PRZEGLĄD PSYCHOLOGICZNY – THE REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY
2025, TOM 68, NR 1, 149–170
DOI: 10.31648/przegldpsychologiczny.11719

The Relationship Between Promotion and Prevention Regulatory Focus and Job Crafting: The Mediating Role of Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance

Zofia Kabzińska[1]
University of Łódź, Institute of Psychology
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3520-0905

Abstract

Objective: The aim of the study was to identify individual predictors of job crafting, understood as the proactive efforts of employees to modify aspects of their work. Job crafting refers to bottom-up initiatives undertaken by employees to adjust their job roles to better fit their skills, needs, and preferences. According to the adopted theoretical model, these initiatives encompass three domains: task crafting, relational crafting, and cognitive crafting.

Method: The study involved 558 employed individuals aged 18 to 76 years (M = 40.1, SD = 11.7). The following instruments were used to measure the variables: the *Job Crafting Questionnaire* by Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, adapted by Kasprzak et al.; the *Regulatory Focus Scale* (promotion and prevention) by Kolańczyk, Bąk, and Brzezińska; and the *Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance Questionnaire* by Xu and Tracey.

Results: Promotion focus, prevention focus, and motivational strength emerged as predictors of both tolerance of ambiguity and job crafting in the tested mediation models. The results also confirmed the presence of indirect effects of promotion focus, prevention focus, and motivational strength on job crafting through the mediator—ambiguity tolerance.

Conclusion: The findings contribute to a better understanding of the individual factors that facilitate job crafting. They also suggest that strengthening employees' personal resources may support effective job crafting within organizations.

Keywords: job crafting, regulatory focus, ambiguity tolerance, CDAT

[1] Correspondence address: zofia.kabzinska@now.uni.lodz.pl.

Job crafting is defined as a process in which employees proactively modify their job tasks, relationships, and perceptions of work to enhance its personal meaning and better align it with their individual needs and capabilities (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). In the context of dynamic changes in the labor market, job crafting serves as an effective strategy for enhancing work performance and coping with emerging challenges (Rudolph et al., 2017). Research indicates that job crafting contributes to higher engagement, increased job satisfaction, improved performance, and enhanced employee well-being (Amillano et al., 2024; Dubbelt et al., 2019; Lee & Lee, 2018).

The process of job crafting unfolds in three stages: the emergence of motivation for change, the identification of available opportunities, and the implementation of modifications (Berg et al., 2008). Although organizational conditions play a key role in enabling change, the initial stages of motivation and exploration are primarily shaped by individual characteristics such as proactivity, flexibility, and curiosity (Kasprzak et al., 2017).

Despite growing empirical support for the relevance of personal traits in job crafting, there remains a need to identify additional psychological resources that can explain the willingness to initiate change under conditions of uncertainty and instability.

The present study focuses on two psychological mechanisms that, although theoretically and empirically grounded, have rarely been addressed in previous job crafting research. The first is regulatory focus, a self-regulation style described in regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), which differentiates between promotion strategies (oriented toward growth and gains) and prevention strategies (focused on avoiding losses). Regulatory focus is associated with risk perception, initiative-taking, and readiness for change, making it a potentially important predictor of proactive behaviors such as job crafting (Neubert et al., 2008; Wallace et al., 2009).

The second mechanism examined is ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making situations (Xu & Tracey, 2015), conceptualized as a mediator that explains how regulatory focus influences the readiness to redefine tasks, relationships, and work perceptions. Given that job crafting requires action in the face of uncertain outcomes, the ability to function under ambiguous conditions appears to be a psychological prerequisite for initiating such behavior.

The aim of the study was to examine the relationship between regulatory focus and job crafting, taking into account the mediating role of ambiguity tolerance. Understanding these associations may expand knowledge on mechanisms of proactive work adaptation and offer valuable insights for human resource management practice.

Job Crafting

Job crafting refers to self-initiated, often informal changes introduced by employees to their tasks, professional relationships, and perceptions of work, with the aim of enhancing its meaning and satisfaction, and aligning it more

closely with their personal needs (Kapica et al., 2022). This process is rooted in individual proactive actions rather than organizational initiatives (Berg et al., 2008; Kasprzak et al., 2017; Rogala & Cieślak, 2019; Tims & Bakker, 2010).

Employees engage in job crafting to increase their sense of control, enhance self-image, strengthen social relations (Berg et al., 2013; Wrzesniewski et al., 2013), and tailor their responsibilities to individual preferences (Tims et al., 2012).

The concept was introduced by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), and over time, two main theoretical models have emerged:

1. The role-based job crafting model.
2. The resource-demand-based job crafting model.

According to the model proposed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), job crafting involves three domains: modifications in tasks (task crafting), relationships (relational crafting), and perceptions of work (cognitive crafting) (Kasprzak et al., 2017). Task and relational crafting may involve both expansion (e.g., taking on additional responsibilities) and reduction (e.g., limiting social interactions) (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019).

The model developed by Tims et al. (2012), grounded in the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Demerouti et al., 2001), conceptualizes job crafting as changes in job demands and resources. These include increasing structural and social resources, increasing challenge demands, and decreasing hindering demands. The primary goal of such actions is to improve the person–job fit (Kapica, 2021).

According to Rogala and Cieślak (2019), a key advantage of the Tims and Bakker model is its broader inclusion of job characteristics that employees can modify, as well as its consideration of organizational context and its alignment with the JD-R model. However, as noted by Kasprzak et al. (2017), the model overlooks the subjective aspect of job crafting, which may be seen as a limitation.

Given the focus on psychological resources in the present study, the Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) model was adopted.

Empirical studies have shown that job crafting contributes to increased motivation, well-being, and performance (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019), as well as higher productivity, job satisfaction, and career success (Bakker et al., 2012; Lee & Lee, 2018; Rudolph et al., 2017; Tims et al., 2013, 2015; van Wingerden et al., 2017). A meta-analysis by Rudolph et al. (2017) confirmed positive correlations between job crafting and self-esteem, job performance ratings, and contextual performance. Job crafting is also positively associated with greater work engagement (Letona-Ibañez et al., 2021; Rudolph et al., 2017; Vermooten et al., 2019), increased meaning of work (Amillano et al., 2024; Letona-Ibañez et al., 2021), life satisfaction (Pan et al., 2021; Shi et al., 2022), lower turnover intentions, and reduced job burnout (Kapica, 2021; Vermooten et al., 2019).

With regard to individual predictors of job crafting, research highlights the role of psychological capital (Park & Ha, 2025), proactive personality (Bakker et al., 2012; Rudolph et al., 2017; Tims et al., 2012), as well as self-efficacy, autonomy, and openness to change (Bizzi, 2017; Tims et al., 2014). Moreover, relationships between job crafting and regulatory style have been documented

(Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Rudolph et al., 2017). Other personal characteristics have also been linked to job crafting. Psychological resilience supports proactive behavior despite obstacles (Morales-Solis et al., 2023; Rhee et al., 2024). A developmental goal orientation is associated with the willingness to engage in actions that enhance the work environment (Bakker et al., 2012). Similarly, a strong need for achievement is positively related to frequent redefinition of tasks and professional goals (Rudolph et al., 2017). Recent research has also demonstrated that personality traits such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion are significantly associated with individual and team-level job crafting behaviors (Gori et al., 2021). In addition, psychological capital—comprising optimism, hope, resilience, and self-efficacy—has been found to not only support better job performance, but also greater engagement in job crafting (Yun et al., 2024). Readiness for change, defined as the tendency to respond flexibly to new job demands, has emerged as a significant predictor of job crafting in dynamic work environments (Sethi et al., 2023).

Given the numerous benefits associated with job crafting, deepening the understanding of psychological individual factors that promote such behaviors is essential (Son, 2024).

Regulatory Focus

The concept of self-regulation originates from Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 2012), which describes the motivational mechanisms underlying goal-directed behavior. Motivation involves the initiation and maintenance of activity aimed at achieving desired outcomes and stems from the structure of the self (Kolańczyk et al., 2013).

Two key components are central to the motivational process: (1) the goal—i.e., the anticipated outcome—and (2) self-regulation—the mechanism that guides behavior toward attaining that goal. Ideal self-standards foster a promotion-focused orientation, aimed at growth and positive outcomes, while ought self-standards support a prevention-focused orientation, centered on avoiding losses and ensuring safety (Kolańczyk et al., 2013). Individuals with a strong promotion focus pursue goals aligned with their aspirations and attend to potential gains. In contrast, individuals with a strong prevention focus set goals based on duties and safety concerns, prioritizing the avoidance of failure.

Research by Kolańczyk and colleagues (2013) has shown that promotion focus is associated with intuitive, holistic information processing and a tendency toward creative and contextual thinking. Prevention focus, in turn, is characterized by systematic, analytical processing and an emphasis on anticipating problems and minimizing risks.

According to Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 2000, 2005), the effectiveness of goal pursuit increases when an individual's regulatory focus aligns with environmental demands. The two orientations—promotion and prevention—are independent dimensions of functioning and may be activated simultaneously or selectively, depending on the context.

Promotion and prevention foci are linked to the fulfillment of different psychological needs. Promotion focus relates to the need for development, aspirations, and future-oriented goals. Prevention focus, on the other hand, is concerned with the need for safety (Higgins, 1997). As they serve distinct psychological functions, these two orientations should not be viewed as opposite ends of a continuum; rather, they constitute independent self-regulatory systems. Depending on situational factors, an individual may activate either, both, or neither orientation.

Regulatory Focus Theory has been widely applied in organizational psychology, including research on organizational citizenship behavior (Dewett & Denisi, 2007), leadership (Kark & van Dijk, 2007), attitudes toward change (Tseng & Kang, 2008), and work engagement (Bakker et al., 2008).

Studies by Brenninkmeijer and Hekkert-Koning (2015) confirmed the link between regulatory focus and job crafting as conceptualized in the Tims and Bakker (2010) model. Specifically, promotion focus was found to correlate positively with increasing job resources and taking on challenges through increasing challenge demands, whereas prevention focus was related to decreasing hindrance demands.

In their 2019 meta-analysis of 132 studies, Lichtenthaler and Fischbach applied the principles of Regulatory Focus Theory to propose an integrative conceptualization of job crafting that combines the Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) and Tims and Bakker (2010) models. They distinguished between promotion-focused job crafting (which involves increasing job resources and challenge demands, as well as task, relational, and cognitive crafting aimed at growth and expansion) and prevention-focused job crafting (which involves decreasing hindrance demands and modifying tasks and relationships with the aim of reduction). Their findings supported the validity of the proposed framework: promotion-oriented job crafting was positively associated with work engagement and negatively with burnout, whereas prevention-oriented job crafting showed the opposite pattern—negative associations with engagement and positive with burnout.

Recent research continues to highlight regulatory focus as a relevant individual resource for job crafting. For example, Chen et al. (2023) found that promotion focus fosters job crafting, while the effect of prevention focus is moderated by authoritarian leadership, which can suppress job crafting tendencies. Studies by Hung et al. (2020) also indicate that the influence of prevention focus on job crafting depends on team dynamics. Shang et al. (2023) demonstrated that regulatory focus moderates the relationship between job demands and crafting: employees with strong promotion focus are more responsive to the positive effects of challenge demands, whereas those with strong prevention focus are more sensitive to the negative effects of hindrance demands. Based on this theoretical background, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H1: Both promotion and prevention regulatory focus are positively associated with job crafting.

Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance

Ambiguity tolerance refers to the ability to act effectively and make decisions in uncertain and ambiguous situations (Gati & Levin, 2014; Levin et al., 2020; Lipshits-Braziler et al., 2016; Udayar et al., 2020). The term originates from the work of March (as cited in Hofstede, 2000, p. 177). Hofstede (2000, p. 177) introduced the related concept of uncertainty avoidance, defined as *coping with uncertain situations in the workplace*. In this context, ambiguity tolerance is considered a cultural dimension, passed on intergenerationally and reinforced through social norms.

Beyond its cultural dimension, ambiguity tolerance can also be conceptualized as an individual difference variable linked to value systems or as a form of cognitive motivation (Yoo et al., 2011, as cited in Paszkowska-Rogacz & Znajmiecka-Sikora, 2020). Organizational psychology research has demonstrated a positive relationship between ambiguity tolerance and career decision-making. For instance, Koh (1996) found that MBA students with higher ambiguity tolerance preferred more risky career paths. Begley and Boyd (1988) showed that small business founders displayed higher levels of ambiguity tolerance, need for achievement, and risk-taking compared to individuals who had not founded businesses. Ambiguity tolerance was also positively associated with perceived agency in complex decision-making tasks (Endres et al., 2009). Wagener and colleagues (2010) found that entrepreneurs demonstrated higher levels of ambiguity tolerance than small business owners in the service sector, despite differences in scale and responsibility.

Research by Xu and Tracey (2014b) demonstrated that general ambiguity tolerance predicted levels of career indecision, dysfunctional career beliefs, and difficulty acquiring information. Additionally, it moderated the relationship between career exploration and the processing of conflicting data.

Ambiguity tolerance gains particular relevance in the context of career decision-making, as such decisions are frequently made under conditions of incomplete and contradictory information (Xu & Tracey, 2015). The ability to tolerate ambiguity becomes a crucial psychological resource in this context. Although numerous studies confirm the importance of general ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making (Xu & Tracey, 2014a, 2014b), its career-specific variant—ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making—has been shown to be a more accurate predictor of effective decision-making (Xu & Tracey, 2015).

Xu and Tracey (2015) proposed a four-dimensional model of ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making, comprising: preference – a positive attitude and curiosity toward ambiguous situations; tolerance – acceptance of and perceived competence in dealing with ambiguity; confidence – belief in one's own agency in uncertain conditions; aversion – tendency to avoid ambiguity and view it as threatening (Xu & Tracey, 2015, 2017).

Based on the situational approach to individual differences, it is assumed that ambiguity tolerance may manifest differently depending on context (Furnham & Marks, 2013; You et al., 2011). Therefore, in the present study, ambiguity tolerance was operationalized using the *Career Decision-Making Ambiguity*

Tolerance Scale (CDAT; Xu & Tracey, 2015), which measures individual attitudes toward ambiguity in the context of career decision-making. The choice of this tool was justified by two main reasons. First, the CDAT captures the specificity of decision-making under career-related uncertainty, making it particularly suitable for examining relationships with work-related behaviors. Second, the CDAT distinguishes four dimensions—preference, tolerance, confidence, and aversion—allowing for a more nuanced analysis than classical unidimensional measures such as Budner's (1962). These dimensions are contextually grounded in the career domain. Empirical studies have shown that the CDAT predicts not only career indecision but also the effectiveness of environmental exploration and the willingness to act despite uncertainty (Xu & Tracey, 2015).

According to self-regulation theory, individuals with a promotion focus tend to engage in more global information processing and adapt well to abstract and intuitive reasoning (Kolańczyk et al., 2013), which may contribute to higher ambiguity tolerance in career-related contexts. In contrast, those with a prevention focus prioritize safety and stability, seeking to avoid threats and failures. As such, they may prefer predictable and clearly structured career paths and demonstrate lower ambiguity tolerance in decision-making situations. Based on this rationale, the following hypotheses were proposed:

H2a: Promotion regulatory focus is positively associated with ambiguity tolerance.

H2b: Prevention regulatory focus is negatively associated with ambiguity tolerance.

In the process of job crafting, employees proactively identify opportunities to modify tasks, social relationships, and perceptions of work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Such actions require decision-making regarding changes whose long-term consequences may be uncertain, even if the opportunities are recognized (Berg et al., 2008). Therefore, the ability to operate in conditions of incomplete information and a dynamic environment may serve as a key resource for job crafting. Ambiguity tolerance—understood as the acceptance of ambiguous and evolving situations (Xu & Tracey, 2015)—may facilitate openness to exploration and modification of one's work. Individuals with higher levels of this trait may be more inclined to initiate job crafting behaviors, even when the outcomes are not fully predictable. Accordingly, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H3: Career decision ambiguity tolerance is positively associated with job crafting.

Theoretical analyses suggest that both promotion and prevention regulatory focus could affect job crafting behaviors, although the underlying mechanisms of these effects may differ. According to Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997), a promotion focus facilitates exploration and opportunity-seeking, whereas a prevention focus is oriented toward maintaining security and minimizing risk (Neubert et al., 2008; Wallace et al., 2009).

Regulatory focus is also related to career decision-making ambiguity tolerance. In line with the assumptions of Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997) and the structure of the CDAT model (Xu & Tracey, 2015), it can be expected that individuals with a promotion orientation will exhibit greater levels of preference, tolerance, and confidence toward ambiguity, while those with a prevention orientation will show higher aversion to ambiguous decision-making situations. Ambiguity tolerance—understood as the capacity to function and make decisions under conditions of incomplete information—plays a central role in adaptive career-related behavior (Xu & Tracey, 2014a, 2014b).

The literature highlights ambiguity tolerance as a key personal resource in the job crafting process. It enables individuals to explore new possibilities and redefine tasks and work relationships, even when outcomes are not fully predictable (Wagener et al., 2010). According to the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), cognitive personal resources such as ambiguity tolerance may mediate the relationship between personality traits (e.g., regulatory focus) and proactive workplace behaviors.

Moreover, in line with the model of proactive motivation (Parker et al., 2010), the transition from intention to action requires the activation of "can do" motivational resources – such as the belief in one's ability to function under ambiguity and change. Ambiguity tolerance may therefore serve as a facilitating resource for the enactment of regulatory motivation. Based on these theoretical foundations, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H4: Promotion and prevention regulatory focus are predictors of job crafting. This relationship is mediated by ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making.

Method

Participants

The study involved 558 full-time employees (working at least 40 hours per week), aged between 18 and 76 years (M = 40.1, SD = 11.7). Participants were employed under standard employment contracts, civil-law agreements, or B2B contracts. Their work experience ranged from 2 to 52 years (M = 18, SD = 11.3). The sample consisted of 261 women (46.8%), 295 men (52.9%), and 2 individuals identifying as another gender (0.4%).

Participants were recruited through a nationwide online research panel and completed the questionnaires via an online form. Prior research indicates that online-recruited samples are at least as diverse as those obtained through traditional recruitment methods (Gosling et al., 2004). To ensure data quality, response time for the entire questionnaire and for individual items was monitored, as well as logical consistency and response patterns. All participants provided informed consent prior to taking part in the study.

Instruments

Job Crafting Questionnaire (JCQ; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Polish adaptation: Kasprzak et al., 2017) is an instrument used to measure job crafting, based on the model proposed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001). It consists of 15 items, with five items assigned to each of the three subscales: *Task Crafting*, *Cognitive Crafting*, and *Relational Crafting*. Respondents rate the frequency with which they engage in job crafting behaviors on a six-point Likert scale, where 1 means *hardly ever* and 6 means *very often*. Sample items include: "I introduce new tasks into my job to better suit my strengths." (*Task Crafting*), "I change how I think about my job to make it more meaningful." (*Cognitive Crafting*), and "I make an effort to have more contact with people at work." (*Relational Crafting*). Subscale scores are computed by summing the responses within each dimension, and the total job crafting score is obtained by summing all items. In the validation studies of the Polish version, Cronbach's α values ranged from .77 to .85 for the subscales and from .86 to .88 for the overall scale. In the present study, the internal consistency coefficients were comparable: .86 for *Task Crafting*, .86 for *Cognitive Crafting*, .87 for *Relational Crafting*, and .92 for the total scale.

Promotion and Prevention Self-Regulation Scale (Kolańczyk, Bąk, & Roczniewska, 2013) was developed to assess promotion and prevention regulatory focus as relatively stable dispositional tendencies. It is based on Regulatory Focus Theory (Higgins, 1997, 2012) and consists of 27 items rated on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 means *strongly disagree* and 5 means *strongly agree*.

The statements are grouped into five subscales: *Promotion Standards* (SPro) (e.g., "In life, I usually do what I want."), *Promotion Self-Control* (KPro) (e.g., "I like to act spontaneously."), *Prevention Standards* (SPre) (e.g., "I usually do what I must."), *Prevention Self-Control* (KPre) (e.g., "I know I might be wrong, so I act cautiously."), and *Motivational Strength* (M) (e.g., "It's hard to discourage me when I've already decided something."). Additionally, the promotion- and prevention-related subscales (standards and self-control) can be aggregated into two broader dimensions: *Promotion Regulatory Focus* (Pro), consisting of nine items, and *Prevention Regulatory Focus* (Pre), comprising eleven items. Together with *Motivational Strength* (M), these scales form a three-factor structure of self-regulation.

According to the authors, the overall scales demonstrate satisfactory internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$ for both Pro and Pre, and $\alpha = .73$ for M). The internal consistency of individual subscales ranged from $\alpha = .57$ (KPro) to $\alpha = .74$ (KPre). In the present study, only the general scales were used, due to their higher internal reliability: $\alpha = .76$ for Pre, $\alpha = .80$ for Pro, and $\alpha = .83$ for M.

Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance Scale (CDAT; Xu & Tracey, 2015). This questionnaire was developed to measure individual reactions to unknown, complex, inconsistent, and unpredictable information encountered in the context of career decision-making. It consists of 20 items grouped into four subscales: *Preference* (e.g., "I enjoy creatively applying my interests toward my career decision."), *Tolerance* (e.g., "It doesn't bother me that I may have to change professions in the

future."), *Confidence* (e.g., "When making career decisions, I easily grasp the meaning of new information."), and *Aversion* (e.g., "I try to avoid choosing a career path with unclear future prospects."). Participants respond using a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 – *strongly disagree* to 7 – *strongly agree*. According to the original validation study, the internal consistency (Cronbach's α) for the subscales ranged from .77 to .87. In the present study, reliability coefficients were .79 for *Preference*, .69 for *Tolerance*, .86 for *Confidence*, and .83 for *Aversion*.

Results

Bivariate correlations between the study variables are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Between Job Crafting, Regulatory Focus, and Ambiguity Tolerance (N = 558)

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Job Crafting	–						
2. Promotion Regulatory Focus	.50*	–					
3. Prevention Regulatory Focus	.39*	.47***	–				
4. Motivational Strength	.39***	.69***	.45***	–			
5. CDAT Preference	.52***	.63***	.43***	.52***	–		
6. CDAT Tolerance	.40***	.47***	.33***	.38***	.58***	–	
7. CDAT Confidence	.44***	.64***	.33***	.57***	.67***	.68***	–
8. CDAT Aversion	.16***	.03	.29***	–.05	.04	.13***	–.02

Note. CDAT = *Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance Scale*
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The results indicate numerous positive and statistically significant associations between the study variables. All examined dimensions of job crafting (task, relational, and cognitive crafting), as well as the overall job crafting score, were positively related to promotion and prevention regulatory focus, motivational strength, and the dimensions of ambiguity tolerance: preference, tolerance, and confidence in career decision-making situations. Aversion to ambiguity was positively associated with cognitive and relational crafting, as well as with prevention regulatory focus.

A linear regression analysis (Table 3) showed that significant predictors of overall job crafting included promotion focus, prevention focus, and preference for ambiguity in career decision-making. Together, these variables accounted for

34% of the variance in job crafting, $F(3, 554) = 95$, $p < .001$. The tolerance values for the predictors ranged from .54 to .73, and VIF values ranged from 1.5 to 1.9, indicating an acceptable level of multicollinearity among the explanatory variables.

Table 2

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Between Dimensions of Job Crafting, Regulatory Focus, and Ambiguity Tolerance (N = 558)

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Task Crafting	–								
2. Cognitive Crafting	**.61**	–							
3. Relational Crafting	**.55**	**.62**	–						
4. Promotion Regulatory Focus	**.47**	**.44**	**.39**	–					
5. Prevention Regulatory Focus	**.37**	**.37**	**.27**	**.47**	–				
6. Motivational Strength	**.38**	**.32**	**.32**	**.70**	**.45**	–			
7. CDAT Preference	**.48**	**.49**	**.38**	**.63**	**.43**	**.52**	–		
8. CDAT Tolerance	**.39**	**.35**	**.30**	**.47**	**.33**	**.38**	**.58**	–	
9. CDAT Confidence	**.45**	**.37**	**.33**	**.64**	**.33**	**.58**	**.67**	**.68**	–
10. CDAT Aversion	.07	**.17**	**.17**	.03	**.29**	–.05	.04	**.13**	–.02

Note. CDAT = *Career Decision Ambiguity Tolerance Scale*. Statistically significant correlations ($p < .001$) are presented in bold.

All predictors were positively associated with job crafting: higher levels of promotion focus, prevention focus, and ambiguity preference were linked to a greater degree of job crafting among participants.

Table 3

Results of Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Job Crafting

Variable	β	*B*	*SE*	*t*	*p*	95% CI
Constant			3.65	1.07	.28	
Promotion Regulatory Focus	.25	5.31	0.93	4.63	< .001	[3.38, 7.35]
Prevention Regulatory Focus	.14	3.78	1.02	3.84	< .001	[1.65, 5.9]
CDAT Preference	.31	0.72	0.10	6.99	< .001	[0.51, 0.95]

Subsequent analyses explored in more detail the associations between promotion and prevention regulatory focus and specific dimensions of job crafting. Linear regression analyses showed that both promotion and prevention focus significantly predicted all three aspects of job crafting. In the case of task crafting,

the model was significant, $F(2, 555) = 91.59$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .25$; both promotion focus (β = .383; 95% CI [.508, .785]) and prevention focus (β = .186; 95% CI [.225, .579]) were significant predictors. For relational crafting, the model was also significant, $F(2, 555) = 54.62$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .164$; promotion focus (β = .347; 95% CI [.440, .731]) and prevention focus (β = .103; 95% CI [.036, .409]) were positively related to relational crafting. For cognitive crafting, the model reached significance as well, $F(2, 555) = 83.66$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .232$; promotion focus (β = .345; 95% CI [.443, .723]) and prevention focus (β = .210; 95% CI [.275, .633]) again emerged as significant predictors. The Durbin-Watson statistics for the models were 2.04, 1.98, and 2.09, respectively, confirming the absence of significant autocorrelation in the residuals. Values substantially below 1.5 or above 2.5 are typically considered indicative of problematic autocorrelation (Bercu & Proia, 2013).

The correlations observed between job crafting, regulatory focus, and ambiguity tolerance suggested the possibility of a mediating relationship among these variables. Therefore, three separate mediation analyses were conducted using PROCESS macro for SPSS (Model 4; Hayes, 2013) with 5,000 bootstrap samples. The dependent variable in each model was overall job crafting, and the mediators were the four dimensions of ambiguity tolerance: preference, tolerance, confidence, and aversion. Mediation was tested separately for each dimension.

No mediating effect was found for aversion to ambiguity in the relationship between job crafting and promotion focus, prevention focus, or motivational strength. In contrast, the remaining three models revealed significant indirect effects while retaining significant direct effects, indicating partial mediation in all three cases. Promotion focus was a stronger predictor of both job crafting and ambiguity tolerance compared to prevention focus.

These findings confirm a positive relationship between promotion regulatory focus, prevention regulatory focus, motivational strength, and job crafting, which is partially mediated by preference, tolerance, and confidence toward ambiguity in career decision-making situations.

Individuals with higher levels of both promotion and prevention regulatory focus, as well as strong motivational strength, also reported greater ambiguity tolerance, which in turn contributed to increased engagement in job crafting behaviors.

Path coefficients and confidence intervals for each model are presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6.

In the tested mediation models, regulatory focus and ambiguity tolerance together accounted for 15% to 33% of the variance in job crafting.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to identify individual-level predictors of job crafting. It was hypothesized that promotion and prevention regulatory focus, as well as ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making contexts, would be associated with job crafting behaviors.

Table 4

Dimensions of Ambiguity Tolerance as Mediators of the Relationship Between Promotion Regulatory Focus and Job Crafting

Predictor: Promotion regulatory focus	**Mediator: Ambiguity tolerance**											
Dependent variable: Job crafting	**Preference**				**Tolerance**				**Confidence**			
Mediation paths	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**
X → Y (c)	10.87	0.78	.50**	[9.3, 12.3]	10.78	0.77	.51**	[9.3, 12.3]	10.78	0.78	.51**	[9.3, 12.3]
X → M (a)	5.64	0.30	.63**	[5.1, 6.2]	6.62	1.40	.47**	[3.9, 9.3]	5.48	0.28	.64**	[4.9, 6.0]
M(X) → Y (b)	0.80	0.10	.34**	[0.6, 1.0]	0.43	0.09	.20**	[0.3, 0.6]	0.50	0.12	.20**	[0.3, 0.7]
X(M) → Y (c')	6.29	0.95	.30**	[4.4, 8.2]	8.72	0.86	.41**	[7.0, 10.4]	8.03	0.90	.38**	[6.1, 10.0]

** $p < .001$

Table 5

Dimensions of Ambiguity Tolerance as Mediators of the Relationship Between Prevention Regulatory Focus and Job Crafting

Predictor: Prevention regulatory focus	**Mediator: Ambiguity tolerance**											
Dependent variable: Job crafting	**Preference**				**Tolerance**				**Confidence**			
Mediation paths	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**
X → Y (c)	10.50	1.10	.39**	[8.5, 12.6]	10.50	1.10	.39**	[8.4, 12.6]	10.50	1.06	.39**	[8.4, 12.6]
X → M (a)	4.90	0.44	.43**	[4.0, 5.8]	4.29	0.50	.33**	[3.3, 5.3]	3.61	0.44	.33**	[2.8, 4.5]
M(X) → Y (b)	1.03	0.10	.44**	[0.9, 1.2]	0.64	0.08	.30**	[0.5, 0.8]	0.89	0.09	.35**	[0.7, 1.1]
X(M) → Y (c')	5.43	1.10	.20**	[3.3, 7.5]	7.76	1.10	.29**	[5.7, 9.9]	7.33	1.04	.27**	[5.3, 9.4]

** $p < .001$

Table 6

Dimensions of Ambiguity Tolerance as Mediators of the Relationship Between Motivational Strength and Job Crafting

Predictor: Motivational strength	**Mediator: Ambiguity tolerance**											
Dependent variable: Job crafting	**Preference**				**Tolerance**				**Confidence**			
Mediation paths	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**	**b**	**SE**	**β**	**95% CI**
X → Y (c)	12.44	1.22	.39**	[10.1, 14.8]	12.45	1.20	.40**	[10.1, 14.8]	12.45	1.22	.40**	[10.0, 14.8]
X → M (a)	6.89	0.48	.52**	[5.9, 7.8]	5.68	0.60	.38**	[4.5, 6.8]	7.26	0.44	.57**	[6.4, 8.1]
M(X) → Y (b)	1.02	0.10	.43**	[0.8, 1.2]	0.61	0.08	.29**	[0.5, 0.8]	0.80	0.11	.32**	[0.6, 1.0]
X(M) → Y (c')	5.36	1.30	.17**	[2.8, 7.9]	8.97	1.30	.29**	[6.5, 11.5]	6.64	1.40	.21**	[3.8, 9.4]

** $p < .001$

The results supported Hypothesis 1, indicating that both promotion and prevention regulatory focus were significantly and positively related to job crafting. This finding is consistent with previous research (Brenninkmeijer & Hekkert-Koning, 2015; Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Tims & Bakker, 2010), and confirms that active goal pursuit (promotion) as well as concern for safety and stability (prevention) may facilitate engagement in job crafting. This mechanism can be interpreted in light of the proactive motivation model (Parker et al., 2010), which posits that effective job crafting requires both "reason to" (motivation) and "can do" (adaptive capacity). Depending on the self-regulatory strategy employed, individuals may engage in different types of job crafting behaviors. This conclusion aligns with Higgins's (1997) theory, which suggests that individuals with a promotion orientation tend to adopt strategies aimed at maximizing gains and achieving aspirations, while those with a prevention orientation focus on minimizing losses and securing the status quo. In the context of job crafting, this may manifest as a preference for either expansive or protective actions. Similarly, Lichtenthaler and Fischbach (2019) demonstrated that regulatory style differentiates the types of job crafting behaviors: promotion focus was linked to proactive, growth-oriented crafting, while prevention focus was associated with more conservative, protective adjustments.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b, which concerned the relationship between regulatory focus and ambiguity tolerance, received partial support. As predicted, promotion focus was positively associated with ambiguity preference, tolerance,

and confidence—suggesting greater openness to situations requiring intuition and flexible thinking. This result supports Higgins's (1997) theoretical claim that promotion-focused individuals are more inclined to explore and seek out new opportunities. For prevention focus, the results were more complex: it was positively associated not only with aversion to ambiguity, but also with preference, tolerance, and confidence. This suggests that individuals with strong prevention orientation may, under certain conditions, flexibly adapt to career-related uncertainty when such adaptation serves to protect stability and reduce occupational risk.

The findings also confirmed Hypothesis 3—ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making was significantly and positively related to job crafting. Specifically, the preference, tolerance, and confidence dimensions of ambiguity tolerance supported engagement in behaviors aimed at redefining tasks, relationships, and perceptions of work. This result is consistent with findings by Xu and Tracey (2015) and with the concept of adaptive cognitive flexibility (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019).

A central aim of this study was to test Hypothesis 4, which concerned the mediating role of ambiguity tolerance in the relationship between regulatory focus and job crafting. The results confirmed the presence of indirect effects via the dimensions of preference, tolerance, and confidence, while aversion to ambiguity did not function as a mediator. These three dimensions of ambiguity tolerance partially mediated the relationship between promotion focus, prevention focus, and motivational strength and overall job crafting. The presence of significant indirect effects across all three dimensions suggests that the ability to function under uncertainty plays a crucial role in facilitating proactive work behaviors. This mechanism can be interpreted within the frameworks of the secondary resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) and the proactive motivation model (Parker et al., 2010). Promotion and prevention regulatory focus provide the motivational drive to act, whereas ambiguity tolerance serves as a cognitive "can-do" resource, enabling individuals to effectively engage in proactive behavior even under conditions of incomplete information and occupational uncertainty. This indicates that high motivation alone (e.g., goal pursuit or failure avoidance) is not sufficient for effective job crafting – cognitive resources that support adaptation and change initiation in the face of ambiguity are also essential.

Additionally, promotion focus emerged as a stronger predictor of both ambiguity tolerance and job crafting (across all dimensions) than prevention focus. This finding suggests that a promotion regulatory orientation may be more conducive to proactive occupational functioning, which aligns with previous studies on regulatory styles and workplace adaptation (Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Wallace et al., 2009).

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The present study is subject to several limitations. First, the data were collected using a cross-sectional design, based on a single-time-point measurement,

which does not allow for causal inferences regarding the relationships between the studied variables. Future studies should employ longitudinal methodologies, which would enable the examination of long-term associations between job crafting and related constructs. A longitudinal approach would also help reduce the risk of common method bias (Razmus & Mielniczuk, 2018).

A second limitation is the exclusive use of self-report data, gathered through questionnaires. A promising direction for future research would be to incorporate qualitative methods recommended in job crafting research, such as diary studies (Kapica, 2021). While objective indicators are difficult to establish for constructs such as regulatory focus or ambiguity tolerance, job crafting behaviors—particularly those related to task and relational crafting—could also be evaluated based on supervisor and coworker observations. Such an approach would enhance the objectivity and reliability of the findings.

Another limitation concerns the use of a context-specific operationalization of ambiguity tolerance—namely, tolerance in career decision-making situations (CDAT)—rather than a general measure of the construct. Although the contextualized approach is well-supported theoretically (Furnham & Marks, 2013; You et al., 2011), this choice may limit the generalizability of the findings to other domains of functioning, such as interpersonal or cognitive contexts.

Finally, future research could explore potential moderators, such as age, career stage, or organizational tenure, which may influence the relationship between ambiguity tolerance and job crafting—an approach consistent with career development theory (Super, 1980).

Conclusion and Practical Implications

This study contributes to a better understanding of the individual factors that promote crafting of tasks, relationships, and cognitive approaches to work. The findings suggest that both regulatory focus and ambiguity tolerance are positively associated with employees' engagement in job crafting behaviors. Consistent with previous research, these results highlight the critical role of individual psychological resources in supporting both employee well-being and organizational effectiveness. It is possible that depending on their dominant self-regulatory style, employees may be more likely to engage in different forms of job crafting.

The findings also offer practical implications for recruitment and selection processes. Individuals characterized by high levels of promotion and prevention regulatory focus, motivational strength, and preference, tolerance, and confidence toward ambiguity appear to be more likely to engage in job crafting behaviors. In contrast, high aversion to ambiguity may act as a limiting factor, reducing such proactive engagement.

In the context of human resource management, these results may serve as useful guidelines for managers and HR professionals aiming to foster adaptive regulatory and cognitive orientations among employees—orientations that are conducive to proactive job crafting.

References

Amillano, A., Letona Ibañez, O., Martínez Rodríguez, S., & Carrasco, M. (2024). Job crafting and satisfaction with life: A mediation model through the meaning of work. *Current Psychology*, *44*(2), 837–846. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-07198-5

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, *22*(3), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649

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

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

Begley, T. M., & Boyd, D. P. (1988). Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and smaller businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *2*, 79–93.

Bercu, B., & Proïa, F. (2013). A sharp analysis on the asymptotic behavior of the Durbin–Watson statistic for the first-order autoregressive process. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, *28*, 1–31.

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). *What is job crafting and why does it matter?* [unpublished manuscript]. Center for Positive Organizational Scholarship, University of Michigan. https://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/What-is-Job-Crafting-and-Why-Does-it-Matter1.pdf

Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2013). Job crafting and meaningful work. In B. J. Dik, Z. S. Byrne & M. F. Steger (Eds.), *Purpose and meaning in the workplace* (pp. 81–104). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14183-005

Bizzi, L. (2017). Network characteristics: When an individual's job crafting depends on the jobs of others. *Human Relations*, *70*(4), 436–460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716658963

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. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-12-2014-0162

Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *Journal of Personality*, *30*(1), 29–50. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1962.tb02303.x

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Chen, W., Wang, B., Chen, Y., Zhang, J., & Liu, Y. (2023). Can work still be crafted under authority? A study of the differential effect of employee regulatory focus on job crafting. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *8*(3), Article 100370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100370

Dewett, T., & Denisi, A. S. (2007). What motivates organizational citizenship behaviours? Exploring the role of regulatory focus theory. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *16*(3), 241–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320701273606

Dubbelt, L., Demerouti, E., & Rispens, S. (2019). The value of job crafting for work engagement, task performance, and career satisfaction: Longitudinal and quasi-experimental evidence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *28*(3), 300–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2019.1576632

Endres, M. L., Chowdhury, S., & Milner, M. (2009). Ambiguity tolerance and accurate assessment of self-efficacy in a complex decision task. *Journal of Management & Organization*, *15*(1), 31–46. https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.837.15.1.31

Furnham, A., & Marks, J. (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the recent literature. *Psychology*, *4*(9), 717–728. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2013.49102

Gati, I., & Levin, N. (2014). Counseling for career decision-making difficulties: Measures and methods. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *62*(2), 98–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2014.00073.x

Gori, A., Arcioni, A., Topino, E., Palazzeschi, L., & Di Fabio, A. (2021). Constructing well-being in organizations: First empirical results on job crafting, personality traits, and insight. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(12), Article 6661. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18126661

Gosling, S. D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O. P. (2004). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *American Psychologist*, *59*(2), 93–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.2.93

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain: How regulation creates distinct types of value. *American Psychologist*, *52*(12), 1280–1300. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, *55*(11), 1217–1230. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.11.1217

Higgins, E. T. (2005). Value from regulatory fit. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *14*(4), 209–213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00366.x

Higgins, E. T. (2012). *Beyond pleasure and pain: How motivation works.* Oxford University Press.

Hofstede, G. (2000*). Kultury i organizacje. Zaprogramowanie umysłu* [*Cultures and organizations. Software of the mind*]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Hung, H., Wang, Y., Tian, Z., & Yang, J. (2020). A cross-level investigation of team-member exchange on team and individual job crafting with the moderating effect of regulatory focus. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(6), Article 2044. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062044

Kapica, Ł. (2021). Czy zmniejszanie wymagań stanowi kategorię przekształcania pracy i wiąże się z zaangażowaniem w pracę? [Does reducing job demands constitute a dimension of job crafting and relate to work engagement?]. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, *26*(3), 277–297. https://doi.org/10.34767/PFP.2021.03.03

Kapica, Ł., Baka, Ł., & Niemiec, A. (2022). *Job crafting jako metoda budowania zasobów i pozytywnych postaw pracowników wobec pracy* [*Job crafting as a method of*

building resources and positive employee attitudes toward work]. CIOP PIB. https://www.ciop.pl/CIOPPortalWAR/file/96073/Job_Crafting_jako_metoda_budowania_zasobow_i_ pozytywnych_postaw_wobec_pracy.pdf

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.

Kasprzak, E., Michalak, M., & Minda, M. (2017). Kwestionariusz kształtowania pracy – KKPracy. Polska adaptacja narzędzia [Job Crafting Questionnaire – KKPracy: Polish adaptation of the instrument]. *Psychologia Społeczna*, *12*(4), 459–475. https:// doi.org/10.7366/1896180020174308

Koh, H. C. (1996). Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics: A study of Hong Kong MBA students. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *11*(3), 12–25.

Kolańczyk, A., Bąk, W., & Roczniewska, M. (2013). Skala samoregulacji promocyjnej i prewencyjnej (SSPP) [Promotion and Prevention Regulatory Focus Scale (SSPP)]. *Psychologia Społeczna*, *8*(2/25), 203–218.

Lee, J. Y., & Lee, Y. (2018). Job crafting and performance: Literature review and implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development Review*, *17*(3), 277–313. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484318788269

Letona-Ibañez, O., Martinez-Rodriguez, S., Ortiz-Marques, N., & Carrasco, M. (2021). Job crafting and work engagement: The mediating role of work meaning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(10), Article 5383. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18105383

Levin, N., Lipshits-Braziler, Y., & Gati, I. (2020). Difficulties in career decision making and self-evaluations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *28*(4), 608–635. https:// doi.org/10.1177/1069072720910089

Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2019). A meta-analysis on promotion- and prevention-focused job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *28*(1), 30–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1527767

Lipshits-Braziler, Y., Gati, I., & Tatar, M. (2016). Strategies for coping with career indecision: Convergent, divergent, and incremental validity. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *25*(2), 183–202. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715620608

Morales-Solis, J. C., Chen, J., May, D. R., & Schwoerer, C. (2023). Resiliency and meaningfulness in work: A job crafting perspective. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *31*(6), 2581–2594. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-09-2021-2951

Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(6), 1220–1233. https:// doi.org/10.1037/a0012695

Pan, J.-L., Chiu, C.-Y., & Wu, K.-S. (2021). Leader-member exchange fosters nurses' job and life satisfaction: The mediating effect of job crafting. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(4), Article 0250789. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250789

Park, S., & Ha, Y. (2025). The relationship between positive psychological capital and work engagement in clinical nurses: Mediation effect of job crafting. *BMC Nursing*, *24*, Article 117. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02600-w

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, *36*(4), 827–856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310363732

Paszkowska-Rogacz, A., & Znajmiecka-Sikora, M. (2020). Styl przywiązania a tolerancja niejednoznaczności w sytuacji podejmowania decyzji zawodowych przez młodych dorosłych. Mediacyjny efekt poczucia bezpieczeństwa [Attachment style and ambiguity tolerance in career decision-making among young adults. The mediating effect of sense of security]. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, *25*(1), 67–84. https://doi.org/10.14656/PFP20200104

Razmus, W., & Mielniczuk, E. (2018). Błąd wspólnej metody w badaniach kwestionariuszowych [Common method bias in questionnaire-based research]. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, *23*(2), 277–290. https://doi.org/10.14656/PFP20180204

Rhee, S.-Y., Shin, Y., Hur, W.-M., & Hwang, H. (2024). Daily renewal for job performance: Understanding the role of recovery, sleep, resilience, and job crafting from a self-regulatory strength perspective. *Current Psychology*, *43*(44), 34227–34241. https://doi. org/10.1007/s12144-024-06906-5

Rogala, A., & Cieślak, R. (2019). Positive emotions at work and job crafting: Results from two prospective studies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, Article 2786. https://doi.org/10.3389/ fpsyg.2019.02786

Rogala, A., & Cieślak, R. (2019). Narzędzie do pomiaru przekształcania pracy: właściwości psychometryczne polskiej wersji Job Crafting Scale [A tool for measuring job crafting: Psychometric properties of the Polish version of the Job Crafting Scale]. *Medycyna Pracy*, *70*(4), 445–457. https://doi.org/10.13075/mp.5893.00822

Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *102*, 112–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008

Sethi, D., Pereira, V., & Chakraborty, T. (2023). The impact of leader–member exchange, perceived organizational support, and readiness for change on job crafting behaviours in HRM in an emerging market. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *34*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2023.2189021

Shang, Y., Zhao, R., & Richards, M. (2023). Do work stressors facilitate or impede job crafting? The role of employee trait and work regulatory focus. *Career Development International*, *28*(2), 250–274. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-02-2022-0028

Shi, J., Cai, X., & Pan, X. (2022). Work–nonwork facilitation mediates the link between job crafting and life satisfaction. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *14*(2), 350–370. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12374

Son, S. J. (2024). Nonwork orientations and job crafting: A moderated mediation model of life satisfaction and age. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance. Advance online publication*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-024-09686-3

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *16*(3), 282–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1

Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *36*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841

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

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2014). Daily job crafting and the self-efficacy–performance relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *29*(5), 490–507. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2012-0148

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2015). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *24*(6), 914–928. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.969245

Tseng, H. C., & Kang, L. M. (2008). How does regulatory focus affect uncertainty towards organizational change? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *29*(8), 713–731.

Udayar, S., Levin, N., Lipshits-Braziler, Y., Rochat, S., Di Fabio, A., Gati, I., & Sovet, L. (2020). Difficulties in career decision making and self-evaluations: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *28*(4), 608–635. https://doi.org/10.1177/10690727209100

van Wingerden, J., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2017). Fostering employee well-being via a job crafting intervention. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *100*, 164–174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.03.008

Vermooten, N., Boonzaier, B., & Kidd, M. (2019). Job crafting, proactive personality and meaningful work: Implications for employee engagement and turnover intention. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *45*(1), Article a1567. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v45i0.1567

Wagener, S., Gorgievski, M., & Rijsdijk, S. (2010). Businessman or host? Individual differences between entrepreneurs and small business owners in the hospitality industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, *30*(9), 1513–1527. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060802624324

Wallace, J. C., Johnson, P. D., & Frazier, M. L. (2009). An examination of the factorial, construct, and predictive validity and utility of the regulatory focus at work scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*(6), 805–831. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.572

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

Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. In A. B. Bakker (Ed.), *Advances in Positive Organizational Psychology* (vol. 1, pp. 281–302). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2046-410X(2013)0000001015

Xu, H., Hou, Z.-J., & Tracey, T. J. (2014). Relation of environmental and self-career exploration with career decision-making difficulties in Chinese students. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *22*(4), 654–665. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072713515628

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2014a). Ambiguity tolerance with career indecision: An examination of the mediation effect of career decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *22*, 1–12.

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2014b). The role of ambiguity tolerance in career decision making. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *85*(1), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.04.001

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2015). Career decision ambiguity tolerance scale: Construction and initial validations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *88*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.01.006

Xu, H., & Tracey, T. J. (2017). The reciprocal dynamic model of career decision ambiguity tolerance with career indecision: A longitudinal three-wave investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *64*(5), 538–549. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000220

Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *23*(3), 193–210.

Yun, M.-S., Lee, M., & Choi, E.-H. (2024). Job crafting, positive psychological capital, and social support as predictors of job embeddedness among clinical nurses: A structural model design. *BMC Nursing*, *23*, Article 192. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-01845-9