge.
- Parker, S. K., Morgeson, F. P., & Johns, G. (2017). One hundred years of work design research: Looking back and looking forward. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102, 403-420.
- Petrou, P., & Demerouti, E. (2015). Trait-level and week-level regulatory focus as a motivation to craft a job. *Career Development International*, 20(2), 102-118.
- Plomp, J., Tims, M., Akkermans, J., Khapova, S., Jansen, P., & Bakker, A. (2016). Career competencies and job crafting: How proactive employees influence their well-being. *Career Development International*, 21(6), 587-602.
- Rudolph, C., Katz, I., Lavigne, K., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 102, 112-138.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1-9.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1), 173-186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., Derks, D., & Van Rhenen, W. (2013). Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(4), 427-454.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2015). Examining job crafting from an interpersonal perspective: Is employee job crafting related to the wellbeing of colleagues? *Applied Psychology*, 64(4), 727-753.

Wageman, R. (1995). Interdependence and group effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(1), 145-180.

Wang, H. J., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). A review of job crafting research: The role of leader behaviors in cultivating successful job crafters. In S. K. Parker & U. K. Bindl (Eds.), *Proactivity at Work: Making Things Happen in Organizations* (pp. 77-104). London, UK: Routledge.

Webber, S., & Donahue, L. (2001). Impact of highly and less job-related diversity on work group cohesion and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 27(2), 141-162.

Wu, C., & Wang, Z. (2015). How transformational leadership shapes team proactivity: The mediating role of positive affective tone and the moderating role of team task variety. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 19(3), 137-151.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179-201.

Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. *Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology*, 1, 281-302.

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.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.