

Exploring Job Crafting: Identifying the Way Lecturers of CLCS Adjust to their Job

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the job crafting practice among the lecturers of College of Language and Culture Studies (CLCS), Bhutan. The study adopted quantitative research approach and used Slemp and Vella-Brodrick's [4] Job Crafting Questionnaire to collect data. The data were collected from 42 lecturers (Male=35 and Female=7) of the college, and analyzed using SPSS to calculate descriptive statistic, frequency, mean and standard deviation. The findings showed that the participants of this study were highly engaged in job crafting. Of three forms of job crafting, relational crafting, cognitive crafting and the task crafting, the findings suggested that participants were most likely to be engaged in relational crafting. Further, the findings showed that the lecturers who lacked job resources such as research competence engaged more in job crafting. Also, it was found that while the gender does not influence job crafting practice, the demographic factor such as participants' qualification and number of years in the job seem to be affecting the job crafting nature of the participants. The study has drawn some strategic implication for employee engagement and wellbeing enhancement.

Keywords: *Job crafting, job design, job resource, job demand*

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of lecturers in Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) has become challenging with demand to balance between research and teaching ever since the RUB has been established in 2003. The university faculties are expected to conduct research alongside their traditional teaching role, which, for many, comes as an unexplored tread. Therefore, even after two decades of RUB's effort in promoting research culture among the lecturers and students, studies [1, 2] have observed that the research culture still remains underdeveloped.

Among several factors affecting research development in RUB, the poor research competence among the faculty was acknowledged as prominent [2]. While this reflects the research competence of most academics of RUB, it might be more related to the lecturers who have joined the teaching profession with monastic education. Most of the lecturers **teaching the national language, Dzongkha**, in Bhutan are graduates from the Buddhist Colleges where the education system is usually knowledge driven, and competence such as research skills are not taught [3]. For these lecturers, while teaching seems unchallenging, conducting research stands as a barrier to several opportunities such as promotion, academic exposure and financial incentives causing distress and frustration resulting in high attrition rate among the Dzongkha lecturers. In CLCS alone, within the last three years, five Dzongkha lecturers resigned from the job.

The college, recognizing the issue, initiated various professional development programs. However, such programs seem to serve little in terms of enhancing research competence among the lecturers [1, 2]. So, the effort college makes might not be easing the stress and quagmire the faculties are undergoing. Withstanding to the situation, [4] asserted that while such intervention enhances contextual and job characteristics, an "alternative way is to focus on behaviour-based change." They believe that focusing on the way employees physically and mentally adjust to a job would engender better outcome related to wellbeing, and also benefit the organization. Job crafting theory, in this regard, postulates that all employees in any organization redesign their job in order to enhance job satisfaction, engagement and meaningfulness [5]. The lecturers lacking the research competence may be engaging in job crafting behaviors by negotiating and modifying the job tasks, perceptions of their job roles, and social interactions in the workplace to suit their unique needs, skills and values. So, some individual lecturers must be participating in the job crafting behaviors, without the benefit of professional development programs.

1.1. Job Crafting

Job crafting according to [6] is a “proactive employee behaviour and represents a bottom-up job redesign approach (p. 2). Employees craft their job in order to better suit one’s “motive, strengths, and passion” and it emerges as a voluntary behaviour necessary for overcoming challenges and constraints posed by a job [7, p.1]. Studies have reported that crafting job contributes to the wellbeing of the employees which augments motivation, job satisfaction and engagement which in turn affects productivity and organizational growth [8, 9].

Basically, the meaning of one’s work life comes from combination of the task performance successfully; having good relation with the people around and having a positive outlook towards one’s job [5]. This shows that the job crafting happens in three ways: task crafting, relational crafting, and cognitive crafting [10]. First, the crafting could happen in the task an individual undertakes. The way an individual alters the tasks could be in terms of number, quality or the kind of tasks performed. Second, the crafting could happen in terms of professional and personal relation an individual seeks with the colleagues. An employee either interacts more or develops new relations at work place in order to enhance connection with the people at the workplace [11]. Third, cognitive crafting refers to reframing perception towards one’s own job. The way one’s job is perceived has a close association to productivity, satisfaction and general wellbeing of the employee.

While generally job crafting could be viewed in task, relational and cognitive aspects, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory helps to explain further how job crafting complexity works [12]. The theory posits that every job and workplace is characterized by job demands (aspects of the job that require energy) and job resources (aspects of the job that give energy). According to [13]

Job demands are the physical, social or organizational aspects of the job that require physical and/or cognitive engagement and that are associated with physical and psychological costs; job resources are those aspects of the job that help employees to achieve their work goals (p. 930).

In meeting the job demand and augmenting job resource, [9] observed that individuals craft jobs in three ways. First, by “increasing job resources” such as by getting feedback and comments from others on one’s on job performance. This increases the autonomy and social support which enable an employee meet the job demand. Second, by “increasing challenge in job demands” - an individual alters one’s job in the event of non-challenging task. Challenging tasks are viewed as motivational in a way that it provides opportunity for mastery. So, when an individual possesses sufficient resources to undertake challenging tasks, they deliver positive work outcome. And third, “decreasing hindering job” refers to an act where an individual averts the jobs that entail risk of failure or futility. Through this categorization, they proposed that job crafting tasks are focused mainly at personal job fit and the ability to meet the job demand with job resource. According to [14] job crafting is stimulated by the self motivation and requirement. For example their study revealed that the job crafting happens when an individual’s developing self image, work experience, human connection and self-efficacy were high.

Accordingly, studies have explored the relation between job crafting and employee wellbeing including “engagement, job satisfaction, job performance and low burnout levels” [10, para. 5]. [8] in their study where they reviewed 122 samples observed that there was positive relation between job crafting and job satisfaction, work engagement and work performance. Likewise, [15] also found that job crafting has association to work performance. This was echoed by several other studies [e.g., 9, 16].

Job crafting, understandably, has become an important aspect of wellbeing of human resource. Where the top-down job design fails to balance job demand with job resource, job crafting helps individual employee autonomy and discretion over determining one’s own task, relation and perspective development [17]. This would be an important resource in turn for managers to create context, condition and job characteristics that facilitates positive job crafting among the employees in the organization [18]. However, there is no literature using theoretical framework of job crafting in the context of Bhutan. Especially, research in terms of Human Resource Management in the context of Higher Education institution like CLCS is almost non-existing. On the other hand, the researchers hypnotize that the lecturers in CLCS must be crafting their job in order to meet the job demands described in formal job

design as well as to generate personal meaning out of their work. So, this study will examine the job crafting practice among the CLCS lecturers.

1.2. Research questions

1. How do the lecturers of CLCS craft job in order to foster their wellbeing?
2. Is there significant difference in crafting job between the Dzongkha lecturer and other lecturers?
3. Do the demographic backgrounds of the lecturers affect their job crafting practice?

2. METHODOLOGY

This quantitative study adopted descriptive survey design to study the general job crafting practice of the lecturers in CLCS. Descriptive survey is a research design that uses a set of questions such as questionnaire in the context of this study [19, 20].

2.1. Setting and Participants

The data for this study was collected from the faculties (N=42) of the college of language and culture studies. CLCS focuses on promoting studies on language and culture of Bhutan and Himalayan region. Owing to the nature of the programs offered in the college, most of the lecturers are Dzongkha lecturers who come with monastic education background. And also because of the low number of total population of the lecturers, the study adopted census survey technique, where all the 42 lecturers, 35 males and 7 females were recruited as the participants of the study.

2.2. Data Collection Instrument

The Job Crafting Questionnaire (JCQ) developed and validated by [4] was adopted and employed to measure task, relational and cognitive forms of job crafting practiced by the participants. The question has 15-item (5 items to measure each of the three components). The JCQ has high reliability for the entire scale (Cronbach's alpha=0.91) as well as for each sub-scale: task crafting Cronbach's alpha=0.87; relational crafting Cronbach's alpha=0.83; cognitive crafting Cronbach's alpha=0.89). It is used by several studies to study job crafting [e.g., 10, 16, 21]. In addition, 6 items were added on the questionnaire to gather the perspective of the lecturers towards the current college regarding the mandatory requirement to conduct research. To insure validity of the tool, the questionnaire items were reviewed by at least three experts. Upon their comments, the items and questions were revised to maintain objectivity in meaning and purpose. Further, the questionnaire was translated into Dzongkha for the purpose of accessibility and clarity to the participants with Dzongkha background. The questionnaire was reviewed by three Dzongkha lecturers for clarity and precision.

2.3. Data Analysis Techniques

The survey data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using Commercial Statistical Package for the Social Science 19 (SPSS). The background information of the respondents was analyzed counting frequencies and percentages. The responses regarding the lecturers' job crafting were analyzed using Means (M) and Standard Deviation (SD).

To determine the participants' job crafting practice, their rating for the engagement in job crafting on the scale ranging 1 (hardly ever) to 6 (very often) were interpreted as High, Moderate and Low as in Table 2.

Table 1. The Interpretation of Scale Value to Determine Level of Participants' job Crafting

Range of score	Level of agreement	Interpretation
5.16-6.00	Very often	Highly engaged in job crafting
4.33-5.15	Frequently	
3.5-4.32	Sometimes	Moderately engaged in job crafting

2.67-3.49	Rarely	Low engagement in job crafting
1.84-2.66	Seldom	
1-1.83	Hardly ever	

3. RESULT

This section presents the analysis of the data gathered through the job crafting questionnaire. The result and the findings are presented in five subsections: demographic information of the participants, general job crafting behaviour of the participants, job crafting in specific area of task crafting, relation crafting and cognitive crafting, the difference in job crafting practice of Dzongkha lecturers and non-Dzongkha lecturer, and relation between demographic factors on participants' job crafting practices.

3.1. Demographic Information

As Table 2 shows, of the 42 participants, one has PhD, 36 (85.71%) have Masters Degree and 5 (11.90%) have Bachelor Degree. More than half (n=22, 52.38%) of the participants had specialization in Buddhist study, and eight (19.5%) studied Dzongkha language and literature in modern education system. Remaining 12 (28.57%) specialized in other subjects. In terms of gender, majority (n=35) were male and seven were female. The data also showed that most of the participants were young to the job: more than 64% (n=27) of the participants did not complete their tenth year in the job while only two participants (4.76%) crossed 20 years working as lecturer.

Table 2. Demographic information of the participants

Participants		Frequency N=42	Percentage
Education	PhD	1	2.38%
	Masters	36	85.71%
	Bachelors Degree	5	11.90%
Gender	Male	35	83.33%
	Female	7	16.66%
Number of Years in the job	20 years and above	2	4.76 %
	15-20	5	11.9 %
	11-15	7	16.66%
	5-10	18	42.86%
	1-5	9	21.43%
Specialization	Buddhist philosophy	22	52.38%
	Language and Literature (Dzongkha)	8	19.05%
	History and social science	12	28.57%

3.2. Participants' Job Crafting Practice

This section reports the participants' job crafting practice based on the data collected through the job crafting scale questionnaire. Specifically, it reports the participants' choice of job crafting among task crafting, relation crafting and cognitive crafting, and it suggests answer to the first research question: *How do lecturers of CLCS craft job in order to foster their wellbeing?*

Generally, Table 3 shows that the participants are highly engaged in job crafting as suggested by the high average ($M=4.87$; $SD=.62$) of the three types of job crafting (see Table 1). Thus, the findings show that lecturers of CLCS are mostly engaged in job crafting. In specific, out of three areas of job crafting, the participants seem to be involving more in relational crafting ($M=5.15$; $SD=.56$) followed by cognitive crafting ($M=5.10$, $SD=.91$), and then the task crafting ($M=4.35$, $SD=.32$).

Table 3. The Participants' job crafting practice

Lecturers' Job Crafting	Mean	SD
Task Crafting	4.35	.32
Relational crafting	5.15	.56
Cognitive Crafting	5.10	.91
<i>General Job Crafting</i>	4.87	.62

3.2.1 Participants' Task Crafting Practice

Table 4 illustrates the participants' rating towards the task crafting practices. Except for *the introducing new approaches for enhancing job nature* which was rated moderately high ($M=3.01$, $SD=.45$) all other items were rated high, means ranging between 4.12 and 5.30. Among them, the item *introduce new work tasks that you think better suit your skills or interests* was rated the highest ($M=5.30$; $SD=.39$) while the item *change the scope or types of tasks that you complete at work* scored the lowest mean of 4.12 ($SD=.91$). Overall, the findings indicate that the participants are highly involved in task crafting (see Table 1).

Table 4. The Participants' Task crating practice

Task Crafting Practice	N	Mean	SD
Introduce new approaches to improve your work	42	3.01	.45
Change the scope or types of tasks that you complete at work	42	4.12	.91
Introduce new work tasks that you think better suit your skills or interests	42	5.30	.39
Choose to take on additional tasks at work	42	4.82	1.09
Give preference to work tasks that suit your skills or interests	42	4.51	.67

3.2.2. Participants' Relational Crafting Practice

Table 5 shows the participants' rating on the practices reflecting relational crafting. With the mean score between 4.3 and 5.7, the participants have rated all the five items under this section high (see Table1). Of the items, *Make friends with people at work who have similar skills or interests* received the highest mean of 5.7 ($SD=.32$), closely followed by the item *Organise or attend work related social functions* ($M=5.6$, $SD=.70$). The item *Choose to mentor new employees (officially or unofficially)* scored the least ($M=4.3$). The general rating on five items show that the participants are engaged highly in relational crafting.

Table 5. The Participants' Relational Crafting Practice

Relational Crafting Practice	N	Mean	SD
Make an effort to get to know people well at work	42	4.64	.53
Organise or attend work related social functions	42	5.60	.70
Organise special events in the workplace (e.g., celebrating a co-worker's birthday)*	42	5.50	.93
Choose to mentor new employees (officially or unofficially)	42	4.30	1.30
Make friends with people at work who have similar skills or interests	42	5.70	.32

3.2.3 Participants' Cognitive Crafting practice

Table 6 shows the participants responses on the items related to cognitive crafting practice. Of five items, the item *Think about how your job gives your life purpose* was rated the lowest (M=4.60, SD=.39) whereas the item *Think about the ways in which your work positively impacts your life* was awarded the highest mean (M=5.52, SD=.63). The findings also show that the participants remind themselves of the importance of their work for the community (M=5.40, SD=.80) and also related the significance of their work to the organizational success (M=4.81, SD=.54). General the high mean rating on all five items asserts that the participants are highly engaged in cognitive crafting practice.

Table 6. The Participants' Cognitive Crafting Practice

Cognitive Crafting Practice	N	Mean	SD
Think about how your job gives your life purpose	42	4.60	.39
Remind yourself about the significance your work has for the success of the organization	42	4.81	.54
Think about the ways in which your work positively impacts your life	42	5.52	.63
Remind yourself of the importance of your work for the broader community	42	5.40	.80
Reflect on the role your job has for your overall well-being	42	5.30	.30

3.3. Job Crafting Practice of Dzongkha and Non-Dzongkha Participants

Table 7 shows the difference in job crafting practice between the participants who were Dzongkha lecturers (N=30) and the non-Dzongkha lecturers (N=12). In general the average means of three types of job crafting under each category, Dzongkha lecturers (M=5.32; SD=0.55) and the non-Dzongkha lecturers (M=4.41; SD=0.61) indicate that Dzongkha lecturers are engaged in the job crafting more than the non-Dzongkha lecturers. It is also revealed that the Dzongkha lecturers are engaged more in all the types of job crafting in comparison to the non-Dzongkha lecturers. The Dzongkha lecturers rated means of 5.03 (SD=0.91), 5.52 (SD=0.32) and 5.41 (SD=0.42) whereas the non-Dzongkha lecturers rated means of 3.67 (SD=0.87), 4.78 (SD=.32) and 4.47 (SD=0.65) against Task Crafting, Relational Crafting and Cognitive Crafting respectively.

Table 7. The difference in Job crafting between the Dzongkha and the non-Dzongkha lecturers

Participants	Domain of Job Crafting	N	Group statistics		
			Mean	SD	Std.error mean
Dzongkha Lecturers	Task	30	5.03	.91	.037
	Relational	30	5.52	.32	.031
	Cognitive	30	5.41	.43	.031
	Average	30	5.32	.55	
Non-Dzongkha Lecturers	Task	12	3.67	.87	.034
	Relational	12	4.78	.32	.033
	Cognitive	12	4.79	.65	.931
	Average	12	4.41	.61	

3.4. Demographic Influence on Job Crafting

In order to examine whether the demographic factors such as gender, education qualification, field of specialization influence the job crafting of the participants, the mean and standard deviation were calculated. Table 8 shows the variation in job crafting practice among the participants based on their demographic variables. The table shows that the mean scores 4.76 and 4.18 male and female received respectively depict that there is no significant difference between male and female in job crafting practice. However, the education qualification seems to play a vital role in participants' job crafting practice. The table shows that participants with Masters Degree (M=5.36, SD=0.78) and Bachelors Degree (M=4.87, SD=0.76) to be engaged more than the participants with PhD (M=3.19). However, the result could be

affected because of the lone PhD participant, which needs to be considered for caution in generalizing the finding. Similarly, the number of years in the service seems to also play an important role in participants' job crafting practice. It seems the participants who are new or at the early stage of the job seems to be engaged more in crafting job. The highest mean was received by the participants who were 5-10 year (M=5.56, SD=0.71) in job, followed by 1-5 (M=4.89, SD=0.34) whereas the participants who have been in the job for more than 20 years and above rated the least (M=3.01, SD=0.02).

Generally, the findings revealed that while gender does not influence job crafting practice, the education background and career stage (number of years in the job) play vital role in it.

Table 8. Job crafting based on Participants' Demographic Variation

Demographic factors		N=42	Mean	SD
Gender	Male	35	4.76	.65
	Female	7	4.18	.45
Education	PhD	1	3.19	.00
	Masters	36	5.36	.78
	Bachelors Degree	5	4.87	.76
Number of Years in the job	20 years and above	2	3.01	.02
	15-20	5	3.91	.89
	11-15	7	4.67	.54
	5-10	18	5.56	.71
	1-5	9	4.89	.34

3.5. Participants Perspective towards their job requirement (job design)

Table 9 shows the perspective of Dzongkha and non-Dzongkha lecturers of CLCS towards the existing rule that mandates the lecturers to conduct research. The table shows that there is perspective difference between the Dzongkha lecturers and non-Dzongkha lecturers against the rule. Most of the Dzongkha participants feel that research is making their job difficult as indicated by majority of them agreeing (Yes) to the statements in the table. Similarly, a few non-Dzongkha participants also share the perception.

Table 9. Participants Perspective on Current Job Design for Lecturers

Participants' Perspective on their Job Requirement	Dzongkha Participants N=30				Non-Dzongkha Participants N=12			
	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
I find it difficult to maintain balance between research and teaching	25	83.33	5	16.66	4	33.33	8	66.66
I think it is not fair that it is mandatory for me to conduct research	23	76.66	7	21	2	16.66	10	83.33
It stresses me when I think of having to conduct research	27	90	3	10	3	25	9	75
I would rather do my teaching well than do research	20	66.66	10	33.33	5	41.66	7	58
I have received training to conduct research	28	93.33	2	6.66	3	25	9	75
I think my job would be more interesting if I need not conduct research	25	83.33	5	16.66	5	41.66	7	58

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, the findings of the study are discussed within the purview of the job crafting theories and previous researches in the field of job crafting. The findings generally showed that the participants are highly engaged in job crafting. Among the three dimensions of the job crafting, task crafting, relational crafting and cognitive crafting, the finding suggested that participants are likely to be engaged more in relational crafting. Further the study also showed that the Dzongkha lecturers engaged more in job crafting comparing to the non-Dzongkha lecturers. Also, there was indication of demographic background of the participants influencing their job crafting practices. For the sake of clarity, the findings are discussed under the three research questions separately.

4.1. How do the lecturers of CLCS craft job in order to foster their wellbeing?

The findings revealed that the lecturers of CLCS highly engage in job crafting. This was hypothesized in the context of the lecturers' poor research knowledge and skill causing stress among them. That has led them to seek alternatives at work to generate meaningfulness in their job. Withstanding the hypothesis, the study found that the Dzongkha lecturers who come from the monastic education system perceive balancing between teaching and researching difficult. Besides, they wish if they could perform their job without having to conduct research. It was also shown that 83% of the Dzongkha lecturer against 34% of non-Dzongkha lecturers confessed they did not receive any form of research training. This might show that the employee when confronting shortage of job resource, such as constraint in knowledge and skill in performing assigned task, tend to seek alternative means to perform the task or change the task itself [5]. The finding implies that the lecturers are heavily involved in job crafting in the wake of their incapacity to perform the required job, conducting research. Hence, a well executed professional development program to capacitate the lecturers in conducting research might be necessary.

Besides, the job crafting practice of the lecturers this study uncovered affirms the [5] proposition that job crafting has three dimensions, task crafting, relational crafting and cognitive crafting. The study illustrated that the participants highly engage in all three job crafting dimensions in order to readjust themselves to their job. These findings corroborated [11]. [4] stated that "...all three forms of job crafting indicate different processes through which employees can take active roles in shaping their experience of work." (p.139) The findings of this study that show participants' high level of engagement in job crafting suggests that Job crafting is an essential composition of organizational success and that it needs to be systematically facilitated so as to draw maximum benefit from the self motivated engagement of the employees.

In CLCS, the lecturers seem to be considering the relation among the members of the college the most important aspect of their job. It was found that the participants generally engaged in relational crafting the most from the three forms of crafting. According to [4] the efficiency and productivity of the job depends much on the professional environment. However, the professional environment could be closely related to the personal and social relation one experiences with the member of the organizations. The social relation, therefore, not only would be factor affecting one's mood and emotion, but also would be enabling factor in performing difficult tasks. Sense of collaboration could be developed from enhanced social environment of the organization since the employees, according to [5], usually seek likeminded colleagues who possess same skill and interest to collaborate for professional task. Accordingly, the study found that most participants show interest in social events and in making friends with the people of same skill and interest. This trend could be beneficial to both individual and the college if the participants' interests are positively harnessed. However, such collaboration if established without proper professional goal, it could turn into a professional as well as social circle which would ultimately become cause of division among the members of the organization. Some scholars call this phenomenon 'balkanization' - a collaboration that forms division [22]. Such collaboration could permeate toxic vibe in the work place and cause more organizational harm than benefit. Therefore, while relational crafting might be benefiting to the employees who seek genuine friendship and collaboration, it could lead to formation of small divisive groups. For this, the finding of this study suggests that the human resource management should include plans and strategies to facilitate positive collaboration among the members of the college.

On the other hand, the perspective the participants hold about their job seems to be playing equal role in motivating and engaging in their job as their relation with colleagues. As hypothesized and in consistent

to the theory of job crafting [5], this study found that participants, in order to add meaning and purpose to one's job, they attach personal, social and communal value and significance to the job. The finding corresponds to [14] study. For example, their study revealed that job crafting happens when an individual's developing self image, work experience, need human connection and self-efficacy were high. In its parallel, this study has also unveiled that the participants accentuated their job in terms of the relevancy and significance to the society, organization and their own lives. Hence, they were involved in defining their roles besides the ones designed for them. This could act as an intrinsic value the participants associate themselves to their job and their surroundings. The Human Resource Management could emphasize on the value of job an employee performs by mere acknowledgement. However, it might be desirable that more than acknowledging culture is vouched.

Finally, the study also found that participants engaged in task crafting as much as other forms of crafting. The participants tend to change the scope of tasks that they complete at work, choose to take additional tasks at work and choose work that suit their skills or interest. However, they seem to confront resource constraint in finding new approach to improve their works. Perhaps, it is referring to the participants' inadequate experience, exposure and incapacity to innovative and critical thinking. According to [9], job crafting happens in three ways, increasing job resources, increasing challenging job demands and decreasing hindering jobs. Accordingly, the participants in this study seem to have sought various measures to increase their resources to perform their task. The participants, as per the study, changed the type of work the task that they complete, which indicates that they increase the challenging job demands in order to make their task performance more fulfilling. Likewise, the choice of work that suits their skills and interest suggest that practice of decreasing the hindering jobs. This study conforms to [18] which also found that employee alter their task when it is either too easy to perform or too difficult to perform.

Likewise, taking additional task, which was one of the findings of the study, could be also a mechanism to increase meaningfulness of one's job. It is stated that when the employee fails to perform an assigned task, in order to keep oneself engaged, the employee might take additional task [14]. That could also happen when the task is unchallenging. So in order to increase the job challenge demand, the employee could undertake additional tasks. However, in the context of present study, limitation in the job resource must be the reason for engaging in task crafting as the study also showed that most of the lecturers still lack required competency, especially in conducting research. Hence the study found that most of the participants were engaging themselves in taking additional responsibility. In this case, it could be decreasing the hindering jobs the viable reason. To this, it is remarked that the job crafting becomes more effective when the employees have more autonomy in developing through own job. Hence, Human Resource Management needs to remember that, job crafting takes place effectively in more uncontrolled context and facilitate autonomy to the employees.

4.2. Is there significant difference in job crafting between the Dzongkha lecturers and other lecturers?

According to [13], the job crafting, in some cases, are influenced by the available job resource including one's knowledge and skills to perform an assigned task. And with large number of lecturers conceding that they have not received any research training, the policy mandating research for the lecturers at CLCS seem to be encumbering in performing their job efficiently. Like hypothesized, it was observed that there is difference in the level of job crafting between Dzongkha ($M=5.32$) and non-Dzongkha lecturer ($M=4.41$). Although participants from both categories, as per the finding, are highly engaged in job crafting, the Dzongkha lecturer participants were comparatively engaged more than the non-Dzongkha lecturers.

This occurrence could be referred to [9] three ways of job crafting. Decreasing the hindrance to job is one of the ways the employees usually engage in job crafting. This could be done when the task entails risk of failure or when the task demands job resource that one lacks. The Dzongkha lecturers, as the study reported, struggle with conducting research which is a requirement for professional growth. Thus, their lack of the research skill and knowledge could have forced them to resort to alternatives such as taking up extra jobs.

4.3. Do the demographic backgrounds of the lecturers affect their job crafting practices?

Previous studies on job crafting in various firms and organizations have recorded that participants' background affects their job crafting behavior [e.g., 16, 18]. Conforming to [18] study, this study revealed that the participants' demographic background influences their job crafting practices. It was found that the participants who were in the job for more than 20 years were engaged the least in job crafting whereas the participants who were at the early stage of the career such as who have been in the job for 1-10 years were highly engaged in job crafting. The findings were in consistent to [15] study which found that employee at different career stage value different aspects of job. [9] reported that while the employees at early career stage seek to learn and enhance their knowledge and skill about the job, the mid career employees seek for growth and development and the seniors in the jobs look for recognition and respect rather than opportunities. However, with just two senior participants with more than twenty years of experience, it might not be feasible to generalize the finding. However, [5, 9] suggested that the senior employees should be provided with the managerial positions so that they engage more in mentoring and guiding younger colleagues. And that the mid-career and early career employee should be provided with opportunities for the professional development trainings and programs. It is also mentioned that the early-career employee be offered with challenging tasks so that they get to prove themselves while also enhancing their knowledge and skill about the job in hand. The findings of this study also suggest that Human Resource Management should provide more professional development opportunities to the lecturers who are at early stage of their career so that they develop their competency to perform the tasks which in turn would contribute to organizational development.

Another finding showed that the participants' educational level also had certain association to the level of engagement in job crafting. It was observed that comparing to participants with PhD and Bachelors degree, the participants with Masters' degree were engaged more in job crafting. The finding makes sense in the light of job crafting theory that expostulated that the employees who have adequate job resources while also confronting certain level of job challenges are engaged more meaningfully in their job than those who either lack job resources or are unchallenged by the job [9]. In present case, the participants with Bachelors' degree must be either affected by inadequate job resources or their own self consciousness about not having higher degree to work in colleges, while the PhD candidate might have found the job prescribed to the lecturers comfortable to be performed that without job crafting. While the findings make logical as well as theoretical sense, the number of the participants in each category might also have affected the findings in present study. Since there was only one PhD candidate, the findings might be representation of an individual's habitual or natural behaviour rather than professional trend. So, drawing any conclusion based on this finding may not be scientifically viable. Nevertheless, it opens an area for query for the future researchers to investigate the job crafting among the lecturers who have PhD qualification, and see whether the job crafting pattern among these participants stand distinct to general employees.

Further, it was interesting to notice that gender is inconsequential to job crafting practice. Both male and female tend to be involving in job crafting almost to the same level. This suggests that the Human Resource Management needs to provide professional challenges and opportunities indiscriminately in terms of gender.

The study aimed to investigate the job crafting practice of the lecturers working in CLCS. From the findings of the study, it could be concluded that job crafting is an essential professional behaviour any employee engages into. The participants of this study were highly engaged in job crafting, which seems to be effective mechanism to enhance productivity and engagement in their job. Of three forms of job crafting, it is likely that the participants engage mostly in relational crafting. Also, it could be viewed that lecturers with poor research competence, especially the Dzongkha lecturers, engage more in job crafting. Furthermore the study revealed that while demographic factors such as qualification and career stage influence the degree of engagement in job crafting, gender was found to be inconsequential. The findings generally suggest that understanding job crafting pattern could contribute to the college in strategizing mechanisms to develop job engagement and job satisfaction.

5. LIMITATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Due to quantitative nature of the study exploring into the depth of the job crafting practice and issues related to it was not achievable. Moreover, using only questionnaire for collecting data, the study was restraint to objective reality bound by the questionnaire. Subjective element in the questionnaire would have elicited more information about the job crafting practice of the participants. The mixed-method study would have enabled the study to obtain "...intricate details about phenomena such as feeling, thought processes and emotions that are difficult to extract or learn about through more convenient conventional research method" [23, p.11]. Future study could employ mixed methods approach to explore deeper into the phenomenon. Besides, the study was conducted with the lecturers of only one college in Bhutan. Therefore, findings from this study cannot be generalized to other contexts. In order to understand the issue at larger context of lecturers in Bhutan, large scale study engaging representative sample from across the country could be conducted.

CONSENT

As per international standard or university standard, participant's written consent has been collected and preserved by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We the researchers remain thankful to the clcs management for permitting to undertake the study in the college. Likewise, we would like to thank the faculties for sharing their experience and perspectives to us by responding to the questionnaire.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

This work was carried out in collaboration between the authors. Jigme Dorji designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Dawa Drakpa searched the literature and managed the analysis of the study. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCE

1. Phanchung, Choden T. Creating an enabling research culture at the Royal University of Bhutan – An analysis. *Bhutan Journal of Research and Development*. 2019; 8(2):15-24.
2. Sherub K, Scheulka M J. The value of research culture. *Druk Journal*. 2019; 5(1): 72-83.
3. Schofield JW. Higher education in Bhutan: Progress and challenges In Scheulka MJ and Maxwell TW (Eds.), *Education in Bhutan: Culture, Schooling, and Gross National Happiness*. Springer Publishing. 2016: 87-102
4. Slemp GR, Vella-Brodrick D A. The job crafting questionnaire: A new scale to measure the extent to which employees engage in job crafting. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2013; 3(2): 126-146. DOI: [10.5502/ijw.v3i2.1](https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v3i2.1)
5. Wrzesniewski A , Dutton JE. Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*. 2001; 26: 179-201. DOI: [10.2307/259118](https://doi.org/10.2307/259118)

6. Wang H J, Demerouti E. A review of job crafting research: The role of leader behaviors in cultivating successful job crafter. In S.K. Parker & U.K. Bindl (Eds), *Proactivity at work* (Series in Organization and Management). Routledge, 2016
7. Berg JM, Dutton J E, Wrzesniewski A. *What is job crafting and why does it matter?*. Regents of the University of Michigan; 2007.
8. Rudolph C W, Katz I M, Lavigne K N, Zacher H. Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2017; 102: 112-138. DOI: [10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.008)
9. Tims M, Bakker A B, Derks D. The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2013; 18(2): 230-240. DOI: [10.1037/a0032141](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032141)
10. Letona-Ibañez O, Carrasco M, Martinez-Rodriguez S, Amillano A, Ortiz-Marques N. Cognitive, relational and task crafting: Spanish adaptation and analysis of psychometric properties of the Job Crafting Questionnaire. *PLoS ONE*. 2019; 14(10). DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0223539](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223539)
11. Petrou P, Demerouti E, Peeters MCW, Schaufeli W B, Hetland J. Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2012; 3(3):1120-1141. DOI: [10.1002/job.1783](https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1783)
12. Bakker AB, Demerouti E. Job Demands-Resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*. 2017; 22: 273–285. DOI: [10.1037/ocp0000056](https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056)
13. Wellman N, Spreitzer G. Crafting scholarly life: Strategies for creating meaning in academic careers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2011; 3(26): 927-931. DOI: [10.1002/jop.708](https://doi.org/10.1002/jop.708)
14. Niessen C, Weseler D, Kostova P. When and why do individuals craft their jobs? The role of individual motivation and work characteristics for job crafting. *Human Relation*. 2016; 69: 1287-1313. DOI: [10.1177/0018726715610642](https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715610642)
15. Lichtenthaler P W, Fischbach A. Leadership, job crafting, and employee health and performance. *leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 2018; 39(5): 620-632. DOI: [10.1108/LODJ-07-2017-0191](https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2017-0191)
16. Brucker DL, Sunder V. Job Crafting among American workers with disabilities. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*. 2020: DOI: [10.1007/s10926-020-09889-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-020-09889-9)
17. Lyons P. The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 2008; 23(1): 25-36. DOI: [10.1007/s10869-008-9080-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9080-2)
18. Hassian K, Zhao M. Job crafting practices and work satisfaction: Evidence from higher education sector in Shaanxi, China. *The new educational review*; 2018. DOI: [10.15804/tner.2018.52.2.05](https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2018.52.2.05)
19. Creswell J. *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4TH ed). Pearson Education, Boylston Street, Boston; 2012.
20. Fraenkel JR, Wallen NE, Hyan HH. *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed). New York, America: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc; 2012
21. Nielsen K, Antino M, Sanz-Vergel, A & Alfredo Rodríguez-Muñoz A. Validating the Job Crafting Questionnaire (JCRQ): A multi-method and multi-sample study, *Work & Stress*. 2017; 31:1, 82-99, DOI: [10.1080/02678373.2017.1293752](https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1293752)

22. Chiang C, Chapman H, Elder R. Overcoming challenges to collaboration: Nurse Educators' Experiences in Curriculum Change of Nursing education. 2011; 50(1):27-33. DOI: [10.3928/01484834-20101029-04](https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20101029-04)
23. Strauss A, Corbin J. Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. 2nd Ed. New Delhi: Sage Publications India Ltd; 1998.