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Weekly Job crafting

Weekly Leisure crafting

Weekly Employees well-being

Weekly Partners well-being
H1. Employees’ weekly expansion-oriented JC is positively related to employees’ weekly LC.
Hypothesis 2a. Employees’ weekly expansion-oriented JC is positively related to their weekly well-being.
Hypothesis 2b. Employees’ weekly LC is positively related to their weekly well-being.
Hypothesis 3. Employees’ weekly expansion-oriented JC is positively related to their weekly well-being through their weekly LC.
The crossover effect (H4)

Crossover model → Resources can be transferred to other individuals in the proximal environment (Hobfoll et al., 2018).

A positive direct crossover may occur when experiences, affective states, and resources are transmitted from one partner to the other (Westman, 2001).

Self-expansion theory → Couples share an intimate relationship that makes them incorporate the other’s resources, perspectives, and identities as a way to expand their self (Aron et al., 1991).

Broaden and Build Theory → Positive feelings cross over via empathy and emotional contagion (Fredrickson, 2001)

Hypothesis 4. Employees’ weekly well-being is positively related to their partners’ weekly well-being.
The Mediating Role of Employees’ Well-being (H5a & b)

W-HR model (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012) + The crossover model (Hobfoll et al., 2018)
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Model of the Study

We explicitly focus on the within-person variables measured over four weeks.
METHOD

4 WEEKS
100 online questionnaires
   72 were returned by employees
   68 were returned by their partners.

50 weekly on-line questionnaires
200 observations

38.60 years (S.D. = 12.53)
26 females
15.6% children under 12
67.3% post-secondary degrees
15.40 years (S.D. = 13.13) of work experience

Weekly expansion-oriented job crafting (Petrou et al., 2012).
α ranged from .81 to .85 and Omega coefficient was .74

Weekly leisure crafting (Petrou & Bakker, 2016).
α ranged from .94 to .95 and Omega coefficient was .84

Employees’ and partners’ weekly well-being (Diener et al., 2010)
α.79 to .94 (Empl) and Omega coefficient was .88
α.83 to .93 (Partn) and Omega coefficient was .83
 RESULTS

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>- .22</td>
<td>- .32*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Expansion-Oriented JC</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly LC</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ weekly well-being</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners’ weekly well-being</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly LC t+1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- .15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ weekly well-being t+1</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ weekly well-being t+2</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners’ weekly well-being t+1</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 50 participants and partners, and N = 200 data points. JC = Job Crafting. LC = Leisure Crafting. Within-person correlations are below the diagonal and between-person correlations are above the diagonal. t+1 indicates the values where we substituted the time 1 with time 2, time 2 with time 3, as well as time 3 with time 4 (N = 150 data points). *p< .05, **p< .01

ICCs were 55% (JC), 54% (LC), 36% (W) and 55% (WP) > .12 (James, 1982).
Within-person Contemporaneous Relationships

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Weekly LC</th>
<th>Employees’ weekly well-being</th>
<th>Partners’ weekly well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (0 = male, 1 = female)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Expansion-Oriented JC</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly LC</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ weekly well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-person (Level 2) residual variance (SD)</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within-person (Level 1) residual variance (SD)</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 200 data points. JC = Job Crafting. LC = Leisure Crafting. Unstandardized Coefficients; one-tailed p values. 
* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001
Indirect Relationships

- Monte Carlo (MC) method → test indirect effects
  - Because our mediation hypotheses are directional, we used one-tailed, $\alpha = .05$, test and obtained the 90% CI (Cho & Abe, 2013; Preacher et al., 2010).
  - We used 20,000 replications for the MC simulation (Ruxton & Neuhäuser, 2010).

\[ H3 \]

Employees’ weekly JC $\rightarrow$ Employees’ weekly LC $\rightarrow$ Employees’ weekly well-being

Estimate of $ab$ product term = .11

(90% CI [.03, .23])
Indirect Relationships

**H5a**

- Employees’ weekly JC → Employees’ weekly well-being
  - Estimate of $ab$ product term = .04
  - (90% CI [.01, .08])

- Employees’ weekly well-being → Partners’ weekly well-being

**H5b**

- Employees’ weekly LC → Employees’ weekly well-being
  - Estimate of $ab$ product term = .07
  - (90% CI [.02, .14])

- Employees’ weekly well-being → Partners’ weekly well-being
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Indirect Relationships

H6

Employees’ weekly expansion-oriented JC → Employees’ weekly LC → Employees’ weekly well-being → Partners’ weekly well-being

Estimate of $abd$ product term = .02

(90% CI [.004, .05])
CONCLUSION

✓ The spillover relationship between weekly crafting behaviors

✓ The main role of weekly leisure crafting

✓ The crossover effect of employees’ well-being
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