

PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY, JOB CRAFTING AND HAPPINESS AT WORK:
A RESEARCH AMONG CALL CENTER AGENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS
OF
İSTANBUL BİLGİ UNIVERSITY

ONUR UÇAR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ORGANIZATION STUDIES

**PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY, JOB CRAFTING AND HAPPINESS AT WORK:
A RESEARCH AMONG CALL CENTER AGENTS**

Onur Uçar
116801013

Prof. Dr. Gonca Günay
İstanbul Bilgi University

Prof. Dr. Deniz Kelekçi
İstanbul Bilgi University

Prof. Dr. Başak Uçanok Tan
İstanbul Bilgi University

Prof. Dr. İdil Işık
Bahçeşehir University

Assist. Prof. Dr. Sibel Çalışkan
Bahçeşehir University

Date of Approval: 2/5/2025



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name Surname: Onur Uçar

Signature:

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the mediating role of job crafting between psychological safety and workplace happiness, which is defined by engagement, job satisfaction, and commitment. Job crafting, as defined by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), is a process through which employees actively reshape their work to fulfill personal needs and create meaning, a concept rooted in Job Identity Theory. This process is not confined to specific job types and can occur in roles ranging from simple to complex, autonomous to non-autonomous.

The study specifically focuses on how job crafting contributes to psychological safety, including feelings of freedom in making mistakes, sharing ideas, and self-realization, particularly among call center employees. The study examines all facets of job crafting; cognitive crafting, which addresses the underlying "why" of work, task crafting, which involves altering job routines, and relational crafting, which involves changing interpersonal interactions. The findings reveal that each dimension of job crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and various aspects of workplace happiness, including engagement, job satisfaction, and commitment.

.

.

Keywords: Psychological Safety; Crafting; Job Crafting; Job Identity Theory; Workplace Happiness

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, psikolojik güvenlik ile iş yeri mutluluğu (bağlılık, iş memnuniyeti ve işe adanmışlık) arasındaki ilişkide iş zanaatkarlığının aracılık rolünü incelemektedir. Wrzesniewski ve Dutton (2001) tarafından tanımlandığı üzere iş zanaatkarlığı, çalışanların kişisel ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak ve işlerine anlam katmak amacıyla işlerini aktif bir şekilde yeniden şekillendirdiği bir süreçtir ve bu kavram İş Kimliği Teorisi'ne dayanmaktadır. Bu süreç, belirli iş türleriyle sınırlı olmayıp, basitten karmaşığa, özerk olandan olmayan rollere kadar her türlü işte gerçekleşebilir.

Çalışma, özellikle iş zanaatkarlığının psikolojik güvenliğe katkısını; hata yapma özgürlüğü, fikir paylaşımı ve kendini gerçekleştirme gibi unsurları içeren bir çerçevede, özellikle çağrı merkezi çalışanları üzerinde ele almaktadır. Araştırma, iş zanaatkarlığının; işin temel “neden”lerini ele alan bilişsel zanaatkarlık, iş rutinlerini değiştirmeyi içeren görev zanaatkarlığı ve kişilerarası etkileşimleri değiştirmeyi kapsayan ilişkisel zanaatkarlık olmak üzere alt boyutlarını incelemektedir. Bulgular, iş zanaatkarlığının her bir boyutunun, psikolojik güvenlik ile iş yeri mutluluğunun çeşitli yönleri (bağlılık, iş memnuniyeti ve işe adanmışlık) arasındaki ilişkiye aracılık ettiğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Psikolojik Güvenlik; Zanaatkarlık; İş Zanaatkarlığı; İş Kimliği Teorisi; İşyeri Mutluluğu



To my beloved wife and my dear daughters, Işık Maya and Işıl Pera, I hope to have the
chance to read your PhD theses one day

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, and most importantly, I would like to present my humble gratefulness and thanks to my advisor Prof Dr. Gonca GÜNAY for her support and encouragement till the end of my thesis journey. More than that, I am deeply grateful for her creation of psychological safety in where I had the opportunity to express, explore and realize myself. Her encouragement and guidance for let me think deeply was incredible for inspiring.

Being her student is a great honor for me to carry throughout my life.

Also, I would like to present my great thanks and gratitude to my committee members, for their contribution, insights and guidance for Prof Dr. İdil IŞIK and Prof Dr. Deniz KELEKÇİ from the beginning to the end of this journey.

I also want to express my gratitude to my family for their great support, and to myself for chasing my dream and turning it into reality.

.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1. Psychological Safety	7
2.1.1. Psychological Safety and Engagement	15
2.1.2. Psychological Safety and Commitment	17
2.1.3. Psychological Safety and Job Satisfaction.....	19
2.2. Job Crafting.....	21
2.2.1. Job Crafting Facets and Psychological Safety	31
2.2.2. Job Crafting Facets and Engagement.....	36
2.2.3. Job- Crafting Facets and Commitment	38
2.2.4. Job Crafting Facets and Satisfaction.....	40
2.3. Mediator Role of Job Crafting Facets	41
3. METHODOLOGY	53
3.1. Sampling	53
3.2. Participants.....	55
3.3. Instrument	56
3.3.1. Psychological Safety Scale	56

3.3.2.	Job Crafting Scale	56
3.3.3.	Happiness at Work Scale	57
4.	DATA ANALYSIS	58
4.1.1.	Participant Demographics	58
4.1.2.	Factor and Reliability Analyses	61
4.1.3.	Psychological Safety Scale Factor and Reliability Analyze	61
4.1.4.	Job Crafting Scale Factor and Reliability Analyses.....	62
4.1.5.	Short-Happiness at Work Scale Factor and Reliability Analyses.....	64
4.2.	Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness and Kurtosis	65
4.3.	Correlation Analysis.....	66
4.4.	Hypothesis Testing.....	68
4.5.	The Summary of Findings.....	92
5.	CONCLUSION	95
	REFERENCES	109
	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A. Result of the Evaluation by the Ethics Committee	131
	Appendix B. Survey	132

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. JIT and JDR Comparison	23
Table 4.1. Participant Demographics	58
Table 4.2. Factor and Reliability Findings for Psychological Safety Scale	61
Table 4.3. Factor and Reliability Findings for Job Crafting Scale	62
Table 4.4. Factor and Reliability Findings for Short-Happiness at Work Scale	64
Table 4.5. Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and, Kurtosis	65
Table 4.6. Correlations Between the Study Variables	67
Table 4.7. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.1	68
Table 4.8. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.1	68
Table 4.9. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.2	69
Table 4.10. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.2	69
Table 4.11. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.3	70
Table 4.12. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.3	70
Table 4.13. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.1	71
Table 4.14. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.1	71
Table 4.15. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.2	71
Table 4.16. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.2	72
Table 4.17. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.3	72
Table 4.18. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.3	73
Table 4.19. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.1	73
Table 4.20. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.1	73
Table 4.21. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.2	74
Table 4.22. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.2	74
Table 4.23. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.3	75
Table 4.24. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.3	75
Table 4.25. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.1	76
Table 4.26. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.1	76
Table 4.27. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.2	77

Table 4.28. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.2	77
Table 4.29. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.3.....	78
Table 4.30. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.3.....	78
Table 4.31. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.1.....	79
Table 4.32. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.1.....	79
Table 4.33. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.2.....	80
Table 4.34. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.2.....	80
Table 4.35. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.3.....	81
Table 4.36. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.3.....	81
Table 4.37. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.1.....	82
Table 4.38. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.1	82
Table 4.39. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.2.....	83
Table 4.40. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.2	83
Table 4.41. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.3.....	84
Table 4.42. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.3	84
Table 4.43. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.4.....	85
Table 4.44. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.4	86
Table 4.45. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.5.....	87
Table 4.46. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.5	87
Table 4.47. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.6.....	88
Table 4.48. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.6	88
Table 4.49. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.7.....	89
Table 4.50. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.7	89
Table 4.51. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.8.....	90
Table 4.52. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.8	90
Table 4.53. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.9.....	91
Table 4.54. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.9	91
Table 4.55. Summary of Regression Findings	92
Table 4.56. Summary of Mediation Analyses Findings	93

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BPNT:	Basic Psychological Needs Theory
CET:	Cognitive Evaluation Theory
COM:	Commitment
COP:	Causality Orientations Theory
ENG:	Engagement
GCT:	Goal Content Theory
HAW:	Happiness at work
JC:	Job Crafting
JCC:	Cognitive Crafting
JCR:	Relational Crafting
JCT:	Task Crafting
JDR:	Job Demand Resource
JIT:	Job Identity Theory
JOBC:	Job Crafting
OIT:	Organismic Integration Theory
PSYS:	Psychological Safety
RMT:	Relationship Motivation Theory
SAT:	Satisfaction
SDT:	Self Determination Theory

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three decades, psychological safety has not only sustained its prominence in academic literature but has also evolved into a central theoretical framework, deeply intertwined with key concepts in organizational behavior science. Its influence spans a wide array of research domains and practical applications (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). Initially emerging as a result of field practices, psychological safety has since transformed into a valuable tool for measuring safety and environmental factors. It has ultimately developed into a robust theory, gaining recognition as either antecedent or an outcome in individual, team, and organizational analyses across numerous studies (Fraizer et al., 2017; Newman et al., 2017).

The widespread incorporation of psychological safety into both organizational practices and theoretical discourse raises a critical question: What accounts for the widespread popularity of this concept, particularly as research in this field continues to proliferate within academic literature? Edmondson, a leading scholar in this area, attributes the increasing significance of psychological safety to its ability to address the "uncertainty and complexity" faced by organizations in the wake of the pandemic (Edmondson & Bransby, 2023). It is noteworthy that the practical relevance of this concept precedes the pandemic, as evidenced by Google's Aristotle Project (2016). This research identified the establishment of a fearless environment as an essential condition for nurturing creativity and facilitating the realization of talent within organizational settings. Despite the absence of substantial variations in participants' talents and educational backgrounds, the key determinant of team success was the presence of safe spaces that enabled highly skilled employees to fully harness their potential. In this context, psychological safety functions as a fundamental precursor to self-determination (Edmondson, 2018).

In other words, even in highly desirable workplaces such as Google, which employs highly qualified individuals, the establishment of a safety zone is critical for self-determination. It enables employees to express creativity, exercise freedom of speech, share ideas, and engage in risk-taking within interpersonal relationships without fear of

potential social consequences. However, the study overlooks the employees' need for basic need satisfaction within the self-determination framework. Edmondson and Bransby (2023) categorize these needs as "being oneself," self-image, self-realization, status, and self-efficacy—factors essential for the fulfillment of both employee norms and behaviors in organizational settings.

In literature, psychological safety has been examined in various roles, including as an antecedent, mediator, independent variable, or moderator (Edmondson & Lei, 2014). To deeply analyze the concept and its role, this study posits its essential role to illuminate the importance of employees' ability to "be oneself" in the workplace to evaluate. It is crucial to explore why the fulfillment of being oneself and basic needs is necessary, the outcomes of meeting these needs, and, if employees achieve fulfillment, the subsequent advantages both for them and for organizations. These questions are central to understanding the ultimate goal of fulfilling basic needs within the context of psychological safety, a topic that has been extensively researched by scholars. Although engagement has been one of the earliest topics in psychological safety research since Kahn (1990), there are controversial results in the literature regarding its ultimate goal. While some studies support its antecedent role in engagement (May et al., 2004; Kark & Carmeli, 2009; Basit, 2017), others suggest a lack of relationship between the two (Oliver & Rothmann, 2007; Rothmann & Rothmann, 2010). Commitment, often considered a confusing concept in relation to engagement, has also been explored as a measure of the belief and meaning that psychological safety promises to employees. However, research on this topic presents conflicting findings: some studies provide supportive results (De Clercq & Ruis, 2007; Chen et al., 2014), while others report non-significant outcomes (O'Neill & Arendt, 2008; Rather et al., 2009), indicating a need for clarification. Edmondson (2018) has used the term engagement as a synonym for commitment, further highlighting the confusion within the theory. Another aspect of psychological safety's promise is the increase in satisfaction levels due to the positive environment in the workplace. This topic remains one of the least explored in surveys, primarily due to the broad definition of satisfaction and the relatively limited focus of the founders of psychological safety on satisfaction. However, this area is increasingly being addressed by scholars, as seen in the works of Kuo et al. (2019), Kim and Kim (2020), and Moin et al. (2021), presenting an emerging

field for further research. The publication dates of these studies themselves provide clues about the importance of the topic and the need for further research to contribute to literature.

Moreover, rather than a broad definition that encompasses concepts such as happiness at work, a more specific evaluation of its facets - engagement, commitment, and satisfaction - is needed. This is particularly important, as only a few studies in literature have explored the role of psychological safety in this context. To examine the role of psychological safety, this study aims to investigate its contribution to the facets of happiness at work, namely engagement, commitment, and satisfaction, from both theoretical and empirical perspectives.

Employees within a safety zone possess the ability to act freely, without fear, and creatively, in pursuit of self-determination and basic need satisfaction, enabling them to determine what, how, and with whom to act (Demerouti, 2014). From the perspective of self-determination, the relationship between determination and the perception of the alteration process, which begins in the mind, is discussed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001). While their study evaluates the cognitive aspects of crafting in the pursuit of happiness at work, the conceptualization by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) is employed to explore the similarities and differences among the facets of crafting and the crafting process, particularly in relation to self-determination and need satisfaction. This framework is used to assess the discovery journey of crafters, as outlined by Sheldon et al. (2003).

The facets of happiness at work and the crafting process are assessed from the perspective of Job Identity Theory (JIT), despite the dominance of the JDR perspective in job crafting studies where most of the facets of engagement, commitment and satisfaction areas are explored (De Gennaro, 2019). In this context, the Job Demand Resource (JDR) perspective is discussed and compared, along with the rationale for using JIT in analyzing and interpreting the data. Additionally, the attribution of job crafting as a mediating role between psychological safety and happiness at work is explored, a relationship that has been rarely investigated in the literature.

The rationale for selecting the JIT lens in this study is rooted in the cognitive aspect of job alteration, which forms the central research problem. The objective is to examine the relations of job alteration from a cognitive perspective, thereby establishing a link with psychological safety. In addition to illustrating the relationship between a safety environment and cognitive crafting, the study also scrutinizes the other facets of crafting—task and relational—within the context of their antecedents, as well as their theoretical foundations.

However, this study aims to evaluate job crafting within the JIT framework, where engagement is primarily important from a cognitive perspective, and the other facets follow sequentially in the crafting process (Hur et al., 2017). The study acknowledges that few studies in literature address this relationship, as well as the commitment aspect, where contradictions and differing results have emerged, such as those found in Ghitulescu's (2007) study. The rarity and contradictory findings are particularly evident in the concept of satisfaction within the JIT framework, as satisfaction derived from job crafting represents a significant outcome. This satisfaction is not solely realized through a one-time act of crafting or through simple modifications in tasks or interactions, but rather through the manner in which crafters organize their ideas, thoughts, and perceptions regarding the crafting process, as well as the environment to which they are connected (Devotta et al., 2022).

This study aims to evaluate the similarities and differences between the facets of job crafting and their relationships with happiness at work through the lens of Job Identity Theory (JIT), which explores the processes of identification and changes in attitudes and behaviors. The research investigates the interaction between job crafting, examining its potential role as a mediator between psychological safety and the independent variable—happiness at work, which is considered in terms of engagement, commitment, and satisfaction. This inquiry encompasses any job within the JIT framework, including both ordinary and simple jobs that do not require high demands or significant resources from the environment. Even in the case of routine tasks, the degree of alteration does not differ or become less significant when compared to more complex jobs. In other words, regardless of whether the job is simple or constrained, the alteration process serves as a

precursor to job crafting. If the environment is conducive to fostering change, job crafting can emerge as a process. As Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) suggest, various types of jobs can participate in this process. This research aims to apply their assertion by measuring the crafting processes of agents within a call center setting.

It is estimated that over 17 million call center agents are employed globally (Gardner, 2022). However, a widespread misconception exists regarding their roles, motivations, and responsibilities, particularly among those on the other side of the line. It is commonly assumed that the primary role of call center agents is to simply repeat and follow pre-assigned scripts during interactions. This perception is not only held by customers, but is also sometimes endorsed by managers, who may view agents as being obligated to operate under strict control mechanisms, akin to machines. This misinterpretation leads to the undervaluation of the roles of call center agents, as well as the working environment in call centers, where job definitions are often perceived as low-skill, temporary, and highly standardized (Tovar, 2022). Although this topic has been extensively scrutinized and contradictory assertions have been noted in literature, call center-based studies remain largely overlooked in research due to their complexity, as well as the dual challenges posed by the stringent control mechanisms and the competitive nature of human factors (Holman, 2002). The existence of this undesirable, disliked, or overlooked research area can be argued to be similar to the situation in Turkish literature, where only a handful of studies exist, and only a few of them are related to organizational science research.

The aim of this study is not only to focus on the commonly accepted perspective in the literature that jobs in call centers are restrictive, controlled, scripted, non-autonomous, less creative, less safe, less desirable, routine, mundane, and repetitive (Tsai, 2016; Howard, 2017), often characterized as "bête noire" conditions, but also to examine the influence of psychological safety on job crafting and its relationship with the facets of happiness at work. In other words, the concept of "bête noire" is attributed to the high and organized control mechanisms imposed on agents. Furthermore, the study investigates how these stringent control systems affect job crafting conditions within job crafting

theories and how these factors, in turn, influence happiness at work facets, specifically in relation to engagement, commitment, and satisfaction.

The data were collected from agents through self-assessment of their psychological safety levels and analyzed in relation to the facets of job crafting and happiness at work. The study adopts job crafting as a process (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) and investigates its role as a mediator between psychological safety and the facets of happiness in the workplace. Specifically, the concept of the fearless zone is explored to examine how it facilitates job crafting opportunities and enhances the methods of alteration for agents in the context of need satisfaction within self-determination theory.

In summary, this study seeks to investigate the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between psychological safety and the dimensions of happiness at work?
2. What is the relationship between psychological safety and the dimensions of job crafting?
3. What is the relationship between the dimensions of job crafting and the dimensions of happiness at work?
4. Do the dimensions of job crafting mediate the relationship between psychological safety and the dimensions of happiness at work?

Finally, the study proceeds with a literature review on psychological safety, exploring its conceptualization and examining its relationship with key aspects of happiness at work, including engagement, commitment, and satisfaction. Additionally, job crafting is discussed in the context of its dimensions—cognitive, task, and relational crafting—and their relationships with engagement, commitment, and satisfaction, which collectively contribute to happiness at work. Chapter 3 outlines the methodology employed in the study, while Chapter 4 presents the data results and findings. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes the study by discussing its theoretical and practical implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Psychological Safety

Psychological safety is analogized as “industrialized love” by Clark (2020) capturing both the simplicity and the complexity of the concept. The metaphor is simple because it draws on universal human experiences and evoking feelings of connection and security. At the same time, it is complex, presenting a paradox: emotional bonds, often regarded as personal and intimate, are crucial for structured environments like workplaces to thrive. These bonds foster a sense of belonging, enabling individuals to connect with something larger than themselves. Schein and Bennis (1965) underline this paradox of the concept as without fear of *unfreezing* and increasing *pressure* exists together to reach the equilibrium point. Schein (1985) clarifies that equilibrium point as the result of psychological safety in new dimensions of the change without losing the “integrity or identity” of the members of the organizations. This change exists at the safety level, defined by Maslow et al. (1942) as the “*rare feelings of threat and danger; unanxious*” stating the difference between security and safety. Schein (1992) expresses *that change* is a path of creation of psychological safety without anxiety in the place of equilibrium where making mistakes does not lead anxiety but a step away from frustration and fear. The path of managing fear as well as learned anxiety is stated by Schein (1996). He mentions that his studies were influenced by Kurt Lewin’s philosophy and change theory in which he explains psychological safety. Schein (1992) cites accumulated change theory that explains the working structure of the human mind is oriented to keep the existing situation in the foreseeable as the cells keep the internal environment stable- homeostasis at the stable psychological conditions. So, he claims that in the change process, the anxiety of the new and the anxiety of making mistakes can be overcome by the psychological safety, unfreezing phase of the learning process. In this phase, hesitation as well as anxiety of losing self-esteem or fear of being excluded from the group is healed by psychological safety where pain exists in trying the new. Schein (1996, 2010) mentions that creating psychological safety in transformational learning emphasizes a reward

system for new ways of thinking and working as a team model which is needed to be redefined cognitively. This learning is defined as an innovative socialization process rather than a custodian way (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

One of the milestones of the psychological safety literature, after Schein's process and learning focus for the concept, raise from Kahn's (1990), magnum opus, "*Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work*" article. This can be due to the fact that the core of the study is based on relational, cognitive, emotional, and physical differences in work performance in terms of engagement and disengagement. In his research, a scuba-diving instructor and an architect were given to imply their expressions on their jobs where they express a "preferred self". According to Kahn (1990), the preferred self (self-image) is influenced by psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability. Furthermore, the difference between engagement and disengagement stems from those conditions that are based on protecting the self and as he cites, portraying like or unlike Hochschild's (1983) machines that did not act from the heart. Psychological safety is defined as "*a feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status or career*" (Kahn, 1990, p.708). This feeling is specified by him as a trust of engagement process in which certainty, consistency, and predictability exist at interpersonal, group, intergroup, and organizational levels. New ideas and openness are the elements of psychological safety without the fear of criticism and failure with a feeling of safety and trust to step out of the defend-controlled area. He asserts cases where an employee makes a mistake, interaction leads him to learn from the mistake to indicate psychological safety. This process is also the path for creating employee satisfaction and commitment along with engagement.

On the other hand, more than a decade later, it was admitted that Edmondson's (1996) discovery, was a result of a mistake (Edmondson, 1996, 1999, 2018) and her psychological safety scale – or its adaptation forms, is mostly used in the studies (Edmondson and Lei 2014; Newman et al. 2017; Frazier et al. 2017) – the concept regained popularity after Kahn (1990). She discovered that the correlation between team effectiveness and mistake are negatively correlated as opposed to her expectations. In the results, she figures out that the more effective teams make more mistakes than other

teams. When the outcomes are investigated to get the root cause of the results, she observes that the teams in the climate report the errors, and do not hesitate to announce or inform to discuss the mistakes. And according to Edmondson (1999), team psychological safety is the “*shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking.*” Shared belief and beyond-trust interaction among the team members to initiate take risks, support each other and motivation for innovation can be underlined as her major findings of the research.

Although Edmondson did not mention or cite Kahn (1990) until Edmondson (2002a), Edmondson’s (1999) study has similarities with Kahn (1990) at theoretical and empirical background (Fraizer et al. 2017). But the core of the divergence from Kahn’s (1990) definition lies beneath the team-level measurement prerequisite for psychological safety studies whereas Edmondson (1999) defines the team’s psychological safety and efforts on the team level measurement as well as it centered the level of study at psychological safety concept (Newman et al. 2017). Furthermore, the dichotomy of definition as well as different levels of measurement exist in Edmondson’s studies: Edmondson (2002a, 2002b) underlines the importance of the interaction of the members where psychological safety is emphasized because of safe interaction among the team members. This safe interaction is the belief in not threatening self-image due to any mistake among the team members and taking risks for compromising a mistake, recognizing a mistake, or asserting a new idea. It can be inferred that the definition of the psychological safety concept, as well as stating the difference in the level of analysis, is one of earlier focus of her studies, while through the development of the concept as well as her late studies, she asserts the resemblance between Kahn’s (1990) and her psychological safety definition (Edmonson 2003; Edmondson, et al. 2004). Edmonson et al. (2004) claims the intrapsychic specialty of the concept with a tacit process measuring the pros and cons of their actions among the group interaction to calculate the risk is a result of psychological safety.

Fraizer et al. (2017) assert May et al. (2004) combine Kahn’s (1990) and Edmondson’s (1999) psychological safety definitions. Although the similarities in the definition, their scale for measuring psychological safety indicate the differences explicitly. In their scale, psychological safety is the availability for workers to express their ideas and being

him/herself at work although existing threat in the place are aimed to measure to depict the engagement with the result of meaningfulness, availability, and safety as Kahn's (1990) theory in which safety is remarkable for protecting the existence of oneself due to the danger of threats. May et al. (2004), is the first study which explored the team members' relations but conducted the psychological safety at the individual level as Kahn (1990). As it is debated above, psychological safety definition at individual or team level studies, Baer and Frese's (2003) research is the first study of psychological safety at the organizational level (Newman et al. 2017). They define the concept as the result of practices that can be formal and informal and that are bound by the interactions of trust at the workplace. They transposed Edmondson's (1999) psychological safety scale to organizational level with the claim of measuring the whole of the organization rather than individual specialty. On the other hand, as Frazier et al. (2017) state, there is a non-significant difference exists between the level of analysis at their meta-analysis. Although Edmondson's (1999) team psychological safety is used in the nomological network of psychological safety at the literature, and most of the studies exist at team level rather than individual or organizational level, Newman et al. (2017), mention the exiting studies which adopted "the team" with "organization" and exemplified Edmondson and Mogelof (2006) that figured out various level of psychological safety did not indicate difference at level of analysis, and assert that team psychological safety is a multilevel construct that contains team level where nevertheless they claim their model have meaningful at team level and even Edmondson and Lei (2014) underlines the multilevel structure of the concept and add engagement and commitment studies are focused on the individual level whereas they still claim group level studies indicate the differences in the organization level and appraise the team level structure. Edmondson and Brandsy (2023) listed studies with measurement at individual, group, organizational and multilevel dimensions.

In addition to the debate about analyzing the unit of the concept, construction differences exist in literature. One of the studies that aims to analyze the antecedents, and the outcome of the concept is conducted by Sanner and Bunderson (2015) where psychological safety is unmoderated antecedent in just team level analysis. Fraizer et al. (2017), in addition to their contribution the level of analyzing construct, antecedents and outcome is listed to describe the concept. Personality, leadership, work role and organizational culture were

listed, engagement, commitment, satisfaction were mainly evaluated as the outcome in the literature review where the concept, trust, interpersonal risk taking and sharing ideas were underlined to evaluate the similarities as well as differences with psychological safety. As Newman et al. (2017) emphasize in their literature review, their study covers additional dimensions of antecedents and outcomes of psychological safety where the antecedents are like Fraizer et al. (2017)'s review, their model reflects multilevel structure which were divided into level of analyses with the antecedents and outcomes. To put it another way, antecedents were classified according to the unit of analyzes; the outcomes of dyadic relations yielded engagement, commitment whereas team relations have creativity, learning dimensions and at the organizational level performance sparks as the outcome. Although the focus of the literature reviews has the distinctions, it is needed to emphasis the main focus of the literature reviews (Edmondson and Lei, 2014; Fraizer et al. 2017; and Newman et al.,2018) is attempt to identify both antecedents and outcomes with mainly evaluating the concept development due to the increase of the works related to psychological safety. Edmondson (2018) attempts to clarify the concept by defining psychological safety is not only:

- i. Being nice or polite but having freedom of speech and candor in expressions and ideas.
- ii. Extroversion but not depend on personalities.
- iii. Trust but count on the mistakes.
- iv. Decreasing the expectations but increasing the expectation as well as challenges with ambitious targets.

And as the literature reviews aimed, Edmondson (2018) promoted practical implementations just like Google - Aristotle project. Practical studies exist in the literature, such as Bienefeld and Grote (2014)'s study about air-crew members as multiteam systems as the healthcare workers where the consequences of psychological safety, raised through cognitive stage of courage and will to voice without the fear of having mistaken or discrimination, that is mediate between voice and team interaction and voice behavior. But the most researched area is the birthplace of Edmondson's psychological safety concept, healthcare team studies (Edmondson and Bransby, 2023).

Even, O'Donovan and McAuliffe (2020), specified the literature review on the healthcare workers and psychological safety to figure out the outcomes as well as the practical results of creating psychological safety to develop the climate for the healthcare teams. On the other hand, Edmondson and Bransby (2023, pg.56) claim, due to the exponential increase in the studies that adds value to the development of the concept both practical and theoretical dimensions of the concept, and practical implications in various industries enriched the organizational behavior area as well as its evolution to a theory, according to their claim as a "mature theory". The core reason behind their claim rests upon not only widespread agreement on conceptual development and measurement ways of the concept but also wide application areas as well as the topics related to psychological safety. According to their literature review, from 2013 to 2021, 51 topics exist in 185 studies, primarily across different sectors at individual, team, organization, and multilevel units are analyzed and summoned theoretical coherence at the studies related to the concept with the claim of the existence of similarities in the definition of psychological safety. Yet, they underlined, the clusters – four clusters were designed as learning, workplace, leadership and performance- about psychological safety related topics through their bibliometric studies, indicated multiple subtopics related to organization studies, and asserted the concepts "maturity" due to the mostly overall coverage of organizational studies related works, it can be criticized due to the overall judgement of both antecedents and outcomes are mixed in the grouping. But also, Kahn's (1990) engagement and disengagement, commitment and job satisfaction topics that are bounded upon workplace happiness remains a broad area for the research with the claim of the outcomes of psychological safety. Despite, the happiness term was used as a synonym of enjoyment, having cheer, fun feeling or positiveness at the workplace (Halbesleben et al.,2014; Plester & Lloyd, 2023) and having fun availability in the mean of being-psychological-safe in the consequences of the jokes or psychological safety existence of being not a victim of the peers or managers' jokes.

Moreover, sharing the humor and laugh are stated as organizational happiness among the employees without any fear and fun at the workplace. Michel et al. (2019), categorize the fun concept as indicating the differences of fun at work and having fun at workplace to evaluate the organizational and individual level of enjoyment in the workplace. The fun at work or having fun has a common aspect according to Plester and Lloyd (2023) when they both grow in the organic form and being sterile of fear in the existence of psychological safety. They assert fun at work also promotes happiness at work where psychological safety and its existence have the crucial and key factor in the emotional manner of establishment and sustaining the workplace engagement and commitment in the company. Salas-Vallina et al. (2017a; 2017b), shares this feeling of happiness and its attitude to employees that shape the job characteristics. These attitudes spawn the engagement as in the shape of enthusiasm, positive feeling for the job description as well as to the company in which the employees and company relationship are defined as a part of the individual in creating meaning for the job itself and identification as commitment and engagement.

Can you paint the happiness for me, Abidin?" is a known Turkish phrase commonly known as a description of a happy moment, it is actually a line of Nazım Hikmet Ran's poem Straw-Blond. And as a response to the poem, for his painter friend, Abidin Dino, wrote a poem as "... that's when Nazım, I would pain the happiness but either canvas or the paint would be enough" (Yanikkaya, 2015). So, by imitating Dino's poem, writing about happiness back to ancient philosophy and times within great literature. As Hegel's famous quotation, "the history of the world is not the theatre of happiness. Periods of happiness are blank pages in it", Fisher (2010) claims that happiness at workplace studies were not blank of pages but limited in the organization studies. In the last decade, there is an increase related to the concept and from 2010' specifically happiness at work was used closely related to other three components (Maldonado et al. (2022) as Fisher (2010) stated a comprehensive methodology to unify both sects, introduced a model for covering both perspective through engagement, commitment, and job satisfaction in sequence for cognitive involvement, judgment and belonging to the organization. Salas-Vallina and Alegre (2021), comments this unification is as a solution for measuring both work, job related issues and the organization with the feelings. Salas-Vallina et al. (2017b) in the

development for scale to measure happiness at work used Fisher's (2010) theoretical background to evaluate three dimensions into one variance as happiness umbrella concept.

But it is needed to evaluate that there is a theoretical background at work and happiness relation as Sender et al. (2021) underline start from enlightenment and Adam Smith in the praise of happiness and work that were related to productivity and add happiness related studies into the categories which were similar to Fisher's (2010) categorization as job transient, individual and organizational. Salas-Vallina et al. (2017), at individual level, were derived from Schaufeli et al.'s (2002) conceptualization in engagement, Allen and Meyer's (1991) commitment measurement and Schriesheim and Tsui's (1980) job satisfaction index, that were mentioned, to measure happiness at work with the claim of measuring feeling of passion, job characteristic including salary and conditions and belonging to the organization in a higher concept to increase the explain happiness at work structure. Furthermore, they assert the antecedents still need further concepts to evaluate emotional, job characteristics and feelings. For add value to this claim, Salas-Vallina and Alegre (2021) developed a shorter scale for measuring this higher concept by fewer questions and claim sustaining the measurement of happiness at work as a concept directly rather than measuring any parts of happiness in a more practical way within align Fisher's (2010) conceptualization in an efficient methodology. And also, she evaluated happiness as a broad concept that has many definitions. In those, one of the significant differences rises from hedonic - unique goal for life and enjoyment and eudemonic - moral right, meaningfulness of life perspectives. Although, she claimed happiness at work studies were mostly at hedonic perspective, as in the form of subjective wellbeing, Seligman's (2002) positive psychology that focus on strength rather than weakness through scientific measurement and methods with optimism, courage and self-reinforcement and it applied to organizational behavior as management of capabilities and encouragement of employees in decision processes as well as to be create an active role in the organizations or satisfaction level to balance hedonic and eudaimonic sides in defining the facets of happiness at work. Those facets can be flourished as a socialization process at relationship of others in feelings, thoughts and idea sharing, meaning attribution to the job itself in leading meaning to the individuals. And those facets exist

in the form of engagement, commitment and satisfaction which compose happiness at work sourced by psychological safety and its environmental frame. (Aboramadan & Kundi, 2022; Plester & Lloyd, 2023).

2.1.1. Psychological Safety and Engagement

In the literature, the relationship between psychological safety and engagement has been the attention of the scholars since Kahn (1990) with different perspectives as well as different results. This lies behind the fact that defining engagement exists in variations (Sherman, 2022). And, it is needed to add that there is lack of agreement upon a common acceptance of engagement concept in the literature (Saks, 2006; Kular et al.2008; Schaufeli 2013). Even in the literature, both employee and work engagement are interchangeable used which is created confusion and blur the context of explaining the engagement as well as research related to the concept (Shuck, 2011).

To clarify the concept and scrutinize the relation to psychological safety, Schaufeli's (2013) categorization is used as below in four sects:

- i. The Needs-Satisfying Approach: Kahn's (1990) cognitive, physical and emotional aspects of the engagement whereas Kular et al (2008) mention Goffman's influence over Kahn's (1990) concept has the impact as role attachment of the engagement which is a process of attachment as well as behaviors for fit in the organization. Most of the psychological safety related research is conducted as antecedents and moderator effect on the needs satisfying approach.
- ii. The Burnout-Anthesis Approach: Burnout is raised as the opposite definition to define the engagement. It is as a process for the path to disengagement. Yet, Cuellar et al. 's (2018) research on burnout with psychological safety at the individual level measurement to evaluate the job-related differences, Swendiman et al. (2019), indicates psychological safety directly affect the burnout at the surgery team level study, Osei et al. (2022) figures out a negative relation to psychological safety at team level analyze to state the

contingency factor of the term to spread the negative feelings among the members where psychological safety in the positive effect. Their burnout level lowers admiring the mistake, taking risk and engagement process.

- iii. The Satisfaction-Engagement Approach: Gallop study, in the literature, the conceptualized the satisfaction and engagement terms as well as overlapping each other in the studies (Schaufeli (2013). Furthermore, psychological safety studies reveal the higher satisfaction level led to decrease the fear of making mistakes at the workplace (Frazier et al.,2017).
- iv. Multidimensional Approach: Sack (2006) states the cognitive side of the burn out and claims that either the needs-satisfaction approach or the burnout approach defines the individual differences. And evaluates the individual level and organizational level engagement and engagement process. Although, the individual level engagement, namely, job engagement and organizational level are related but have different structures where Kahn's (1990) triplication are measured.

On the other hand, there is research that could not find association between psychological safety such as Oliver and Rothmann (2007), Rothmann and Rothmann (2010) and Ge's (2020) research that indicates non-signification between psychological safety and engagement but through mediation of voice, the relationship exists at their research. Yet, Basit (2017) indicated psychological safety had the mediator role in engagement process and Rabbanee et al. (2019), in needs satisfaction approach evaluation for engagement claim the psychological safety influences employee engagement.

The relationship between engagement and psychological safety is shared as a belief among the members of the team as well as the management level relationship (May et al.,2004) While adding the self-consciousness variable to psychological safety for engagement relationship and define engagement parallel with Kahn (1990), as adding workers' spirit to the work, at their study indicated the link between psychological safety and engagement. As previously mentioned, "the industrialized loved" is linked with adding emotions and spirit to the work (Clarke, 2020). And self-consciousness as a cognitive aspect of belief has a positive effect on psychological safety and engagement

(May et al.2004) and provide vitality or increase the energy in work involvement and creativity that yield to engagement (Kark & Carmeli, 2009). Furthermore, both mental – cognitive and emotional - and physical engagement increase when the candor exists in the workplace within the existence of psychological safety (Basit, 2017).

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1.1. Psychological safety is positively related to engagement.

2.1.2. Psychological Safety and Commitment

Saks (2006) underlines an important misunderstanding in the literature about engagement which confused and defined as emotional commitment in the organization studies. Therefore, before exploring the relationship between psychological safety and organizational commitment relationship, it is needed to explain the commitment which is developed since Becker's (1960) definition of "side bet". The analogy of bargaining generates "side bet" term in commitment to explain the being commitment to involve the interest of his to engage by his action of commit to the organization; this commitment has the hidden investment of the employee (Cohen, 2007). Although, in some studies in the literature, side bet is just used as an exchange of investment, side bet offers that when the options are limited, and few alternatives lead to commitment for the investors. So, the main criticism about side bet is raised from its original statement of how commitment occurs rather than its conceptualization the definition (Wallace, 1997). The shift from side bet to attitudinal approach is stemmed from the psychological attachment to the organizational studies from identification of the employees to the organization in the belief of goal and sustaining the membership of the organization (Cohen, 2007). Due to the scale of the commitment a new approach raised where normative commitment is added by Meyer and Allen (1991) who composed three components of commitment as affective, continuous and normative commitment. Meyer and Allen (1991) claim that those three components have the relationship and continuity of the membership of the employees with the organization. (Burch-Parker, 2021).

Three words, want, need and ought to be used to define the components as:

- i. Affective commitment, the employees want: Belief of the employees with the organization
- ii. Continuous commitment, the employees need: Calculation of the stay and leave results.
- iii. Normative commitment, the employee ought: Pressure and obligation for membership.

It is claimed that those are components of a unique concept rather than different types of definitions within different degrees of the employees can reason and have impact as the antecedents of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Furthermore, Fornes et al. (2008), mention the antecedents of commitment at employee perceptions at organizational and individual commitment without mentioning psychological safety in their literature review. It is needed to add that after Kahn (1990), De Clercq and Ruis's (2007) study is the first one related to psychological safety and commitment. In their study, affective and normative components are evaluated with the claim of emotional side is consistent with their theoretical perspective where normative component is defined as obligation to sustain the membership of the organization. The root of their psychological safety study is based on Brown and Leigh's (1996) scale that has three dimensions as supportive management, clarification and self-expression to define psychological safety. Furthermore, according to the results, psychological safety has a positive effect on the commitment of the workers according to their research. On the other hand, O'Neill and Arendt (2008), uses Brown and Leigh's (1996) scale, in just self-expression dimension, to investigate the relationship between psychological safety and commitment where there was no-significant prediction on it. Rathert et al. (2009), an individual level study with Edmondson (1999) scale related to the clinical care providers, revealed psychological safety and commitment relationship whereas psychological safety did not reveal a significant relationship with the engagement. Another study at the individual level related to commitment is conducted with "proteges" at China to figure out the relationship between psychological safety which is considered as group cohesion of the member of the teams are influenced by the belief of sharing the same values lead psychological

safety. If it occurs then commitment ratio increases conversely turnover ratio declines, also, the belief of the organization is increased by the belief of shared values. The belief of organization is affective commitment whereas the shared values through psychological safety which has the positive relationship between affective commitment (Chen et al, 2014). At an organizational level study, multi structural commitment and psychological safety connection is questioned and typology of the organization as private or public has the impact over it. The survey indicates the difference as psychological safety is a predictor for higher commitment just for the private company (Wołowska, 2014). An individual level differences in immigration study was conducted by Ulusoy et al. (2016) to figure out the immigrant effect on commitment and psychological safety. The immigration has negative impact on commitment and engagement whereas psychological safety that has higher affective commitment prediction. Specifically immigrated employees on psychological safety have higher results of affective commitment than the local ones. Frazier et al. (2017), both individual and group level meta- analysis are designed to measure the correlation of commitment. At the individual group level of analysis exists higher and significant correlation is stated whereas at the group level due to the lack of data, the study could not be examined. However, Kirk-Brown and Van Dijk (2016), at the group level analysis, Li et al. (2022), at the multi group level analysis, according to the job differences, found the direct effect of psychological safety on the affective commitment. The core of the affective commitment lies behind the employee perception of the caring and caring attitudes of the workplace within the feeling of trust and secure of the expression and without fear of being judgment. Job security and less risk with the rise of positive perception led to an increase in commitment in the workplace.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1.2. Psychological safety is positively related to commitment.

2.1.3. Psychological Safety and Job Satisfaction

Although, neither at Kahn (1990) nor Edmondson (1996,1999) which are founder articles of the psychological safety concept, job satisfaction is not mentioned or described as an

outcome or as an antecedent, Edmondson and Lei (2014) emphasis job satisfaction as a comprehensive concept for both engagement and commitment. The first research which indicates correlation between overall satisfaction and psychological safety is conducted by Detert and Burris (2007) without any theoretical background of satisfaction, whereas the job satisfaction and psychological safety relation was first researched by O'Neill and Arendt (2008). In their individual level analysis, self-expression dimension of psychological safety has prediction over job satisfaction which is associated with self-expression as a dimension of psychological safety. Another research, measuring individual level job satisfaction with work unit psychological safety also is depicted the relation by Detert and Edmondson (2011) but job level satisfaction is used as a control variable without any theoretical debate in the research.

On the other hand, Frazier et al. (2017), both at individual and group level within the claim that safety decreases the risk level, anxiety and fear at the workplace and increase the satisfaction level that is figured out with significant level. Kuo et al. (2019), at cross level analysis, used psychological safety as a moderator variable whereas proactive personality and psychological safety did not indicate a positive relation with job satisfaction but in the high level of psychological safety, personality is less related to job satisfaction that is predicted as when both proactive personality and psychological safety exist, the job satisfaction level decreases. Kim and Kim's (2020) individual level of analysis, with the claim that the feeling of protection decreases the anxiety level and candor for the workplace increases the satisfaction level, figured out high correlation between psychological safety and job satisfaction and significant relationship. Another individual unit of analysis, Moin et al. (2021), investigated psychological safety as a mediation role with job satisfaction and leadership where psychological safety is found as an antecedent of job satisfaction.

Although the existence of the research about satisfaction and psychological safety, theoretical background of the studies is limited due to the lack of consensus about job satisfaction, satisfaction and overall satisfaction differences. The umbrella concept-satisfaction- is so broad to define and lead to decrease the studies. And job satisfaction with the broad area for the researchers causes the complexity of the definition as well as

methodology of the measurement (Judge & Klinger, 2008). The core of the concept is backed to Fisher and Hanna (1931) cited by Salas et al. (2017b), and they emphasize the main difference in the measurement of job satisfaction stem from its dissimilarity with engagement measurement that evaluate of the job conditions as job satisfaction level index.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1.3. Psychological safety is positively related to job satisfaction.

2.2. Job Crafting

The well-known anecdote related to the bricklayers indicate a very brief and an elucidation to job crafting, according to the story; while one bricklayer describes his work just as laying a brick, the other one, contemplate his work as building a wall but the last one, evaluate his work as building a cathedral for the next generations is mentioned by Silvestri (2020) to depict the differences between laying a brick and building a cathedral on job crafting. The story is back in the 1600's and emphasizes the cognitive side of job crafting, whereas the earliest studies related to job crafting back to only last two decades.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), conceptualize the definition as “the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work” (p.179). In literature, top-down management in job design since Taylor was dominant till job crafting where the division of labor was rooted in the job design, and the employees had the passive role altered. To put it simply, up to down job design is replaced vice versa by job crafting (De Gennaro, 2019).

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) mention Dubin (1956) about the workers positioning the work at their life and emphasize its historical root of the job crafting theory. The study claims that the workers do not state the work to the centrality of life as was assumed. Furthermore, Ghitulescu (2007) states that idiosyncratic and job innovation perspectives are the key pillars of the germination process of job crafting concept. From Doeringer and Piore's (1970) task idiosyncratic conceptualization to Miner's (1985) job idiosyncratic

definition, in the time of blur, the individuals act to shape their job according to their interest and abilities. Schein's (1971) role innovation perspective is related to the redefinition of the job out of the restrictions and the rules of the jobs.

De Gennaro (2019), emphasizes those perspectives are in the theoretical rather than practically applied. Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) also underline crafting is not a completely new concept by citing Katz and Kahn's (1966) role innovation, Bell and Staw (1989)'s control over the job design and organizations, Staw and Boettger 's (1990) task revision, Ilgen and Hollenbeck's (1992) autonomy resulted the job change and also dissimilarities with Hackman and Oldham's (1980) job design and Salancik and Pfeffer (1978)'s social information processing were mentioned to define theoretical steps of the job crafting. Throughout the 1970s to 1990's, it can be asserted that theoretical background of Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) work is settled but it is not only the job crafting is conceptualized by but also the changed the dimension to job crafting from task, organizational behavior and courageous behavior (Ghitutescu, 2007) to create the job identity model. Furthermore, Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) conceptualization based of job crafting on the solution for creating meaning and identity of the employees whom basic needs are fulfilled. Those needs are centered on what they do or act, whom they interact and how they evaluate. The avoidance of the negative impact of the work and self-control of the work is related to the task, cohesion and communication with basic need of connection with others are relational side, and experiencing the meaning and identity over the job and expressing themselves is associated to the cognitive crafting (Demetrouti, 2014).

Two different theoretical backgrounds exist in the job crafting literature: Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) and Tim and Bakker's (2010) theory with different labels (Hu et al. 2020), and the recent meta-studies at job crafting (Rudolph et al., 2017; Zhang & Parker, 2019; Lichtenthaler & Fischbacher 2019; Lazzazzara et al., 2020) do not have the unity in defining the job crafting theories.

Job Identity Theory (JIT), role-based perspective or job crafting theory are titled for Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) conceptualization; resource-based perspective or Job Demand-Resource perspective (JDR) are named for Tim and Bakker's (2010)

perspective. Those two perspectives or theory have important differences that stem from the conceptualization as the aim of job crafting and the existence of cognitive crafting (Zhang and Parker, 2019). Yet, in the literature, the difference leads to conciliation difficulty between two perspectives and where existing attempts to unify a single theory for job crafting through meta analyzes and meta synthesis mostly end with its the difficulty due to the core elements and complexity in differences at the perspectives (Rudolph et al., 2017; Zhang & Parker, 2019; Lichtenthaler & Fischbacher 2019; Lazzazzara et al., 2020). But also, this complexity is defined by De Gennaro (2019, p.) with an analogy with an Italian word “pezzotto” which almost means “counterfeit” to indicate the similarity of non-similarity. On the other hand, the perspectives-theories are claimed as similar, because the original theory, as in Zhang and Parker’s (2019) mentioning, was copied, and developed with resource and demand aspects.

Table 2.1. JIT and JDR Comparison

Perspective	Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001)	Tim and Bakker (2010)
Definition	Changes in task, relational and cognitive facets	Changes in job characteristics
Aim	Meaning and work identity	Balance between resource and demand
Cognitive	Cognitive facets are important, active	Cognitive crafting does not exist or passive form

(Source: Adapted from Zhang and Parker (2019))

Also, to evaluate the differences of the two perspectives-theories, as well as to define integration models of the two perspectives-theories, the motivation of Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) job crafting needed to be explained which are three individual needs as the primary reason for job crafting as work meaning, positive self-image and connection with others.

Work meaning, according to Wrzesniewski et al (2003), has three components as job, role and self-meaning at work. At the three facets the content and the evaluation of them are complements of the categories. In other words, the content of job, role and the self are the part of evaluation of the job, role and the self to alter the meaning of the job. The core of the components is aimed to figure out “why, when and how” the employees craft the jobs at Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s study (2001), also changed the meaning of the work from positive side with the proactive incentive of the employees. It is stated that job crafting is related to the change of the meaning of the work, role, and self to experience differently when interpreting the job with according to the purpose of the self attributes (Wrzesniewski et al.2013). Accordingly, job crafting is not a static action which is changed individually even the individuals act at any time in their role meaning to value their roles in the organizations with their self-evaluation whom they are to the meaning of themselves to evaluate their job, themselves at the job and their job crafting (Wrzesniewski et al.2003). In altering the job crafting activities, three forms as task crafting, relational crafting and cognitive crafting are defined (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Although Bindl et al. (2019), Fryer (2019) claim skill crafting is the fourth dimension of the job crafting by citing Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) study to add skill crafting as a positive development for crafting, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) emphasis that skill crafting within demand and resource perspective exist at JDR model. Therefore, at job crafting theory, just three ways are defined in the crafting process (Wrzesniewski et al.2013). The grouping of those three ways is crafted by the employees and at the job crafting studies are related to those combinations (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Ghitulescu 2007; Wrzesniewski et al.,2013).

As far as it is found, up to now, there are few studies solely conducted at facets of crafting. Fryer (2019) asserts that task crafting was solely researched whereas Ghitulescu (2007) claims the opposite, in her study with citing the task crafting studies before the conceptualization. Therefore, it can be claimed that after job crafting theory, the studies aimed to evaluate the facets and their combination. The first type, as in the original usage order, task crafting is defined as “the number, scope, or type of job tasks done at work” both increasing, decreasing, adding, or dropping the job description to craft the job. As exemplified, Dutton et al.’s (1998) research, the task crafting is conducted by one group of

the cleaners act to change their “dirty” jobs with adding new tasks to themselves with proactively with or without explicit behaviors to alter their routines or non-routines in their crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). One of the unique studies on only task crafting dimension is conducted by Lin et al.’s (2017) as engage on creativity is related to task crafting as a strategy for the underemployment where relational and cognitive crafting were defined as less recognizable. Also, Fyer (2019), who solely researched on just task crafting, mentions task crafting has more influence on promotion rather than cognitive and relational crafting again with the same claim of visibility and relational crafting might not result in the change of the job. Geldenhuys et al. (2021) states the examples of task crafting as altering the timeline of the tasks according to the feeling of energy and the task complexity cannot be visible in the task crafting by the others as Fyer (2019) claims the importance of visibility in the task crafting. It is necessary to emphasize that job crafting is not related to the complexity or simplicity, autonomy and non-autonomy of the job description. Furthermore, it is underlined that even the most routine jobs with non-autonomy with inability of the job design and strictly controlled employees can craft their jobs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al. 2008; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013). Furthermore, it is valid for the task crafting as a subdimension of the job crafting identity. Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) one of the citing related to the task crafting is Rafaeli’s (1989) study related to the cashiers who craft their task in different forms as task crafting such as engaging with the customers to keep the customers busy to alter the way of their tasks where the employees can change their job descriptions and craft according to themselves as well as their task (Rafaeli et al. 2008) where Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) relates the job crafting in organizational citizenship behavior.

As mentioned above, the job crafting related to the answers of how is one of the main developments in the JIT. Another words, the surveys in qualitative studies chose Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) JIT with few exceptions (Lazazzara et al. 2020) such as Ghitulescu (2006) and then Leana et al. (2009), Slemp and Vella- Brodrick (2013) figure out the quantitative scale for measuring the job crafting; Leana et al. (2009) research about the childcare teachers and aiders who have the scripts as well as schedule with having the autonomy in the classroom activities, they designed a scale for

measurement of individual and collaborative level job crafting where task interdependence as well as task crafting is investigated directly or indirectly questions with specifically on the childcare job description. Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2013) with claim of measuring the job crafting in generally not specific population as Leana et al.'s (2009) scale without specific parts. In the task crafting measurement, the introduction of new approaches, was adapted from Leana et al.'s (2009) scale with other four questions are added to measure the task crafting within the line of JIT theoretical background. Niessen et al. (2016), although aims to create the scale within the three facets of job crafting theory, JDR perspective of fit in person perspective is used to combine two perspectives with asking the job suits the employees with the concentration level, undertaking or seeking extra task and enjoyment with intensity work relation.

As in the crafting task, solely relational crafting studies existence at literature are few that the researchers are allowed to study of the relationship of the three facets at Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) model (Slemp et al. 2014). Furthermore, there is non-hierarchy in their conceptualization or linear process in the job crafting. Ghitulescu (2007) assumes the three facets are interacting with each other and although emphasizes cognitive crafting due to the perspective difference in the literature, she underlines the importance of relational crafting with the claim that the relational crafting was mostly ignored perspective of the job crafting literature. Employees alter their relationship with the other employees, either interaction frequency or interaction quality or even who they communicate to change their jobs. Through those, the job description is altered based on the behaviors and relationship with the other employees, the social act of doing the job is altered by crafting to differentiate the works according to they interact with others at the social environment (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). The example can be given from the same research in task crafting, Rafaeli (1989)'s study, the cashiers, change their relationship with the customers with learning recipes from them as making their job crafting. Engaging rejection, or ignoring the customers are ways of changing their relationship with the customers and struggling to gain control in their jobs to do. The relationship is not only with the customers but also with the colleagues as well as the managers or, all the interaction and non-interaction participants of the work are about the relational job crafting in doing the jobs. Leana et al.'s (2009) scale to measure the

relational crafting includes one question, without stating any relational boundaries and relational crafting in their study as well as unique results of the relational crafting. The question was adapted by Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2013), with other questions to measure the job crafters' proactive tendency of interaction with the other members of the organization. Job Resources perspective in relational crafting stated as the job resources dynamic with the measurement of the fit to the crafters with their preferences. In Niessen et al.'s (2016) research, although it was supposed that the human connection and relational crafting was related, the results indicated that there is no significant relationship which was claimed due to the study timeline, the relationship establishment could be needed more time for crafting, and it could be the lack of connection between the employees in the study. On the other hand, as the antecedence of job crafting, the social factors are analyzed to indicate its importance as the influence over the job crafting not specifically on the relational crafting (Wang & Chen, 2020) whereas Niessen et al.'s (2016) stated the importance as well as easy side of the cognitive crafting than the relational crafting and mentions the probability of sequence of crafting which starts from the cognitive one to the behavioral crafting (task and relational crafting) to evaluate the human connection as an antecedence of the job crafting.

As it was underlined, the unresolved division in the literature between job crafting theory and JDR, mainly stems from the cognitive crafting conception. While JDR rejects the cognitive crafting with the claim that cognitive crafting is not an actual crafting but adjusting the needs on four grouping as increasing structural and social resources and increasing challenging or decreasing hindering job demand (Tims & Bakker, 2010). From job crafting theory lens, cognitive crafting, changing the perception of the of the job or part of it, is the primary cause of the altering the task and the relationship crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Furthermore, job crafting theory is based on the three facets in which facets of crafting can lead to other forms of crafting. The complexity of the job crafting theory stems from this duality. The task and relational crafting cause each other to craft and they are not solely independent also, the cognitive crafting can lead to task and relational crafting and the opposite influence can exist as the task crafting and relational crafting can lead to the cognitive crafting as the causality (Berg et al. 2010; Zhang & Parker, 2019).

In the measurement of cognitive crafting, Ghitulescu (2007), with the theoretical background of at Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) model but meaning assignment to the job is measured through Hackman and Oldman's (1980) scale to evaluate the significance of the job and evaluation of the job effectiveness to the others. Like, relational crafting, Leana et al.'s (2009) study, did not mention solely cognitive crafting result in their research without categorizing the three facets of the job crafting (Slemp et al. 2013). It can be claimed that cognitive crafting is measured first by including and emphasizing the importance to cognitive crafting by Slemp and Vella- Brodrick (2013) as well as comprising all facets of the crafting (De Gennaro, 2019). They stated one of the major questions of job crafting as "why" is related to the cognitive crafting. The job crafters can identify themselves as well as their meaning of job through cognitive crafting, which includes the perception, understanding and evaluation of their altering the job. This also leads to another importance of cognitive crafting which is needed to measure all the facets of the crafting due to the antecedents and consequences of the cognitive crafting which can be the cause and result of the other facets of crafting. Cognitive sides of crafting are measured by the purpose, impact of life and well-being relationship, also, success of the organization, community relationship of the job evaluation (Slemp & Vella- Brodrick, 2013). Another measurement in job crafting Niessen et al. (2016), in their cognitive crafting scale, the meaning of the job aimed to analyze through measuring a deeper meaning at work, task and responsibilities for the crafters. This deeper meaning for the work is further developed as metacognition by Bruning and Campion (2018) who aim to solve the unsolved disputed of the division of the job crafting with designing a 2x2 matrix in a role crafting-resource crafting and approach crafting – avoidance crafting. In achieving unification, and establishing taxonomy, cognitive crafting was melted into the metacognition dimension of the approach resource crafting cell. While metacognition defines the purity of the cognitive facet of the crafting and covers the diverse aspects of it, at their survey result, the metacognition and cognitive engagement and work meaning do not indicate a positive relation. Furthermore, Bruning and Campion (2018), affirm that their unification model does not have focus on the cognitive aspect unlike the other facets of the crafting which role based crafting term was used to define Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) perspective and resource based job crafting in Tim and Bakker's (2010)

model to emphasize the employee adaptation view versus employee mechanistic view (Zhang and Parker, 2019). Moreover, the meta analyze of job crafting theory, Rudolph et al. (2017, p.47), mentions the “missing piece” as the cognitive crafting facet in their analyze and claim that Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) and Tims and Bakker’s (2010) conceptualization relations are not similar although existing similarities in the subjects. Additionally, their claim over two perceptions as having separate literature, also widens the gap to solve the unsolved issue in the job crafting literature with also their underestimation of the cognitive crafting at their meta analyze (De Dennaro, 2019). The same ignorance of cognitive crafting is valid at Lichenthaler and Fischbach (2019), with the usage of different synonymous terms in the job crafting literature in their meta analyze; their usage of promotion and prevention focused job crafting have the blur in differentiation of the approach and avoidance crafting (Hu et al. 2020). In their conceptualization, the promotion focused, and prevention focused job crafting were aimed to unify two perspectives: Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) and Tims and Bakker’s (2010) conceptualization as role-based model and resource demand model with the claim of tangible and intangible dimensions. In the taxonomy, cognitive crafting is categorized under the promoted focused crafting. Also, at their results, cognitive crafting is still a missing piece like Rudolph et al.’s (2017) meta-analysis, as well as the other facets of the job role-based theory. Zhang and Parker (2019) aimed to figure out the missing part with integration of Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) model that is called as the original theory and Tims and Bakker’s (2010) JDR perspective. Their difference in conceptualization the job crafting, with compared to the other meta analyzes, stems from its hierarchical structure that is established based on two perspectives. If the phasing is described from job crafting- up- to down, the first phase, which is blurred in the literature, is approach and avoidance perspective. The second phase is related to the cognitive and behavioral division, and at the last phase starts with resource and demands. The core reason behind this structurization is explained as the importance of Wrzesniewski and Dutton’s (2001) study and emphasized that both Rudolph et al. (2017) and Lichenthaler and Fischbach (2019) ignored this perspective which had the dominance in the job crafting literature till their study that has a taxonomy at the job crafting literature with the phases to generate a complete conciliation which was not successful, with the proposal of

eight types of crafting. The first phase of the hierarchical model is established on approach and avoidance which have synonyms of wording in the literature (Hu et al. 2020), the crafting has two dimensions as expanding or limiting the boundaries of the work is commonly exist in the literature (Zhang and Parker, 2019), In their model, the distinct separation of two dimensions as approach and avoidance are the core pillars of their model which is the least debated area of the job crafting theory. On the other hand, the most debated subject is the cognitive crafting is the second phase of their model. The cognitive crafting is not underestimated like mentioned studies but the facets of the crafting as task, relational and cognitive ones are summed up into behavioral and cognitive crafting where they combined task and relational crafting and named as behavioral crafting in their leverage in job crafting form that task crafting and relational crafting which are considered as tangible rather than intangible of the cognitive side to explain the existing different perspectives of JDR and JIT. It is confusing that although they claimed that two crafting forms are not interchangeable, they mentioned the studies indicated the opposite as well as the cognitive facet led to the other crafting in their terms behavioral crafting (Melo et al.2021). So, it can be inferred that the existence as well as importance of cognitive crafting is stated in the model whereas it is an effort to create a unified and a single model in the job crafting. Finally, the third phase of the model is the resource and demand division which is established on Tims and Bakker (2010) perspective which establishes 2 x 2 x 2 matrix in eight types of crafting. It is summarized that “approach crafting in behavioral with job demand and resource phase” and “avoidance crafting in behavioral with job demands phase” can be measured with existing scales whereas other five types which is “approach and avoidance in cognitive both resource and demand” and “avoidance crafting in behavior with job resources” cannot be measured within the existing scales (Zhang and Parker,2019). This model is criticized by Melo et al. (2021) who claim that this is a way of underestimating the importance of cognitive crafting and disqualify it under the under JDR although they admire that the first cognitive and behavioral crafting integration is conducted by their study. Cognitive crafting with related to other crafting phases measurement is designed by Bindl et al. (2019), while using promotion and prevention focused crafting as Lichenthaler and Fischbach (2019), a scale for measurement for promotion and prevention oriented at four types of crafting other

than cognitive as task, relational and skill with the development of existing scales in the literature. Additionally, in their study, cognitive crafting is highlighted with its relation to the other crafting facets which are influenced by cognitive crafting. This relation is defined by Melo et al. (2020, p. 1309) as “cause / consequences of cognitive crafting” with other facets. Moreover, Hu et al. (2020) assert that every behavior has cognitive dimension and contains cognitive element. Boehnlein and Baum’s (2022) meta analyze about well-being and job crafting relationship, the cognitive crafting is underestimated yet the cognitive crafting which is the primary cause and effect on the other facets of crafting as well as psychological dimension of the crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Makikangas & Schaufeli, 2021). On the other hand, at this study, cognitive crafting was considered the key component in evaluating the crafting process, aligning with the perspective of Melo et al. (2020) in recognizing the cognitive aspect for the other facets of crafting, even in tasks that are boring, repetitive, monotonous, and routine. This cognitive side of crafting exists even when the actors and observers may not be consciously aware of it in everyday chores. Furthermore, from the perspective of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) and their identity model for the crafting process, cognitive crafting is seen as the litmus test to differentiate between the two models of crafting. Cognitive crafting is essential for the psychological dimensions of the crafting process, without any hierarchical distinction between it and the other facets of crafting, in order to evaluate the relationship both between the components and with the psychological side of the crafting process. In terms of the psychological dimension, safety plays a primary role in the altering process, influencing thinking, sharing, and taking on new ideas, roles, and responsibilities in the workplace, and even in daily activities and repetitive duties.

2.2.1. Job Crafting Facets and Psychological Safety

As was mentioned, psychological safety is the result of fearless consequences of taking risks in their environment where those are related to self-image, status, and career (Kahn, 1990). In taking risk behavior, the tacit calculation and its result determines the behavior of the individual. Also, at the group level, sharing the group level risk taking is

psychological safety (Edmondson,1999). Therefore, Ghitulescu (2007) assumed that altering the job at relational crafting was related to psychological safety at the group level with the intergroup risk taking would lead to increase job crafting due to the psychological safety from any mistake consequences. But, in her study, it was indicated that team psychological safety had negative effect on cognitive crafting and relational crafting and had no effect on the task crafting. It was claimed that higher psychological safety limits the job crafting activities as well as perception contrary to the reassumption. There are few studies, as far as it was found, that investigate the relation between job crafting in JIT and psychological safety in literature. The first research was Ghitulescu (2007), where she proposed that psychological safety was the antecedent of job crafting. At the group level, the safety work climate, which was designed without any risk, the employees craft their jobs without any fear of self-esteem, career or status and also had the support for altering their jobs but her findings indicated that the negative impact of team psychological safety on the relational and cognitive crafting and had no effect on task crafting. Another research, but at the group level study was conducted to measure different work contacted groups in job crafting through psychological safety by Plomp et al. (2019) whose measurement and job crafting perspectives are diverse from Ghitulescu (2007). At their research, they evaluated the relationship through JDR perspective in expectancy theory- the motivation theory of approach and avoidance in job crafting. The tacit calculation which is mentioned by Edmondson (1999) is related to the theory that individuals act in the calculation of the cost-benefit weight before their acting. Also, the motivation theory was related to psychological safety in the sense of calculating without any negative impact to assume that psychological safety led JDR where the individuals who could take risk in crafting would be in more crafting behavior (Plomp et al., 2019). On the other hand, individual differences, organizational culture, leader effect, team group behavior are the structures of psychological safety. The individual difference in risk taking and the interactions with previous experiences in the group dynamics increase or decrease the anxiety in taking the risk. Organizational culture, organizational structures with the uncertainty, leader behavior in promoting the voice are the other factors that determine the fearless or the fear of taking the risk as well as the psychological safety (Edmondson & Mogelof, 2006). Similar arguments were found at Plomp et al.'s (2019)

two different groups as permanent employees who had lower psychological safety and job crafting behavior than the temporary workers. Although, at permanent workers group, psychological safety was significantly related to increasing structural, social job resources but negatively on the hindering job demands on both groups while for the temporary worker group's psychological safety did not indicate any relationship with the job crafting.

From JDR point of view, another study researched the psychological need, safety and crafting; as the psychological needs which were autonomy, competence and relatedness of self-determination theory standpoint where the psychological needs were proposed in mediating role between psychological safety and job crafting at individual level. The employees who craft their jobs are satisfied in their psychological needs with the result of psychological safety was claimed through Burris et al.'s (2008) psychological safety and Tims et al.'s (2012) job crafting scale and the research indicated the effect of psychological safety on the needs and job crafting and, the mediating role of psychological needs between safety and job crafting. The employees who craft their jobs are satisfied in their psychological needs with the result of psychological safety that was claimed through Burris et al.'s (2008) psychological safety and Tims et al.'s (2012) job crafting scale (Chinelato et al., 2021).

The unique study, as it was asserted by Meng et al. (2021), the dependent and independent variables were interchanged by claiming job crafting had the influence over the psychological safety the opposite of other studies assertion. It was related to person-organization fit theory - demand and ability of it which was one of the antecedents of JDR perspective (Tims et al., 2016) but the relationship was not approved in the result of the survey which was measured by May et al.'s (2004) psychological safety scale and Slemp & Vella-Brodrick's (2013) job crafting scale with JDR theoretical background.

Although the psychological safety and the job crafting relation investigation are attempted in the literature, due to the confusion of job crafting theory and its result in measurement differences, since Ghitulescu et al. (2007), psychological safety and the facets of the job crafting, Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) model, relationship did not gain much attention of the scholars. To explain the relationship, it is necessary to emphasize the

evolutional structure of job crafting. Repeated behaviors or cognitive changes with the result of altering the boundaries can be named as job crafting results, rather than snapshot or single performance acting (Berg et al.2008), and described as a process (Wrzesniewski et al,2013). The seeking for a positive meaning is the first step to this altering the work. The meaning, as it was stated above, is also creating an identity and a combination of the meaning and identify for the workers. By altering the work-meaning, the identity was created so the worker creates his image by acting crafting. The meaning of the job is altered to change the identity of the work as well as identity of the self (Berg et al.2013).

Rosso et al. (2010) mention the sources of work meaning (instead of using meaningfulness) and its relation to the work identity. As it was depicted below, source of work meaning, and work identity are categorized into four segments. The self is not static but a dynamic factor which can be influenced by values, motivation and beliefs, the others indicate all aspects of social interconnection with equal or upper levels of the work colleagues, being the member of the groups in the organization as well as outside of the organization like family. The context of the work related to directly to the job description and indirect effect on the meaning which can be also theological. The need and the desire for meaning are the primary causes of altering job crafting. On the other hand, psychological safety is “willing contribution of ideas and actions to a shared enterprise” (Edmondson & Lei, 2014, pg. 24).

With from the same example, which was mentioned before, Kahn’s (1990) scuba-diving instructor who not only physically showed how to dive but also adding joy to his job, teaching about the ocean, guiding the boat drivers to alter his task; encouraging novice divers to alter his relations; making talks and sharing the philosophy about the ocean to alter his cognitive job are the key clues about the engagement and disengagement difference which is psychological safety. Another example of Kahn (1990) was related to the designer who defined his job as flying around the office indicates her task crafting; her avoidance for criticism with others indicated relational crafting; her attempts with working with units led cognitive crafting. May et al. (2007), for engagement path, in their analysis, mentions the coworkers and supervisor relations, co-worker’s norm and self-consciousness for the antecedent for psychological safety. which mediates to engagement.

Those variables foster or decrease the psychological safety level as in their assertion. Kahn (1992) also mentions the importance of individual differences in recursive models about psychological presence that emphasis the psychological conditions as meaningful, safety and availability which are influenced by work, social and individual factors. In a recursive model, engagement is both antecedent and the outcome of those as well as safety and work situations which are called as work elements: tasks, interactions, and the meaning. It is also underlined that the future is determined by the present, *ad infinitum*, according to his circle model. In other words, work elements are linked to psychological conditions which determine the psychological presence to engagement and from engagement to outcomes as individual experiences, performance, and growth to feedback lead to the work elements in a never ended circle.

Furthermore, another loop, the interaction between the individual and contextual forms co-exist to form the psychological safety, influence over the new idea development, creativity to engage with the free world in their mind and interact without any danger for the self-image (Wanless, 2016). The self-image which any threat was stated as the primary reason for innovation with also voice behavior at organizational level (Baer & Freese, 2003). At the hierarchical model, team structure as well as the support of the group for taking risk in unexpected results through innovation and new ideas led psychological safety, organizational climate had the influence at anxiety level which is a cognitive factor for the individuals (Edmondson & Mogelof, 2006). The difference of innovation and creativity is implementation, the creative ideas are implemented to the organization by innovation (Amabile, 1996). Behavior and cognitive difference can be suggested to evaluate the differences. In the promotion and prevention crafting lens, Bindl et al. (2019) claims the strong relationship between innovation and job crafting with the assertion of novel idea implementation. But also, creativity is related to task crafting as offering to create things for the help of the other employees (Harbridge et al., 2022). While less fear causes creativity is obvious, with the support for creating fearless organizations, support of leader and the group also increase the proactivity for being creative work involvement (Carmeli et al., 2010) and creative problem solving which is a process rather than an outcome (Carmeli et al., 2014), the proactive worker behavior as creativity which have relationship with job crafting (Berg et al., 2010). This outcome is evaluated in a social

perspective in terms of endeavoring to manage anxiety and protecting the self-image and taking risk for the novel ideas and failure for creativity (Tian et al.2021). It is surprising that either from the resource perspective nor the JIT that considers creativity as reshaping way of altering the job facets, there are few studies related to creativity, even as Schachler et al. (2019) claimed, first study related to creative self-efficacy and job crafting relationship, within nomological network, conducted by them. Also, it is important to note that the mind wandering thoughts that occur when one is not focused on work, or a task are detrimental to creativity (Hao et al. 2016). Creativity was considered as a resource as Buonocore et al. (2021) cites from the World Economic Forum report indicates creativity would change job performance which is bounded to the high technology and creative thinking, from resource perspective, creativity is considered as an adding extra task component and engagement is related to creativity (Demerouti et al.,2015) where psychological safety is the primary antecedent of creativity and free will of thinking without any fear and existence of candor in the workplace without any fear. And eventually, despite the existence of JDR perspective in the literature to explain the job crafting relationship, Lee's (2022) study was based upon JIT perspective, Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2013) scale was used to determine job crafting and its relationship to psychological safety without the investigation of facets of job crafting were scrutinized and figured out positive and significant relationship.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 2.1 Psychological safety is related positively to task crafting.

Hypothesis 2.2. Psychological safety is related positively to relational crafting.

Hypothesis 2.3. Psychological safety is related positively to cognitive crafting

2.2.2. Job Crafting Facets and Engagement

Since the introduction of the concept, Kahn's (1990) tripartite model, which includes engagement as one of its key elements, has been widely discussed in the literature in relation to job crafting (Rudolph et al., 2017; Frederick & VanderWeele, 2020). As

different engagement approaches have been explored, the antithesis of burnout – the Job Demands-Resources (JDR) model of engagement – is based on Schaufeli et al.'s (2002) definitions of vigor, dedication, and absorption, with the relationship between job and personal resources or/and job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). In contrast, Tims and Bakker (2010) developed a balanced model, suggesting that hindering job demand is not related to engagement, unlike other forms (Tims et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2013; Bakker et al., 2016). However, Demerouti et al. (2015) found a negative effect between job demands and engagement. Makikangas (2018) highlights these conflicts in the literature, regarding the relationship between engagement and job crafting, particularly due to the different timelines of crafting, such as cross-sectional, daily, weekly, and longitudinal studies, which have produced varying results. Makikangas and Schaufeli (2021) argued that daily measurements show no significant difference in JIT and JDR perspectives regarding engagement, a finding also supported by Letona-Ibanez et al. (2021). Their study covered the three facets of job crafting in relation to engagement and evaluated both JIT and JDR perspectives, finding a positive correlation but indicating that decreasing job demand does not predict a significant relationship with engagement. Similar results were found by Sakuraya et al. (2020), where decreasing job demand negatively impacted engagement. From the JDR perspective, job resources were found to be related to work engagement, with the ceiling effect of job crafting suggesting that higher engagement might result from higher job crafting.

On the other hand, due to the theoretical foundation of engagement and the JDR perspective, which predominantly covers the existing studies (Rudolph et al., 2017; Frederick & VanderWeele, 2020), meta-analyses have mainly focused on JDR perspective studies. In contrast, there is less emphasis on JIT and only a limited amount of research exists in the literature regarding engagement and its relationship with the three facets of job crafting from Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2010) perspective. As far as it was found, one of the earliest studies at the engagement and job crafting relationship was conducted by Hur et al. (2017). They indicated significant relationship between task crafting and work engagement through Slemp and Vella-Brodick's (2013) scale in JIT point of view to evaluate the crafting process. Another study in the lens of JIT, Rofcanin et al. (2019) argued that relational influence generally rests on individual behavior and

particularly job crafting. They suggested that social climate influences relational crafting, which, in turn, fosters employee engagement. Their study indicates a positive relationship between social influence and interaction, leading to relational crafting. This process supports positive side effects, including increased vigor, dedication, and absorption in the workplace which are the main components of engagement.

The other facet of crafting, cognitive crafting, which was described as the crucial part and facet of job crafting, is one of the key factors for engagement process. The way of comprehending the job is related to engage of the workplace (Blind 2019; Buonocore et al. 2020) with align of the results of Hu et al. (2020). In their findings, cognitive crafting was significantly related to the work engagement with the measurement of Slemp and Vella's (2013) scale and claimed both JIT and job characteristic model had the same result. Costantini (2022), declares the scarcity of cognitive crafting-based studies in the field with highlight mindset crafting and reframing the job meaning to the employees in JDR perspective and aim to analyze approach and avoidance crafting in the result of work engagement in behavioral and cognitive aspect where Mkhwanazi and Dhanpat (2023), by using Slemp and Vella-Brodick's (2013) scale in JIT in three facets of crating indicate the prediction of them to the engagement in which cognitive crafting have the highest variance and relational crafting is the least.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 3.1. Task crafting is related positively to engagement.

Hypothesis 3.2. Relational crafting is related positively to engagement.

Hypothesis 3.3. Cognitive crafting is related positively to engagement

2.2.3. Job- Crafting Facets and Commitment

Unlike variation in JDR perspective-based job crafting and engagement studies; job crafting, and commitment is only stated at Zang and Parker's (2019) meta analyzes whereas the other meta analyzes and synthesis (Rudolph et al., 2017; Lichtenthaler & Fischbacher 2019; Lazzazzara et al., 2020) did not even mention about this relationship.

Ghitulescu's (2007) study, she was again pioneer in another field, researched commitment and job crafting the relationship. From the JIT, she signified task, and cognitive crafting affected commitment whereas relational crafting did not indicate an effect on it. She asserts that the meaningfulness through job crafting led to increased commitment at work and organization. On the other hand, Leana et al. (2009), in the group level of analysis, collaborative job crafting had positive relationship with commitment but at the individual level, there was no significant relationship at their study without in task, relational and cognitive aspect measurement. From JDR perspective, Bakker et al. (2003a), showed job resources had positive and significant relationship with commitment at affective and continuous dimensions whereas job demand and commitment indicate non-significant relationship as Bakker et al.'s (2003b), study, similar results were found. Furthermore, Tims and Bakker (2010), proposed the commitment is a positive result of the job crafting process as work engagement and stated this process as a loop for defining the relationship in the assumption that altering and controlling the job have the positive affect on the outcomes, one of them is commitment. From the group level analysis, Leana et al.'s (2009) results showed positive relationship between collaborative crafting and commitment whereas at the individual level did not indicate significant relationship. Chen et al. (2016), while stating the contradictory results of Leana et al.'s (2009) findings, both individual and collaborative crafting related to higher commitment with the claim of increase of the altering the job also lead meaningful for the jobs and work identity. Kim and Beehr's (2018) research about job crafting and career commitment that was also proposed as an activity for sustaining work identity, from resource and demand perspective, indicate a positive relation. Meijerink et al. (2018), reverse conceptualization about high level of commitment on JDR model conducted study resulted significant relationship at increasing job resources and challenging job demand but indicated negative result at decreasing hindering job demand. At affective commitment Wang et al.'s (2018) study, from JDR perspective again, indicated the positive relationship. On the other hand, Romeo et al. (2018), from JIT, through Slemp and VellaBrodrick's (2013) scale in measurement task, relational and cognitive crafting revealed positive relationships with affective commitment whereas need commitment did not indicate a relationship.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 4.1. Task crafting is related positively to commitment.

Hypothesis 4.2. Relational crafting is related positively to commitment.

Hypothesis 4.3. Cognitive crafting is related positively to commitment.

2.2.4. Job Crafting Facets and Satisfaction

Hackman and Oldman (1980), from job design perspective, mentions the change in the job characteristics, in positive manner as a motivation, increase the alters' satisfaction level, Wrzesniewski et al. (1997), emphasis cognitive side as well as calling behavior, as perception of the job by the workers can lead the satisfaction. Within JIT, Wrzeniewski and Dutton (2001), assume satisfaction of the work is aimed through task, relational altering of the jobs, from this perspective, Ghilutescu (2007), categorized the satisfaction that is an outcome of commitment and meaning at the work but in her study, just only cognitive crafting affected satisfaction where task and relational crafting did not have a significant relationship on the other hand, at her second study, job satisfaction is related to relational and cognitive crafting. Leana et al. (2009), in their analyzes, while collaborative job crafting had positive relationship with job satisfaction, individual job crafting had negative relationship with satisfaction. On the other hand, Llorente-Alonso and Topa (2019) found a non-significant relationship between collaborative crafting and satisfaction as well as individual level crafting. Another study with a different result, Slemp and VellaBrodict (2013), argued all the facets of job crafting had related to job satisfaction and also their idiosyncratic targeted results, as the intrinsic need satisfaction from the work, mentioned the causality of job crafting and figured out relationship through three facets of the job crafting.

In longitudinal result of satisfaction and job crafting, from JDR perspective, Niessen and Abildgaard (2012) pointed out that the increased social job resources were related to satisfaction where decreasing had no relationship at blue color workers. On the other hand, Dubbelt et al.'s (2019), longitudinal result of satisfaction and job crafting, seeking

challenges increasing related to the career satisfaction where seeking challenges are not related to the career satisfaction like Tims et al.'s (2013) increase in job resource was related to higher satisfaction level. Devotto et al. (2022), mentions the static form of job crafting from JIT, Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2010) facets of crafting, and underlines the importance of basic need satisfaction specifically on work meaning related to the satisfaction by using Slemp and VellaBrodrick (2013) scale.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 5.1. Task crafting is related positively to satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5.2. Relational crafting is related positively to satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5.3. Cognitive crafting is related positively to satisfaction

2.3. Mediator Role of Job Crafting Facets

According to Self-Determination Theory (SDT), the distinction between the hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of happiness is not entirely separate, as they encompass different components of overall well-being (Ryan et al., 2008). Where eudaimonic activities, in nature, have to be autonomous and the need for autonomy, the will for responsibility of actions; volition, harmony of choice with the belief, values and the targets; congruence, consistency and cohesion in the sense of how individuals guide their lives; unity are defined as the innate desire of autonomy (Ryan, 1993). The spectrum of the behaviour is not covered by "autonomous and heteronomous" actions that are either influenced by just external, with the external and internal factors are classified as "independence, interdependence and dependence" and variation of those and their contexts (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Namely, just the inner and self-regulated ones are considered as autonomous as free-will for choice and decisions of the behaviour as the first basic need for satisfaction psychologically.

The second one is stated as competence that are bounded with autonomy to compose "informational" as intrinsic motivation. Although competence and motivation are separate concepts, the distinguished factor is the innate need to define the difference. The

musician is shared as an example for competence and autonomy who plays to enjoy the music to satisfy his need because he enjoys the experience. Any activity that can be a noble purpose or an ordinary form could be competent to achieve the desired outcome as well as the competence increase the motivation that is feeling about the behavior and its role. Nevertheless, competence and autonomy are essential components for innate needs, relatedness is catalyst of them to sustain the intrinsic motivation. With the relation to the self to other people, care for others and internalization of socialization and group relations is called relatedness. The self is also the internalization of the external factors and internal ones. This integration process is called intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2019). And the core of the theory relies upon the realization of the integration process that is the basic needs as autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

In brick analogy, Ryan and Deci (2019) define why answer of the question to explain the theoretical development of SDT which is not only one of the most used theory but also gradually developed theory that focus on also to the self rather than only external factors through satisfaction with the relationship with the others in owning self-behavior with desired outcome for integration of intrinsic motivation are defined the key elements of theory (Deci & Ryan, 2012) that has 6 mini-theories that are evolved in time brick by brick and worded as a “Copernican theory” due to its focus on the self rather than only external factor of behaviorist perspectives as:

Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET): The first mini theory of meta-theory is structured by Deci and Ryan (1980) with two important assumptions as it was debated above; autonomy, competence and relatedness are the basic needs to nitrite the intrinsic motivation that is prone to be affected in positive or negative way for each human-being by external and intrapersonal events. As Reeve (2023) asserts this duality generates the importance of the theory yet the main aim of the theory is developed over time from control and uncontrol external events and its correlation to intrinsic motivation to evaluate efficiency information causality on intrinsic motivation and amotivation. Those external events flourish functional significance that is defined to scrutinize the cognitive evaluation of external factors: information, events and any feeling that has the role over autonomy, relatedness and competence. Reward is shared as the example for describing

the functional significance that have multi-results: reward with external control yield to decrease in the autonomy but an increase in competence with positive feedback lead to increase intrinsic motivation and high competence. The relationship between intrapersonal and social relations has the same results, if autonomy is supported by behavior or events then increasing intrinsic motivation occurs otherwise a decrease in result (Ryan & Deci, 2019). Furthermore, cognitive process is crucial in adjusting both internal and external events by the emotions and experience in the relationship as well as social interaction in the autonomy (Fu et al., 2024).

Organismic Integration Theory (OIT): Extrinsic motivation is the core subject as well as the distinguishing one when it is compared to other theories as well as the rest Self Determination mini theories where the extrinsic motivation has multi forms in the sense of autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2019) and it differs from its point of view extrinsic motivation in a positive way as well as its consequences. Extrinsic motivation is described into four regulations: external, introjected, identified and integrated forms that are linked to relatedness due to the fact that socialization is a crucial component that covers regulations, norms, culture and interaction with others (Pelletier & Rocchi, 2023).

- i. External regulation: Based on either avoidance of punishment or accompany with reward form of regulation. Although, external regulation is the most significant driving factor with the less internalized and less sustainable one due to its dependence on the full externality and instrumentality. So, its existence is just based on the carrot and stick, if the factor disappears then it cannot be evaluated the external regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2019).
- ii. Introjected regulation: Ego involvement in control and regulating the external regulation is called introjected regulation. The externality of the regulation is ended by the internalization, but ego centralization exists to increase the self-worth that is prone to be affected by the ego itself and ego centralization rest upon “should” rather than full ended internalization process. Possession, display and extrinsic outcomes from the ego are shared as sample for introjected regulation (Pelletier & Rocchi, 2023).

- iii. Identified regulation: Behaviors are incorporated to the extrinsic motivation. Distinguished from integrated regulation, behavior is dominant in the internalization process to become value, but it is not on that ally with identity. The person knows the benefits of behavior and through enjoyment of the behavior, but it is not fully integrated.
- iv. Integration regulation: The full internalization process, the extrinsic motivation is transposed to the identity that is composed of autonomy, competence and relatedness and become a part of the value system. The reason for its form of extrinsic motivation is due to its outcome for value rather than pure enjoyment of the intrinsic motivation (Pelletier & Rocchi, 2023).

The theory highlights the importance of internalizing external factors in sustaining motivation and autonomy. Song and Jo (2023) argue that job crafting affects both innovative behavior and motivation. Their study found that autonomy and controlled motivation play a mediating role in the relationship between job crafting and innovation. Additionally, it was determined that engagement is supported by these two dimensions, which contribute to fostering innovation and motivation. From the perspective of the Job Demands-Resources (JDR) model, internalization functions as a job resource that connects external motivation with internal processes, while externalization is explained by the internalization of employees' tendencies toward innovation.

This mini theory is built upon another trilogy consisting of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This indicates that COP (Causality Orientations Theory), is related to the previously mentioned mini-theories, CET (Cognitive Evaluation Theory) and OT (Organismic Integration Theory), and shares similar constructs. Its fundamental framework is connected to autonomy, impersonal, and controlled tendencies of individual differences (Ryan & Deci, 2017).

The orientation of individual tendencies is expressed as an individual's focus, which may or may not be influenced by their interpretation of motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2019). Autonomy refers to an individual's inclination toward their own behavior, placing greater value and care in it than other aspects, as perceived locus of causality. Hagger and Hamilton (2020) suggest a positive relationship between autonomy and various forms of

motivation, while control orientation balances both external and internal motivations and their regulation. Impersonal causality, on the other hand, extends beyond internal control and involves orientation toward external events, as well as mastery over elements that lie outside personal control.

Malinowska and Tokarz (2020) explored the motivational process in job crafting and its specific relationship with engagement, focusing on the role of COP. In their study, they demonstrated that autonomy results from individual preferences or the outcomes of internal or external impacts, or relatedness. They also identified the moderating role of these factors in the relationship between engagement and job crafting processes through the lens of the JDR model.

Basic Psychological Needs Theory (BPNT): Ryan et al. (2022) argues that BPNT is formed through the combination of CET (Cognitive Evaluation Theory), OIT (Organismic Integration Theory), and COP (Causality Orientations Theory), as these theories focus on well-being by integrating autonomy, competence, and relatedness through the alignment of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The relationship between engagement and job crafting in the context of job crafting has been examined, showing that the fulfillment of basic needs is positively associated with autonomy, connection with others, and individual competence, highlighting the dominant role of the JDR perspective in the literature (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Goal Content Theory (GCT) and Relationship Motivation Theory (RMT) are the latest sub-theories of SDT that aim to explain the connection between self-actualization, autonomy, competence, and relationships with others (Ryan & Deci, 2019; Ryan et al., 2022). However, these theories have not garnered much scholarly attention regarding their relationship with either JDR or JIT. As Sheldon et al. (2003) assert, SDT has been studied in organizational contexts, including job crafting, since the 2000s. Before this period, it was primarily applied in studies related to healthcare, sports, childhood, and education and Ryan and Deci (2012; 2017; 2018) highlight organizational studies, particularly those focusing on commitment and engagement, have become one of the most common areas of application for SDT, where JDR dominated research on the relationship between these concepts.

On the other hand, from the JIT perspective, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) examine how limited job opportunities can positively impact job crafting. In other words, altering opportunities for job design can act as a support mechanism for job crafting, as employees achieve self-determination through the redesign of their work. However, under conditions of restricted control or limited discretionary space, the need for self-determination and job crafting tends to increase, resulting in various facets of crafting. In their framework, they highlight the similarities between SDT and JIT. This suggests that the autonomy aspect of SDT aligns with Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) cognitive crafting, the competence dimension of SDT corresponds to JIT's task crafting, and relatedness is reflected in relational crafting. Additionally, it could be argued that Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) did not explicitly mention these similarities. However, they do discuss intrinsic motivation as a means of "expressing self-determination and competence in the work" (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 185), while extrinsic motivation is described as a hindering factor in job crafting. They assert that self-determination serves as an antecedent to increased job crafting. Slemp (2013) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2014), figure out the relationship between intrinsic need for autonomy, competence and relatedness with facets of crafting; task, relational and cognitive side that are all positively related to each other's. Alternatively, in the same survey, both the intrinsic needs are the outcomes of job crafting facets that mediate between wellbeing. From JIT perspective and using job crafting as a result of autonomy support and job crafting, they found a reciprocity in the relationship; both as outcome and an antecedent relationship exist between autonomy support and job crafting, unlike Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) assert self-determination as control is an antecedent of job crafting. From JD-R perspective, Bakker and Oerlemans (2019) conducted the research and support Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2014)'s result in the claim of relatedness, autonomy and competence are the mediator between job resources and engagement to claim those components are consequences of the crafting. Napier et al. (2024), in their review, seek to answer this difference in the literature as well as aim to categorize the relationship between job crafting process with SDT. In other words, depict SDT both as antecedent and outcome for job crafting process with the aim of consolation autonomy, competence and relatedness with adding meaning phase to the theory to unify a broad through SDT with

solving the difference between JIT and JDR perspective; cognitive crafting facet is related to the meaning phase of SDT to indicate as a version of the crafting. Furthermore, accentuation of the core of job crafting – specifically JIT- lies behind bottom-up job characteristics which has the multi formations by altering the jobs and it is utterly a proactive behavior without any connection to prize, reward or punishment, loss during daily basis (Wang et al.,2016) where the type or the characteristic of the jobs is not a determinator in crafting process, within the birth of the JIT article, job groups are stated as examples of three facets of crafting forms. Hospital cleaners were specified for task crafting with avoiding behaviors, internet provider staff is exemplified as relational crafting in interaction and connection of the job creation and computer support personnel in changing task and its regulations through interaction with others to indicate task crafting and relational crafting sample. But it was added that interaction with others causes less opportunity or space for job crafting due to the interdependence, in other words, the sole workers have mostly chance for increasing job crafting in task and relational crafting phases. Hairdressers were signified in the importance of interaction among the customers that leads to relational crafting through altering the jobs, kitchen employees even under the strict role and the rules change the tasks in cognitive way to identify their job as an art. But the control mechanisms or controlled by the task, time or strict management control cause less opportunity for job crafting in also relational and task crafting but at any job type, job crafting facets can be existed in physical, social and cognitive dimensions in everyday altering and “re-creating and crafting all the time” (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, pg.180).

Also, contradictory results can be seen in the literature, for instance, one of the earliest studies about blue color workers research, Ghitulescu (2007), analyzed job crafting facets, where the high autonomy, higher interdependence, and less designed processes were assigned to the staff at researched workplace where cognitive crafting is not significant in discretion. Another interesting result with comparison of teacher’s role in different groups of pupils is significant at discretion at cognitive facet of job crafting but task complexity and interdependence did not yield any impact on cognitive crafting. It can be reduced, without considering the individual differences, job characteristics have an impact on the job crafting facets. Since it was theorized in the lens of JIT, cognitive

crafting can be measured as well as evaluated to define the differences in the job crafting facets. But it is also needed to emphasize that job type and job characteristics are needed to evaluate to define the re-define the job altering.

As discussed earlier, while the relationship between job characteristics and crafting behaviors has been widely explored, the broader concept of happiness at work—encompassing engagement, commitment, and satisfaction—has recently gained attention in relation to psychological safety. Since Edmondson's (1999) foundational work, psychological safety has been a key focus in organizational research. Edmondson and Bransby's (2023) literature review highlights leadership, performance, and climate as top issues in this field. Interestingly, half of the studies on psychological safety cited in their review were published in the last three years, indicating a growing interest in this area. However, despite this surge, happiness at work remains underexplored, with only a few studies examining its relationship with psychological safety, engagement, commitment, and job satisfaction. This gap in the literature was explicitly noted by Aboramadan and Kundi (2022), who emphasized the need for further research on the connection between psychological safety and happiness at work. In their research on Pakistani workers, psychological safety is positively related to happiness at work. Another importance of this research is due to most of the studies related to happiness at work mention human resource management, leadership, and job-related issues yet the higher concept itself of happiness at work is also in the literature and was not the main topic for the researchers (Salas -Vallina et al., 2017b). But they did not compare the subcategories of engagement, satisfaction, and job satisfaction to compare the result with themselves as well as the happiness at work results in relation to psychological safety. Slemp and Brodrick (2014), in the lens of JIT, figure out the indirect effects between subjective well-being, psychological well-being (as a replaced concept instead of eudaimonia, and hedonic happiness), and three facets of job crafting; cognitive, relational, and task crafting through satisfaction and indicate the significant relationship among well-being and psychological well-being in the comment of job crafting also found satisfaction and engagement relationship positively at the workplace but not did research commitment concept in their discussion. Previously to JIT, JDR model had offered well-being and job crafting relations by Tims et al. (2012) as previously debated, engagement and satisfaction were

mentioned yet again commitment was not debated and researched. Furthermore, there are limited studies related to happiness at work and job crafting relations in the literature where the other sub-categories of happiness at work are studied (Rudolph et al., 2017; Zhang & Parker, 2019; Lichtenthaler & Fischbacher 2019; Lazzazzara et al., 2020). Yet, as Boehnlein and Baum (2022) underline, the meta-analysis in the literature covers different results of job crafting and focus on the theoretical differences. In their meta-analytic, in differentiating hedonic and eudaimonic approaches to research both positive and negative aspects in the evaluation of three facets of job crafting by promotion job crafting and yielded positive relationship with well-being with positive indicators and negative aspects with negative well-being yet do not cover happiness at work. From an authentic happiness perspective, Ruparel et al. (2022), claims of adding both satisfaction and meaning to add subjective well-being concept, in the JDR model, challenging demand leads positive relation whereas hindering demand did not lead to any significant relation to proposing JDR model in crafting lead happiness. At JIT, Berg et al. (2022) cite Bell and Staw's (1989) analogy for the control role of the employees as sculptors and sculpture that were designed by the mindset of the employees in job crafting intentions rather than behaviors but indicate a positive impact on happiness that was measured through just happiness level in general.

Petrov et al. (2023), from JDR perspective, consider psychological safety as a mediator role between engagement and performance within the claim that engagement increase the job resources and psychological safety is the antecedents for both engagement and job crafting. To put it simply, increase in the psychological safety both has positive impact over engagement and job crafting in the resource-based view. Job crafting as an antecedent with the result of commitment is questioned in qualitative analyzed by Noesgaard and Jørgensen (2023). According to their findings, task crafting is bound to cognitive and relational crafting that led to commitment in the organization at individual level research. According to their research, it can be inferred that, due to the qualitative research results, activities about the perception of the work are based on discussing the issues in an open manner. If the climate exists in the discussion through psychological safety and candor in communication at the organization than it can be claimed that the psychological safety is the antecedents for the job crafting yield as it was hypothesized

and then, the relationship between job crafting facets -task, cognitive and relational- and commitment relationship can be scrutinized as well as other factors of happiness at work additionally engagement and satisfaction. One of the major roles of psychological safety and its existence leading a safety zone for the employees and their freedom of thought, act and changes in the workplace make psychological safety as an antecedent role for the job crafting and happiness at work. To put the matter differently, psychological safety as was stated above, creativity, enthusiasm, willingness for alteration of the workplace environment, fearless thinking and acting in both the relationship with the others as well as the interaction with the job itself is a result of the heart of the employees and their feelings about the job and their identification with the job itself. The machine does not work from the heart as the human act where psychological safety yields the basic needs the autonomy, competence and relatedness which are the component of self-determination. As Newman et al. (2017) indicate the psychological safety influence upon both individuals, improvements of motivation and emotion to imply high self-esteem, creativity and relationship with the other colleagues, job design as well as the organization itself. So, in the feeling of ability to indicate one-self at the high level at the state of fearlessness of making mistake to engage in altering the job as well as task performance (Kahn, 1990) in the tacit calculation of self-esteem protection from the job altering process which is not just an incident or event based but as a process, sum of activities and perception. Moreover, without any risk for altering the job and its perception, the tacit calculation is the antecedent of the development where psychological safety is required for promoting job crafting that is more than changing the approach of working, design of the job, the practice of the job requirement or the style of acting in the job but generating an identity and a meaning to constitute an image in crafting the job. This crafting has the coverage dimensions that was debated above as task, relational and cognitive manner which are influenced by the belief of safety and free will of the crafters. In the crafting process, the crafter believes the free will and gets the responsibility of being a crafter in creating this identity that is enhanced by psychological safety which both influences crafting activities at engagement (Hur et al., 2017). This identity process influences also, commitment and satisfaction elements. Task crafting in the identification of the job itself impacts the engagement understanding of the employees in vigor, dedication and

absorption sides, attachment of dedication in adding spirit to the work itself. So, the identification process is also a creation of the new spirit for the work itself. This identification has a task crafting facet where the answer is of what they act in the job crafting process as the scope of the work done as the description where the job typology does not significant difference (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). The less visible but more sensible facets of crafting as relational and cognitive crafting represent the identification process for how and who answers in the existence of psychological safety climate to for sustaining the mentally and cognitively to roles of the employees as well as interaction and relationship to act the performance. Either one of the components as believe, calculation or obligation or combination of them have the common point as employee perception where psychological safety is considered as antecedent (Fornes et al., 2008) for individual commitment. From JIT, the essence of the theory is set back upon the cognitive side whereas the commitment also relies upon the belief that altering the job has the influence for it. The facets of crafting also yield the influence, when it comes to task crafting, the tacit calculation is also conducted by the employee, as it is done in psychological safety measurement, who is at a crossroads between staying and leaving that is logical or emotional (belief and normative) commitment to continue on the task altering process. This process is meant as meaningfulness to increase commitment in the organization (Ghitulescu, 2007) in the cognitive evaluation of the employees and interaction with the other employees as well as the workplace environment which have the psychological safety atmosphere.

The satisfaction, the last facet happiness at work, also covers the prior facets as engagement and commitment in the place of voice behavior, freedom of expression, idea sharing as well as self-expression are related to psychological safety (Detert & Burris, 2007; O'Neill & Arendt, 2008), self-esteem protection need and less anxiety level in the workplace as well as feeling safety increase the satisfaction level at the work place (Kim & Kim, 2020). So, as was asserted above, psychological safety is positively related to satisfaction and in job crafting addition to this relation as a mediator figure in the lens of JIT, the perception is again crucial for cognitive attribution to the job itself to increase the satisfaction level, specifically intrinsic need satisfaction where the self is the major actor in the process of crafting. To put it differently, need-satisfaction theory-based argument

states the importance of job crafting in accessing the satisfaction level (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2010) where the psychological safety environment flourishes the job crafting development at the workplace.

Therefore, I hypothesize:

Hypothesis 6.1. Task crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and engagement.

Hypothesis 6.2 Relational job crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and engagement.

Hypothesis 6.3. Cognitive crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and engagement.

Hypothesis 6.4. Task job crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and commitment.

Hypothesis 6.5. Relational job crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and commitment.

Hypothesis 6.6. Cognitive job crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and commitment.

Hypothesis 6.7. Task crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6.8. Relational crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6.9. Cognitive crafting mediates the relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sampling

In this study, an exploratory study based on a quantitative survey was conducted where participant were outsourced employees who takes the call from answering questions and help to solve the inquires of the customers which is called as inbound handlers and call the customers to inform about companies' news, policies and tele-marketing duties which is described as outbound call handlers and assigned both duties in the operations of one of the biggest multinational firm at Türkiye to measure psychological safety, job crafting and workplace happiness facets at call center.

Call center outsourcing a model for implementing not only cost reduction for the companies that need call center but also attempting for efficiency in the manner of development, demand management and focusing core business to avoid technological investment. And those employees are monitored according to the scripts and obligated to act according to the designed rules which are monitored by strict technology and managerial control. Even though, the control and restriction as well as the expectations of the job characteristics based on following the procedures and regulations which are all defined (Taylor & Bain, 1999), the human touch to the scripts as well as control which occurs in the form of either in outbound or inbound calls between the humans. Therefore, any boundaries are altered during the communication that befalls under pressure from time management, over assignments (Sprigg, 2011) which are contemplated as “bête noire” factors of call center at organizational science or those factors make call center studies as the avoiding places for research studies (Holman,2002).

On the other hand, as it was debated above, any type of the job even the most restricted ones as “bête noire” is considered as crafting place for JIT. Wrzesnieski and Dutton (2001) emphasis the facets of crafting exist in the daily activities in each altering processes. The call center firms at Mcclelland et al.'s (2014) collaborative crafting research, highlighted less opportunity of the agents to change the job structure due to the

high control of the management as well as structured job design, the agents role in the job were restricted to answer the calls and in “temporal cycles” that was implied as less interdependence among the others with restriction caused both from management and management tools ended with high motivation for the crafters to use job crafting facets in altering their jobs.

Mkhwanazi and Dhanpat (2023) also, conducted their survey at call center, where they figured out the task, cognitive and relational crafting have significant prediction on engagement, to underline that call centers are appropriate atmosphere to spring the job crafting due to their control mechanism, hard working conditions, standardized expectations of the management and job descriptions. As McClelland et al. (2014) claim, the need arouse for the control is the ambitious for job crafting, yet Rafaeli et al. (2008) mentions in script usage ratio at the operations in “mot a mot” is just 15% at the surveys. Yet, this survey seems to be contradictory upon the existence of core call center operation, and it may not the only reason or scenario as Rafaeli et al. (2008) predicted for “perfect script” need but the human need of touch to the scripts. Bakker et al. (2003), from JDR model, evaluate this need, as the job demand for source, one of pillar of the model, with achieving the target and personnel development perspective within reducing job demands. In the job resources, support from both the manager and the peer with performance feedback and time management were shared as the key points for the outcome of commitment and engagement. It can be shared that the change of the work of the model is unclear and change process was not on the inquiry at job source but at the job demand side with measuring the difficulty result from altering.

Though call center agents are under strict control, both from control systems via technology and managerial control mechanism (Panopticon analogy often used in literature to describe call centers, as mentioned by Taylor & Bain, 1999), why do agents still alter their work, even using only 15% of the assigned scripts in their calls although they know that they are controlled and why the managerial systems cannot detect it? What is the goal of the agents, and why they alter their job, yet they are under “panopticon” with strict control? To answer those questions as well as evaluate job crafting theory, it is

necessary to illuminate those answers through innate psychological needs rather than just on the goal orientation questioning.

Once getting the approval of ethic committee of İstanbul Bilgi University (see Appendix B), HR department of the call center company analyzed the questions to be sure that outsourced companies are not asked or identified in the survey as well as any information will not be disclosed to the participants and granted for the survey to the employees through Google forms via link sharing to their company e-mail addresses with the notification of confidentiality and voluntary participation as well as the purpose of the survey (see Appendix A)

Sample size determination specifically for the mediation analyzes, different approaches exist in the literature, Fritz and MacKinnon (2007) at power .8 created a matrix for test in effect size, in a small effect for both a-path and b-path for Baron Kenny and Bias-Corrected bootstrap 562 to 462 samples are required. For Sobel on the other hand, the highest number exist in small condition were shared as 667 to 450 from according to lower β paths. On the other hand, at Monte Carlo power analysis, at .8 power, the highest sample calculator is 465 at small effect for a-path and b-path was analyzed by One of the major advantages of application the mediation size in power analyzes, it is based on assumptions but does not underestimate the indirect effect in the mediation analysis (Schoeman et al. (2017).

3.2. Participants

The survey was shared with 1504 company employees, whom were selected due to their role at the company as their role in the organization as outbound operators, inbound operator and both for responsibility and even if they had the managerial roles for outsource company, the participants were added to the survey where the support department members and managers of the call center company were deduced from the survey participants from 563 to led 552 participants via purposive sampling methodology. Another words, the participants were outsourced for other companies, yet they earn their salaries from the main call center company but work for another company in a period of

agreement between the call center company and the recruiter companies which were not specified in the survey.

3.3. Instrument

All measures are presented in Appendix B.

3.3.1. Psychological Safety Scale

In this study, measurement of psychological safety, as it was debated in the literature section; Edmondson (1999)'s scale for measurement is the widely used for analyzing for group level studies but also applied in evaluating individual and organizational level studies (Edmondson, & Bransby, 2023), was used to gather the perceptions of the climate of psychological safety that consists of 7-items where three reverse items in single dimension with .79 Cronbach alpha value (Edmonson, 1999). The scale was translated into Turkish by Yener (2015) and figured out 0.81 Cronbach alpha and his translation is used at this survey.

3.3.2. Job Crafting Scale

The instrument to measure job crafting by JIT perspective, Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2013)'s scale, which was translated into Turkish by Kerse (2017), was used to capture the job crafting level and dimensions of the participants. The scale is designed to analyze three pillars of crafting as cognitive, task and relational crafting where to measure at individual, team and organizational level studies via 5 question for each dimensions to sum 15 questions as in the original scale with .91 Cronbach alpha value (.89 for cognitive, .87 for task and .83 for relational crafting).

3.3.3. Happiness at Work Scale

The participants were asked to evaluate their happiness at work by Salas-Vallina et al. (2017)'s question of short-happiness at work scale that both aim to measure three components of happiness as commitment, engagement and satisfaction through short survey with 9 questions to achieve more direct and efficiency for direct questions as Salas-Vallina et al. (2017b) claim, the longer surveys may be more “over surveyed” and getting more reliable data through less questions, was targeted as original survey reached at commitment .962, engagement .911 and satisfaction .891 with total .92 Cronbach alpha value that is higher than the original happiness at work scale of Fisher (2010) 's definitions that was created by Salas-Vallina et.al (2017b) with 31 items. Turkish translation of the survey was conducted by Yozgat and Bilginoğlu (2020) where Cronbach alpha value .89 Cronbach alpha value where dimensions have .77 for commitment, .82 engagement, and .74 for satisfaction Cronbach alpha value.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data of the survey was carried out by SPSS 29 for descriptive analysis to generate the demographic data, reliability analysis, regression analysis and multiple regression analysis for mediation related hypothesis and also Sobel test was used throughout the online calculator webpage, <https://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm>, that was designed by Preacher and Leonardelli to evaluate the mediation effects and conduct simultaneously Sobel, Aroian and Goodman test results.

4.1.1. Participant Demographics

When demographic data were evaluated, majority of participants, 82.2% were female, 39.8% age between 24-29, only 24.8% was high school graduate and the rest were higher degree from universities, more than five years in working profession time was 52.7% and 80.7% were agent role where 15.4% of them were assigned in just outbound calls and in general 58.3% were responsible for just inbound calls and both inbound-outbound calls added 84.6% were getting inbound calls with outbound calls. To put it another way, the only outbound calls ratio was 15.4% in the sample, which may be meaningful due to the assigned calls or callbacks after the outbound calls for the customers (see Table 4.1)

Table 4.1. Participant Demographics

Frequencies for Gender Identity

Gender Identity	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	149	17.753	17.753	17.821
Female	403	82.247	82.247	100.000
Prefer not to say	0	0.000		

Frequencies for Educational

Educational	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Bachelor's degree	268	48.551	48.551	48.551
Two-year college	111	20.109	20.109	68.659
Master's degree	36	6.522	6.522	75.181
High School	137	24.819	24.819	100.000
Total	552	100.000		

Frequencies for Gender Identity

Gender Identity	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total	552	100.000		

Frequencies for Age

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
24-29	220	39.855	39.855	39.855
36+	112	20.290	20.290	60.145
30-35	147	26.630	26.630	86.775
18-23	73	13.225	13.225	100.000
Total	552	100.000		

Frequencies for Length of time working in a profession

Length of time working in a profession	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-3 years	155	27.928	27.928	27.928
5 +	293	52.793	52.793	80.721
4-5 years	76	13.694	13.694	94.414
Less'then 1 year	31	5.586	5.586	100.000
Total	555	100.000		

Frequencies for Job Level

Job Level	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agent	428	77.536	77.536	77.536
Manager	65	11.775	11.775	89.312
Team Leader	59	10.688	10.688	100.000
Total	552	100.000		

Frequencies for Call Role

Call Role	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Both inbound and outbound calls	145	26.268	26.268	26.268
Only outbound calls	85	15.399	15.399	41.667
Only inbound calls	322	58.333	58.333	100.00
Total	552	100.000		

4.1.2. Factor and Reliability Analyses

At the literature, although the Cronbach's alpha value is mostly used, has different scales exist and used among the scholars with lower and upper bounds but generally acceptance level of alphas .65 to .80 are stated to evaluate the internal consistency of the scales (Nunnally& Bernstein, 1994). The principal component analyses were used to evaluate the structure validity of the scales via load values of the items and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was used to identify the correlation between the items to indicate the homogeneity of the items where .6 to .7 is mediocre and .7 to .8 is average for the analyses (Kaiser & Rice, 1974)

4.1.3. Psychological Safety Scale Factor and Reliability Analyze

As it was stated above, the scale consists of 7 items with 3 of them were reverse in the original and translation to Turkish. Due to the reverse coding of the questions, those reversed factors did not indicate positive correlation as well as decrease Cronbach alpha so, it was considered as mis-interpreted by some of the participant and removed from the factor analysis as to reached one factor that had .687 Cronbach alpha, .62 of the scale is explained in with .732 was correlated and appropriate for the analysis (see table 4.2)

Table 4.2. Factor and Reliability Findings for Psychological Safety Scale

Factor	No	Items	Loading	Total Variance Explained	Cronbach Alpha
	7	Working with members of this organization, my unique skills and talents are valued and utilized	.788		
	2	Members of this organization are able to bring up problems and tough issues	.743		

PSYS	6	No one on this team would deliberately act in a way that undermines my efforts	.699	62,119	.687
	4	It is safe to take a risk on this organization	.652		
TOTAL	62,119				
Kaiser Meyer Olkin			.732		
Barlett's Test of Sphericity					
Chi Square			352.876		
df			6		
p value			< .001		

4.1.4. Job Crafting Scale Factor and Reliability Analyses

The job crafting scale was composed of three factors with 15 items but less than .5 loading and overlapping item, 1 item (from task crafting factor) was discarded from the scale with the result of .856 Cronbach alpha with .85 Kaiser Meyer-Okin score in <.000 to describe significant for analyses result whereas 59,7% total variance explained. The 3 factors were depicted below (see table 4.3):

Table 4.3. Factor and Reliability Findings for Job Crafting Scale

Factor	No	Items	Loading	Total Variance Explained	Cronbach Alpha
JCC	4	Think about the ways in which your work positively impacts your life	.854	37,814	.861
	5	Reflect on the role your job has for your overall well-being	.823		

	2	Remind yourself about the significance your work has for the success of the organization	.809		
	3	Remind yourself of the importance of your work for the broader community	.785		
	1	Think about how your job gives your life purpose	.726		
JCR	4	Choose to mentor new employees (officially or unofficially)	,761		
	5	Make friends with people at work have similar skills or interests	,752	11,969	,777
	3	Organize special events in the workplaces (e.ge celebrating a coworker's birthday)	,732		
	2	Organise or attend work related social functions	,701		
	1	Make an effort to get to know people well at work	,699		
JCT	2	Change the scope or types of tasks that you complete at work	.790		
	3	Introduce new works tasks that you think better suit your skills or interests	.784	9,931	.69
	1	Introduce new approaches to improve your work	.650		
	4	Choose to take on additional tasks at work	.556		
TOTAL					
	59,715	.856			
Kaiser Meyer Olkin		.857			
Barlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square		3118,039			
df		91			
p value		< .001			

4.1.5. Short-Happiness at Work Scale Factor and Reliability Analyses

The scale was composed of three dimensions as engagement, commitment and satisfaction with 9 items. In the principal component analysis, factor loading in overlapping item with lower than .5 load value (satisfaction item) was removed from the analysis to get <.001 and .832 Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure in .838 Cronbach Alpha value with 74.949 dimension were explained of the scale (see table 4.4)

Table 4.4. Factor and Reliability Findings for Short-Happiness at Work Scale

Factor	No	Items	Loading	Total Variance Explained	Cronbach Alpha
COM	2	I feel emotionally attached to this organization	.891	50,665	.878
	3	I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization	.879		
	1	I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	.683		
ENG	2	I am enthusiastic about my job	.812	13,667	.797
	3	I get carried away when I am working	.787		
SAT	1	How satisfied are you with the nature of the work you perform?	.877		
	3	How satisfied are you with the opportunities which exist in this organisation for advancement (e.g. promotion)?	.871		

2	How satisfied are you with the pay you receive for your job?	.714	10,617	.684
---	--	------	--------	------

TOTAL	
74,949	.838
Kaiser Meyer Olkin	.832
Barlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square	2088,503
df	28
p value	< .001

4.2. Means, Standard Deviations, Skewness and Kurtosis

For each survey after factor and reliability analysis, the skewness and kurtosis were re-measured as between -1,4 to -0,571 in Skewness and -0.22 to +1.844 for Kurtosis. Ghasemi and Zahediasl (2012) consider $\pm 1,96$ range for Skewness and Kurtosis are acceptable range.

And also, higher means were figured out, for each survey, the means were between 3.1 and 4.3 that signify higher agreement in the participants' perceptions with the statements (see Table 4.5)

Finally, collinearity tests were conducted to identify VIF (variance inflation actor) and tolerance value that were less than 2.5 and higher than .1 in this research study to indicate non-multicollinearity problem among Psychological Safety, Job Crafting and Short-Happiness at Work variables (Midi et al., 2010).

Table 4.5. Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and, Kurtosis

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
PSYS	3,8335	0,92308	-0,600	-0,229
JC	4,1853	0,63095	-0,692	-0,244
JCT	3,9440	0,83006	-0,571	-0,043
JCC	4,3877	0,77613	-1,437	1,844
JCR	4,1758	0,79614	-0,946	0,455

HAW	3,9055	0,81163	-0,844	0,384
ENG	4,3099	0,84720	-1,387	1,440
SAT	3,1227	1,19194	-0,192	-0,796
COM	4,0229	1,04003	-1,060	0,569

4.3. Correlation Analysis

Davis (1971) categories r value in a scale as ,01-,09 is very weak; ,1-0,29 weak; ,3 to ,49 is moderate; ,5-,69 is strong and more than ,7 is very strong correlation in considering perfect correlations are rare in the social sciences. According to the results of the survey, psychological safety and job crafting yielded higher correlation result at Pearson Correlation Analysis $r = ,506$ (.001 level, 2-tailed), the subcategories of job crafting and psychological safety, lowest one is relational job crafting as $r = ,333$ (.001 level, 2-tailed), in moderate correlation and the highest correlation was found task crafting. The relationship between psychological safety and happiness at work resulted in $r = ,425$ (.001 level, 2-tailed) with moderate correlation level in each sub-categories as engagement, satisfaction and commitment. In job crafting and happiness at work, $r = ,540$ with strong correlation whereas the subcategories were at moderate correlation. This can be seen in the subcategories of job crafting in task crafting has moderate correlation with engagement and commitment but satisfaction with low correlation, the same resulted in relational crafting but at the cognitive crafting side, each factor had moderate correlation with high correlation in happiness at work.

Table 4.6. Correlations Between the Study Variables

	PSYS	JC	JCT	JCR	JCC	HAW	ENG	SAT	COM
PSYS	1	,506**	,493**	,333**	,422**	,425**	,355**	,356**	,362**
JC		1	,818**	,833**	,743**	,540**	,512**	,344**	,495**
JCT			1	,495**	,530**	,445**	,447**	,268**	,394**
JCR				1	,371**	,348**	,328**	,196**	,348**
JCC					1	,546**	,494**	,402**	,476**
HAW						1	,875**	,824**	,822**
ENG							1	,589**	,571**
SAT								1	,522**
COM									1

**Correlation is significant at ,001 level (2-tailed)

4.4. Hypothesis Testing

To test Hypothesis 1.1., simple linear regression analyses were conducted to measure the independent variable and dependent variable relationship in the meaning of prediction of the outcome as engagement and independent variable as psychological safety that depicted regression ($F_{1, 552} = 79,767$, $p < .001$).

Confidence interval in 95% predict engagement from psychological safety is between ,245 and ,398. One unit increase in psychological safety will lead ,326 unit increase on Engagement. The R^2 was 12.6 indicate that psychological safety explained 12,6 % of the variance in engagement.

Therefore hypothesis 1.1 was accepted.

Table 4.7. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.1

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	3,060	,144		21,252	<,001	2,777	3,342
PSYS	,326	,037	,355	8,931	<,001	,254	,398

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

Table 4.8. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.1

Independent	Dependent	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	P
PSYS	ENG	,355	,126	,125	79,797	<,001

To test hypothesis 1.2, the relationship between psychological safety and commitment; simple regression was tested.

According to the model, psychological safety was related to commitment positively and indicate regression ($F_{1, 552} = 83,307$, $p < .001$) within Confidence in ,334 to ,518 at 95% certainty. The R^2 was 13.1 as explain 13,1 % of the variance in Commitment. One unit increase of Psychological Safety will cause ,426 unit increase at the Commitment level.

Therefore, hypothesis 1.2 was accepted,

Table 4.9. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,414	,184		13,116	<,001	2,053	2,776
PSYS	,426	,047	,362	9,127	<,001	,334	,518

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment

Table 4.10. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.2

Independent	Dependent	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	P
PSYS	COM	,362	,131	,30	83,707	<,001

To test hypothesis 1.3, as the rest of the facet of happiness at work dimensions, psychological safety and job satisfaction relationship were analyzed via simple regression. At the test, the influence of psychological safety on satisfaction was found in regression model ($F_{1, 552} = 80,275$ $p < .001$). Confidence interval level at 95% was between ,316 and ,494.

The R^2 was 12.7 with ,405-unit increase will increase the Satisfaction.

Therefore, hypothesis 1.3 was accepted.

Table 4.11. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 1.3

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	1,891	,178		10,613	<,001	1,541	2,2242
PSYSY	,405	,045	,356	8,960	<,001	,316	,494

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 4.12. Model Summary of Hypothesis 1.3

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
PSYS	SAT	,356	,127	,125	80,275	<,001

To test hypothesis 2.1, psychological safety and task crafting, the first facet of job crafting, were evaluated to identify regression formulation via simple regression analysis that yielded significant results ($F_{1, 552} = 177,120$ $p = <.001$) and explained 24,3% (The $R^2 = ,243$) of a change in job crafting within ,329 to ,442 at Confidence Interval 95%.

Therefore, hypothesis 2.1 was accepted.

Table 4.13. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.1

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,754	,114		24,110	<,001	2,530	2,979
PSYS	,386	,029	,493	13,309	<,001	,329	,442

a. Dependent Variable: Task Crafting

Table 4.14. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.1

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
PSYS	JCT	,493	,243	,242	177,120	<,001

To test hypothesis 2.2, the relationship between psychological safety and relational crafting was evaluated by simple regression analyses. The model established a statistically significant results in regression ($F_{1, 552} = 69,058$, $p = <.001$) with 11.1% will be explained at the change of relational crafting could be explained (The $R^2 = ,111$).

One unit of a movement in psychological safety will increase on relational crafting with the result of between ,220 to ,356 in 95% Confidence Interval.

Therefore, hypothesis 2.2 was accepted.

Table 4.15. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound

1 (Constant)	3,073	,136		22,552	<,001	2,805	3,341
PSYSY	,288	,035	,333	8,310	<,001	,220	,356

a. Dependent Variable: Relational Crafting

Table 4.16. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.2

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
PSYS	JCR	,333	,111	,110	69,058	<,001

To test hypothesis 2.3, cognitive crafting was positively related to psychological safety that is related to cognitive crafting within the regression analyses results (F 1, 552 =119,615 p= <.001) and 17,8% was explained (The R² = ,178) in cognitive crafting. One unit of change in psychological safety will yield ,414 units of increase at cognitive crafting.

Confidence Intervals predict cognitive crafting from psychological safety was between ,220 to ,486. at 95% certainty.

Therefore, hypothesis 2.3 was accepted.

Table 4.17. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 2.3

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,706	,149		18,116	<,001	2,403	2,999
PSYS	,414	,038	,422	10,937	<,001	,220	,486

a. Dependent Variable: Cognitive Crafting

Table 4.18. Model Summary of Hypothesis 2.3

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
PSYS	JCC	,422	,178	,177	119,615	<,001

To test hypothesis 3.1, the relationship between task crafting and engagement, a simple regression test was conducted. As independent variable, task crafting was positively related and indicated regression ($F_{1, 552} = 137,572$ $p = <.001$) with engagement in explanation 19,9 % of the variance in engagement (The $R^2 = ,199$).

One unit of increase at Task Crafting will yield ,524 increase at engagement that created Therefore, hypothesis 3.1 was accepted.

Table 4.19. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.1

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,092	,192			10,908	<,001	1,715	2,469
TaskCrafting	,524	,045	,447		11,728	<,001	,580	,612

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

Table 4.20. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.1

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCT	ENG	,447	,199	,198	137,542	<,001

To test hypothesis 3.2, relational crafting as the second facet of job crafting and its contribution to engagement were evaluated via simple regression analysis.

Relational crafting was positively related ($F_{1, 552} = 66,557$, $p < .001$) and engagement explains only 10,6% (The $R^2 = ,106$) of the total variance in relational crafting with ,265 to ,433 Confidence Interval 95%.

And one unit of increase in relational crafting could increase ,349 times for engagement.

Therefore, hypothesis 3.2 was accepted.

Table 4.21. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,852	,182		15,682	<,001	2,495	3,210
RelationalCrafting	,349	,043	,328	8,158	<,001	,265	,433

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

Table 4.22. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.2

Independent	Dependent	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	P
JCR	ENG	,328	,108	,106	66,557	<,001

To test hypothesis 3.3, the simple regression analysis was tested to evaluate cognitive crafting and engagement relationships. The influence of cognitive crafting on engagement was positive and found significant ($F_{1, 552} = 178,388$, $p < .001$) with The R^2 was ,244 that explained 24,4% of the variance in engagement.

The increase of one unit at cognitive crafting influenced ,462 to engagement according to the results at ,394 to ,530 Confidence Interval at 95%.

Therefore, hypothesis 3.3 was accepted.

Table 4.23. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 3.3

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,326	,152		15,321	<,001	2,028	2,624
CognitiveCrafting	,462	,035	,494	13,356	<,001	,394	,530

a. Dependent Variable: Engagement

Table 4.24. Model Summary of Hypothesis 3.3

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCC	ENG	,494	,244	,243	178,388	<,001

To test hypothesis 4.1, the simple regression analysis was used to explain the relationship between task crafting and commitment. One unit of increase at Task Crafting will yield ,592 units of increase in commitment in 15,4 % of the total variance could be explained in Commitment ($F_{1, 552} = 101,338$, $p = <.001$) and significant statistically. Confidence intervals depicted 95% certainty to slope predict commitment from Task Crafting between ,477 to ,708.

Therefore, hypothesis 4.1 was accepted.

Table 4.25. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.1

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	1,541	,253		6,098	<,001	1,044	2,037
TaskCrafting	,592	,059	,394	10,067	<,001	,477	,708

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment

Table 4.26. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.1

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCT	COM	,394	,155	,154	101,338	<,001

To test hypothesis 4.2, relational crafting and commitment relationship was analyzed via simple regression test.

Relational Crafting was positively related ($F_{1, 552} = 75,870$, $p = <.001$) to commitment. Although commitment can be explained only 12,1% (The $R^2 = ,121$) of the total variance in relational crafting with ,367 to ,581 Confidence Interval 95%, and one unit of increase in relational crafting will result in ,474 times rise at commitment.

Therefore, hypothesis 4.2 was accepted.

Table 4.27. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,067	,231		8,932	<,001	1,613	2,522
RelationalCrafting	,474	,054	,348	8,710	<,001	,367	,581

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment

Table 4.28. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.2

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCR	COM	,348	,121	,119	75,870	<,001

To test hypothesis 4.3, cognitive crafting and commitment relationship was tested by simple regression analysis. The influence of cognitive crafting on commitment was positive and found significantly ($F_{1, 552} = 161,583$, $p = <.001$) where The R^2 was ,226 that explained 22,6% of the variance in Commitment.

One unit of increase at independent variable, cognitive crafting will influence ,462 to commitment at ,482 to ,659 at 95% Confidence Interval.

Therefore, hypothesis 4.3 was accepted.

Table 4.29. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 4.3

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	1,599	,197		8,118	<,001	1,212	1,985
CognitiveCrafting	,570	,045	,476	12,712	<,001	,482	,659

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment

Table 4.30. Model Summary of Hypothesis 4.3

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCC	COM	,476	,226	,225	161,583	<,001

To test hypothesis 5.1, the relationship between task Crafting and satisfaction was conducted by simple regression analyses. At the analysis, one unit of increase of task crafting will lead ,389 unit of increase in satisfaction. Only 7,2 % of the total variance can be explained in satisfaction and regression was significant statistically (F 1, 552 =42,643, p= <.001). Confidence intervals depicted 95% certainty to slope predict commitment from task crafting between ,477 to ,708.

Therefore, hypothesis 5.1 was accepted.

Table 4.31. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.1

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	1,797	,256		7,026	<,001	1,295	2,300
TaskCrafting	,389	,060	,268	6,530	<,001	,272	,506

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 4.32. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.1

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCT	SAT	,268	,072	,070	42,643	<,001

To test hypothesis 5.2, relational crafting and satisfaction relationship was evaluated via simple regression analysis. Relational crafting was positive and indicated regression ($F_{1, 552} = 22,008$, $p = <.001$) and satisfaction was explained only 3,8% (The $R^2 = ,038$) of the total variance by relational crafting with ,150 to ,366 at 95% Confidence Interval where one unit of increase at independent variable, relational crafting can increase ,258 times units for satisfaction.

Therefore, hypothesis 5.2 was accepted.

Table 4.33. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.2

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	2,366	,234		10,121	<,001	1,295	2,826
RelationalCrafting	,258	,055	,196	4,691	<,001	,150	,366

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 4.34. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.2

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCR	SAT	,196	,038	,037	22,008	<,001

To test 5.3, The last hypothesis, about the relationship between cognitive crafting and satisfaction was conducted via the simple regression analysis. The contribution of cognitive crafting on satisfaction was positive and found significantly (F 1, 552 =106,296, p= <.001) where cognitive crafting explained 16,1% of the variance in satisfaction (The R² was ,226). One unit of increase at cognitive crafting will yield, ,465 to satisfaction level at ,377 to ,554 at 95% Confidence Interval.

Therefore, hypothesis 5.3 was accepted.

Table 4.35. Simple Regression Analysis of Hypothesis 5.3

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	Sig.	95,0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	1,446	,198		7,303	<,001	1,057	1,835
CognitiveCrafting	,465	,045	,402	10,310	<,001	,377	,554

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 4.36. Model Summary of Hypothesis 5.3

Independent	Dependent	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	P
JCC	SAT	,402	,161	,160	106,296	<,001

It was stated two regression analyses indicated positive relationship between psychological safety and engagement ($\beta=.355$ $p=, <.000$), and task crafting ($\beta=.493$ $p=, <.000$). To test hypothesis 6.1, the third analysis was measured as a multiple regression model for determining the mediating role of task crafting between psychological safety and engagement. In other words, both task crafting and psychological safety were defined as independent variables to measure their effect on engagement. The analysis indicated positive results, and task crafting had significant contribution on engagement ($\beta=.359$ $p=, <.000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the engagement. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.37. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.1

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,386	Sobel test:	5,939	0.028	0
b. ,421	Aroian test:	5,925	0.028	0
S _a 0.037	Goodman test:	5,952	0.028	0
S _b 0.040				

Table 4.38. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.1

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1 Analysis	,355	,126	76,767			
PsychologicalSafety				,355	8,931	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Engagement						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,493	,243	1777,120			
PsychologicalSafety				,493	13,309	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: TaskCrafting						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3 Analysis	,473	,224	79,349			
PsychologicalSafety				,179	4,140	<,001
Task Crafting				,359	8,312	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Engagement						

Psychological safety and engagement relationships were found in positive and regression ($\beta=.355$ $p=, <000$), as well as psychological safety had positive contribution on relational crafting ($\beta=.333$ $p=, <000$). To test hypothesis 6.2, the final test was conducted as multiple regression model for determining the mediating role of relational crafting between psychological safety and engagement as both independent variables and their impact on

the engagement were evaluated. The result indicated positive results, and relational crafting had significant contribution on engagement ($\beta=.236$ $p=, <000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the engagement. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.39. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.2

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,288	Sobel test:	4,688	0.015	0
b. ,251	Aroian test:	4,664	0.015	0
S _a 0.035	Goodman test:	4,711	0.015	0
S _b 0.044				

So, hypothesis 6.2 was accepted.

Table 4.40. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.2

		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1	Analysis	,355	,126	76,767			
	PsychologicalSafety				,355	8,931	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Engagement							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2	Analysis	,333	,111	69,058			
	PsychologicalSafety				,333	8,310	<,001
b. Dependent Variable: RelationalCrafting							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3	Analysis	,419	,173	58,706			
	PsychologicalSafety				,277	6,745	<,001
	Relational Crafting				,236	5,746	<,001
a.Dependent Variable: Engagement							

To test hypothesis 6.3, the third last hypothesis on psychological safety and engagement, it was needed to repeat the regression analyses results as psychological safety was positively related and significant contribution on engagement ($\beta=.355$ $p=, <000$), and cognitive crafting ($\beta=.422$ $p=, <000$). Both psychological safety and cognitive crafting were defined as independent variables in the multiple regression to evaluate their impact on engagement. It was analyzed that resulted in significant contribution on engagement ($\beta=.419$ $p=, <000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the engagement. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.41. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.3

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,414	Sobel test:	7,490	0.021	0
b. ,392	Aroian test:	7,474	0.021	0
S _a 0.038	Goodman test:	7,507	0.021	0
S _b 0.038				

So, hypothesis 6.3 was accepted.

Table 4.42. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.3

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1 Analysis	,355	,126	76,767			
PsychologicalSafety				,355	8,931	<,001
b. Dependent Variable: Engagement						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,422	,178	119,615			
PsychologicalSafety				,422	10,937	<,001
c. Dependent Variable: CognitiveCrafting						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P

3	Analysis	,520	,270	102,128		
	PsychologicalSafety		,179	4,449	<,001	
	CognitiveCrafting		,419	10,435	<,001	
a.Dependent Variable: Engagement						

The relationship between psychological safety and commitment indicated positive relationship on commitment ($\beta=.362$ $p=, <.000$), and psychological safety and task crafting relationship ($\beta=.493$ $p=, <.000$). To test hypothesis 6.4, the third analyze was conducted to measure the mediator variable where both psychological safety and task crafting were defined as independent variables in the multiple regression to evaluate their impact on commitment was analyzed that was resulted in significant contribution on commitment ($\beta=.284$ $p=, <.000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the engagement And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.43. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.4

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,386	Sobel test:	5,939	0.028	0
b. ,438	Aroian test:	5,925	0.028	0
S _a 0.029	Goodman test:	5,925	0.028	0
S _b 0.066				

So, hypothesis 6.4 was accepted.

Table 4.44. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.4

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1 Analysis	,362	,131	83,307			
PsychologicalSafety				,362	9,127	<,001
c. Dependent Variable: Commitment						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,493	,243	177,120			
PsychologicalSafety				,493	13,309	<,001
d. Dependent Variable: TaskCrafting						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3 Analysis	,439	,192	65,631			
PsychologicalSafety				,222	5,043	<,001
TaskCrafting				,284	6,465	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Commitment						

The regression between psychological safety and commitment ($\beta=.362$ $p=$, <000), and psychological safety and relational crafting regression was found positively ($\beta=.333$ $p=$, <000). To test hypothesis 6.5, the third analysis was conducted to measure the mediator variable where both psychological safety and relational crafting were defined as independent variable in the multiple regression to evaluate their impact on commitment was analyzed that resulted in significant contribution on commitment ($\beta=.225$ $p=$, <000) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the commitment. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than <.05.

Table 4.45. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.5

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,288	Sobel test:	4,959	0.020	0
b. ,348	Aroian test:	4,935	0.020	0
S _a 0.035	Goodman test:	4,982	0.020	0
S _b 0.056				

So, hypothesis 6.5 was accepted.

Table 4.46. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.5

		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1	Analysis	,362	,131	83,307			
	PsychologicalSafety				,362	9,127	<,001
d. Dependent Variable: Commitment							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2	Analysis	,333	,111	69,058			
	PsychologicalSafety				,333	8,310	<,001
e. Dependent Variable: RelationalCrafting							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3	Analysis	,435	,189	61,671			
	PsychologicalSafety				,277	6,807	<,001
	RelationalCrafting				,255	6,272	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Commitment							

The last hypothesis on commitment was tested via psychological safety and was found positively on commitment ($\beta=.362$ $p=, <000$), and psychological safety and cognitive crafting relationship ($\beta=.422$ $p=, <000$). To test hypothesis 6.6, the mediator analysis was conducted to measure by psychological safety and cognitive crafting were defined as

independent variable to evaluate their impact on commitment was analyzed that resulted in significant contribution on commitment ($\beta=.393$ $p=, <000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the commitment. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.47. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.6

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,414	Sobel test:	7,207	0.027	0
b. ,471	Aroian test:	7,190	0.027	0
S _a 0.038	Goodman test:	7,225	0.026	0
S _b 0.054				

Table 4.48. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.6

		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1	Analysis	,362	,131	83,307			
	PsychologicalSafety				,362	9,127	<,001
e. Dependent Variable: Commitment							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2	Analysis	,422	,179	119,615			
	PsychologicalSafety				,422	10,937	<,001
f. Dependent Variable: CognitiveCrafting							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3	Analysis	,508	,258	95,840			
	PsychologicalSafety				,196	6,807	<,001
	CognitiveCrafting				,393	6,272	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Commitment							

The relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction ($\beta=.356$ $p=, <000$), and psychological safety and task crafting was found positively ($\beta=.422$ $p=, <000$). To test hypothesis 6.7, the third analyze was conducted to measure the mediator variable where both psychological safety and task crafting were defined as independent variables in the multiple regression to evaluate their impact on satisfaction was analyzed that was resulted in significant contribution on satisfaction ($\beta=.122$ $p=, <000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on the satisfaction. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.49. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.7

Input	Test statistic	Std. Error	p-value
a. ,405	Sobel test:	2,600	0.027
b. ,177	Aroian test:	2,590	0.027
S _a 0.038	Goodman test:	2,611	0.026
S _b 0.066			

Table 4.50. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.7

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1 Analysis	,356	,127	80,275			
PsychologicalSafety				,356	8,960	<,001
f. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,422	,179	119,615			
PsychologicalSafety				,422	10,937	<,001
g. Dependent Variable: TaskCrafting						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3 Analysis	,372	,138	44,174			

PsychologicalSafety	,296	6,519	<,001
TaskCrafting	,122	2,679	<,001

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

The relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction ($\beta=.356$ $p=, <.000$), and psychological safety and relational crafting was found positively ($\beta=.333$ $p=, <.000$). To test hypothesis 6.8, the multiple regression was tested to identify the mediator variable where both psychological safety and relational crafting were defined as independent variables to illuminate their impact on satisfaction, that resulted in significant contribution on satisfaction ($\beta=.087$ $p=, <.000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on satisfaction. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.51. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.8

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,288	Sobel test:	2,009	0.016	0
b. ,114	Aroian test:	1,996	0.016	0
S _a 0.035	Goodman test:	2,024	0.016	0
S _b 0.055				

Table 4.52. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.8

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
1 Analysis	,356	,127	80,275			
PsychologicalSafety				,356	8,960	<,001
g. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,333	,111	69,058			

PsychologicalSafety				,333	8,310	<,001	
h. Dependent Variable: RelationalCrafting							
		R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3	Analysis	,366	,134	42,494			
	PsychologicalSafety				,327	7,785	<,001
	RelationalCrafting				,087	2,059	<,001
a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction							

The relationship between psychological safety and satisfaction ($\beta=.356$ $p=, <000$), and psychological safety and cognitive crafting regression result was ($\beta=.422$ $p=, <000$). To test hypothesis 6.9, the multiple regression was tested to identify the mediator variable where both psychological safety and cognitive crafting were defined as independent variables to illuminate their impact on satisfaction, that resulted in significant contribution on satisfaction ($\beta=.306$ $p=, <000$) as partial mediation variable due to the existence of contribution on psychological safety on satisfaction. And Sobel test was conducted for significance of the indirect effects that resulted in significant as p value is less than $<.05$.

Table 4.53. Sobel Test of Hypothesis 6.9

Input	Test statistic		Std. Error	p-value
a. ,405	Sobel test:	5,633	0.025	0
b. ,354	Aroian test:	5,612	0.025	0
S _a 0.045	Goodman test:	5,655	0.025	0
S _b 0.049				

Table 4.54. Mediation Analysis of Hypothesis 6.9

		R	R^2	F	Beta	T	Sig
1	Analysis	,356	,127	80,275			
	PsychologicalSafety				,356	8,960	<,001
h. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction							

	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	Sig
2 Analysis	,422	,178	119,615			
PsychologicalSafety				,422	10,937	<,001
a.Dependent Variable: CognitiveCrafting						
	R	R ²	F	Beta	T	P
3 Analysis	,452	,204	70,561			
PsychologicalSafety				,227	5,419	<,001
CognitiveCrafting				,306	7,297	<,001
a.Dependent Variable: Satisfaction						

4.5. The Summary of Findings

Table 4.55. Summary of Regression Findings

Hypotheses	Findings	Beta	P
H.1.1	Psychological safety is related positively to engagement	,355	<,001
H.1.2	Psychological safety is related positively to commitment	,362	<,001
H.1.3	Psychological safety is related positively to satisfaction	,356	<,001
H.2.1	Psychological safety is related positively to task crafting	,493	<,001
H.2.2	Psychological safety is related positively to relational crafting	,333	<,001
H.2.3	Psychological safety is related positively to cognitive crafting	,422	<,001
H.3.1	Task crafting is related positively to engagement	,447	<,001

H.3.2	Relational crafting is related positively to engagement	,328	<,001
H.3.3	Cognitive crafting is related positively to engagement	,494	<,001
H.4.1	Task crafting is related positively to commitment	,394	<,001
H.4.2	Relational crafting is related positively to commitment	,348	<,001
H.4.3	Cognitive crafting is related positively to commitment	,476	<,001
H.5.1	Task crafting is related positively to satisfaction	,268	<,001
H.5.2	Relational crafting is related positively to satisfaction	,196	<,001
H.5.3	Cognitive crafting is related positively to satisfaction	,402	<,001

Table 4.56. Summary of Mediation Analyses Findings

Hypotheses	Findings
H.6.1	Task crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and engagement
H.6.2	Relational crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and engagement
H.6.3	Cognitive crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and engagement
H.6.4	Task crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and commitment
H.6.5	Relational crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and commitment
H.6.6	Cognitive crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and commitment
H.6.7	Task crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and satisfaction

- H.6.8 Relational crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and satisfaction
- H.6.9 Cognitive crafting partially mediates between psychological safety and satisfaction
-



CONCLUSION

The seeking for Schein and Bennis (1965)'s equilibrium points which was seeded Kurt Lewin was become sapling by Kahn (1990) and designated as a theory at the last decade mostly through Edmondson's contribution to the literature as well as her pioneer role for psychological safety.

On the other hand, the stem point of Kahn' (1990) imprint to the theory, lies behind at defining psychological safety; without any fear or protecting preferred self for exhibition of feeling, acting and voicing as an antecedent for engagement, commitment and satisfaction for the employees. In other words, the sapling flourished through specific engagement and disengagement relationship and its impact and although psychological safety has become a mature theory and numbers of studies exist in the literature about them, there are still studies that are needed for enhancing psychological safety with its rudiment relations. Employee experience at workplace is the key determinator for growing by fearless attitudes to yield psychological safety with edges in engagement (Edmondson & Brandsy,2023). Although engagement definitions vary in literature, need-satisfaction engagement approach dominated the psychological safety relationship (Schaufeli, 2013). And employee perception for the role depends upon safety and fearless role of the employees for their role at the workplace was conducted and figured out psychological safety is significantly related to engagement in stating employee perception for the role depend upon safety and fearless role of the employees for their role at the workplace (May et al., 2014). Burn-out is used as antonyms of engagement and at different levels of analyses but feelings for fear to express contributes to disengagement in the place of lack of psychological safety environment (Culler et al.,2018; Swendiman et al., 2019; Osei et al.,2022). At the satisfaction and engagement approach, engagement is significant and positive relation to work engagement as an outcome of organizational work place safety as a result of employee feeling for sensing no-fear for expression of themselves as well as risking their self-image (Fraizer et al.2017) .As the last sects for engagement, multidimensional approach, the individual level of engagement through

psychological safety that exist and positively related to engagement upon coworkers, managers and environment social support for positive outcome orientation of the results of the mistakes (Saks,2006). Therefore, in line with the studies mentioned, this research yielded the similar results as psychological safety contributes significantly and positively to engagement ($\beta = .355, p < .001$).

Commitment also has different approaches to be defined as it was stated above. Belief, calculation and obligation are the sects of commitment where again, Kahn (1990) is the first theory constructor upon the relationship between psychological safety and commitment. This relationship was figured out significant effect of psychological safety to commitment where the scale for their measurement is designed for belief and obligation perspectives of the employees and safety as voice and supportive behavior of managerial relationship (De Clercq & Ruis,2007). And psychological safety is significantly and positively related to commitment where belief and normative commitment were evaluated to identify the commitment and engagement difference in their studies as well as to goals and values were added to the belief system (Rather et al.,2009 & Chen et al.,2014). In order to measure commitment, in multi-structural level psychological safety, is the predictor for it as well as align with climate that is created via psychological safety in the workplaces. In other words, at each commitment typologies were affected by the level of psychological safety and the climate was the result of it that influenced the typology of the workplace in the belief of the employees (Wolowska ,2014). As it was mentioned engagement, Fraizer et al. (2017) also, depicted psychological safety at individual level analysis and found positive prediction for commitment at satisfaction-engagement perspective. And, in an effective commitment perspective, at group psychological safety level revealed the belief of the employees for commitment and their desire to work for the company relationship with psychological safety increase (Kirk-Brown & Van Dijk, 2016). At affective commitment in multilevel unit of analysis, commitment indicated significantly positive regression (Li et al, 2022). Hence, the existing literature conceptualization difference for commitment was research in each perception of commitment and its relationship with psychological safety at the literature. Namely, the conditions for creating commitment were advocated by psychological safety as well as it has been affected by safety and its environment at different levels of analyses.

In the employee side bet evaluation that resulted in the belief and values of shared by individual, group and community construct, or basic gain or lost evaluation for commitment to decide stay or leave decision in the evaluation of external and internal factors within calculation of certainty and uncertainty resulted in the leave decision through the need perspective, and obligations were the determinator for the commitment side yet multi-structural commitment also this study as the mentioned studies, yielded significantly positive relationship ($\beta=.362$, $p<.001$).

The last facet of happiness at work; satisfaction was one of the last concepts that was evaluated in literature, where, with limited theoretical debate, psychological safety and satisfaction indicated positive relationship (Detert & Burris, 2007) and in the development of the satisfaction concept, also studies indicated similar and significant results (O'Neill & Arendt, 2008; Detert & Edmondson, 2011). Also, satisfaction was analyzed as an outcome for psychological safety in their research that was significant relationship at individual level as well as group level (Fraizer et al., 2017). As the mediator role of psychological safety between and its direct relation to satisfaction was significantly high at the group level analysis, and lower stress level due to the experience of without fear and blame for increase satisfaction level and psychological safety had an impact for decreasing stress and anxiety for making mistakes and lead to a path for the employees for their career development in the place of taking personal risks and decreasing threats for self-esteem led a space for satisfaction for the employees (Kim & Kim, 2019). Another role of mediation analyses between psychological safety and satisfaction indicated significantly positive relationship at direct effect which was evaluated as creativity, encouragement, friendship within fearless of adaptivity and its result of increase of safety contributed to satisfaction level of the employees in general workplace happiness. To put it differently, the overall working conditions were created by the feelings of the employees as well as feeling created the atmosphere, so increase in the satisfaction was the result of cooperation, friendship and solidarity. There was the result of fearless communication that ended in easily adaptation to the changes and trust between the individuals increase due to the existence of psychological safety and if psychological safety increase in the workplace, then satisfaction level both at the individual level and group level were positively contributed. As was supported by

previous research, the results depicted positive contribution of psychological safety to satisfaction ($\beta=.356$, $p<.001$).

The relationship between psychological safety and job crafting is evaluated and found out positively from JDR perspective. To put it another way, most of the research focused on job crafting only, without the facets of JIT, demand and resource modelling which are positively affected by psychological safety (Plomp et al, 2019; Chinellato et al, 2022). The core of the relationship lied upon job resource influence which was shared as a positive contribution by taking risks and initiatives for job crafting activities as well as taking new roles and responsibilities for challenges. The new challenges and responsibility were pointed out as an antecedent for decreasing the hindering job demand with the assertion that psychological safety also promotes creativity and involvement as well as increase in the effort for the job itself and increase the job demand resource. Additionally, from JIT perspective, with the job crafting measurement without the sub-dimensions of it, psychological safety revealed positively and significantly to job crafting in Slemp and Vella-Brodrick's (2013) scale. It was stated that in the condition of safety without risk taking and challenges for the new responsibilities, tasks and altering duties, the result of feeling of support from the peers and management, feeling and belief of fearless in the behaviors and new methods of execution of the duties yield job crafting behaviors in the forms of relational, cognitive and task crafting.

The facets of job crafting are essential in the job crafting studies for which JIT perspective is used, since cognitive crafting is one of the determinator for the difference in the perspectives and the belief in cognition for crafting is one of the influences for altering behavior. So, in order to evaluate both similarities and differences in the crafting facets, measurement in the facet is required to understand the impact of psychological safety on the crafting typology. In other explanation, job crafting activities have in the same root for the contribution of psychological safety and but the relationship among the colleagues and managerial level are influence as well as alters' perception and belief of the job itself or the obligations are conducted according to the behavior of the alters and the task itself is crafted. So, dimensional analysis helps to depict the whole picture of job crafting process. Therefore, as in this research, it was found, psychological safety positively was

related to task crafting ($\beta=.493$, $p<.001$), relational crafting ($\beta=.333$, $p<.001$), and cognitive crafting ($\beta=.422$, $p<.001$).

JDR perspective dominated the field of study at job crafting and engagement relationship in job demand perspectives mainly. In description of altering the work and attitudes to the job itself in sense of demand and resource also cause an increase at engagement as a result of positive behavior changes of the employees (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Demerouti, 2014; Bakker et al.2016; Rudolf et al.2017; Bakker & Oerlemans, 2019). On the other hand, from JIT point of view in the facets of job crafting and engagement relationship; task crafting were positively and significantly predicts the work engagement (Hu et al.,2017), relational crafting and engagement relationship was evaluated as again to indicated altering the relationship at the workplace as a result of interaction, sharing time and communication had positive impact on the engagement (Rofcanin et al., 2019). Cognitive crafting had positive relationship on engagement was figured out in a result of self-altering the perception of the job (Blind,2019; Bounocore et al.2020; Hu et al.2020) and as the other facets of crafting prediction on engagement, cognitive crafting was revealed its importance in the relationship with engagement as it was found in this research : task crafting ($\beta=.447$, $p<.001$), relational crafting ($\beta=.328$, $p<.001$), and cognitive crafting ($\beta=.494$, $p<.001$).

Ghilutescu (2007) through the lens of JIT, stated altering job crafting had impact and predict commitment where cognitive crafting and task crafting was valid with the claim of creating a meaningful altering and decision-making process lead a positive perception for commitment. At JDR perspective, studies also indicated, positively significant contribution of job crafting process as job resource to commitment in the literature with job resource modelling, the identity and effect on the job altering process lead positive impact on identification as well as affective commitment (Bakker et al. 2003a; Bakker et al, 2003b; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Chen et al, 2016; Wang et al., 2018). Also, affective commitment was found significant and was influenced by job crafting process through JIT in the three facets of crafting; task, relational and cognitive crafting had positive relationship with commitment where cognitive crafting had the highest among the other facets (Romeo et al, 2018). Similar results as the existing literature were figured out in

this research, as task crafting ($\beta=.394, p<.001$), relational crafting ($\beta=.348, p<.001$), and cognitive crafting ($\beta=.476, p<.001$).

As was mentioned above, existing literature, both JDR and JIT points of view exist about the relationship between job crafting and commitment studies. The key studies from JDR Tims et al. (2013) and Slemp and Vella-Brodrick (2013) from JIT indicated positive relationship between satisfaction and job crafting where JDR focus on the job resource lead to increase in the satisfaction level and need satisfaction was resulted in job crafting facets of JIT where crafting facets indicating different results, whereas the results of this study, task crafting ($\beta=.268, p<.001$), relational crafting ($\beta=.196, p<.001$), and cognitive crafting ($\beta=.402, p<.001$) revealed positive relationship to satisfaction at all level of the facets of crafting.

Through JIT lens to evaluate the relationship between psychological safety and facets of workplace happiness as engagement, commitment and satisfaction was investigated in this study within in the claim of Wresniewski and Dutton (2001) basic needs and meaningfulness were replaced as psychological safety and workplace happiness in the mediation of job crafting facets; task, relational and cognitive sides of them. Petrov et al. (2023), figured out – from JDR perspective-at Romanian employees to predict engagement, crafting and psychological safety relationship that yielded mediation role of engagement between safety and job crafting with the claim of increase job resources as a result of demand increase the challenges as well as affect the perception of the employees for engage to the work and stated psychological safety as an antecedent for job source relationship; psychological safety contributes to effort as well as resource in the result of engagement and satisfaction. In this study, it was found that job crafting from JIT, task, relational and cognitive facets were partially mediated between psychological safety and engagement, commitment and satisfaction in their interactions. In other words, psychological safety with the facets of crafting was positively related to engagement, satisfaction and commitment as workplace happiness factors.

Also, the study indicated psychological safety in the meaning of fearless of making mistake and taking risk for being sure that it will not be used against the actor in protecting self-esteem, the effort of the member would be valuable for creativity and ensuring the

utilization of the self-determination in a freedom of speech as well as expression created an atmosphere for enhancing job crafting processes that had the facets as altering the tasks, introducing new ideas and promoting them in the space for creativity and altering the job references as task crafting, yielding the impact of the job and its meaningfulness in living perspective as cognitive crafting and altering the communication with the other members of the organization as relational crafting were positively related with the feeling of belonging and attachment to the organization, enthusiasm and dedication to the job itself as engagement as well as satisfaction of the core structure of the job with its payment as well as promotion opportunities.

Results indicated psychological safety are positively related to engagement, commitment and satisfaction, which are the pillars of happiness at work. The study illuminates psychological safety in the place of fearless employees in the self-determination has positive relationship at engagement, commitment and satisfaction process in considering external regulations to avoid any esteem danger and sustain self-determination in OIT to get integration with the environment that surrounds the agents as well as avoidance of negative effects and intrinsic to protect the self-identity COP and regulations role for integration the self-identity to the organization as OIT compose BPNT (Ryan et al., 2022) which is related to psychological safety theory in the manner of psychological safety has the impact over intrinsic motivations and internalization of external values as well as motivation in different personality to act without any fear to gain engagement, commitment and satisfaction process in the form of happiness at work. The psychological safety within self-determination aim creates opportunities for the agents to be happy at the workplace. In the risk of self-identity and self-esteem, the boundaries are weakened with the organization and effort to the work as well as the meaning of it.

Moreover, the study revealed psychological safety is positively related to job crafting and specifically JIT at all facets of crafting as cognitive, relational and task crafting and contribute to literature. As it was shared about, most of the job crafting studies are dominated by JDR perspective in which cognitive side of crafting is neglected and but Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) model in JIT propose not only cognitive crafting but also job crafting as a process and having an identity rather than a situation-based decision

or taking role and responsibility. This study indicates similar findings according to JIT which proposes identification through basic needs satisfaction in the condition of psychological safety environments since Kahn (1990) with few research in job crafting as well as all facets of crafting. Cognitive crafting, on the other hand, have the key role for the difference between JIT and JDR and this study from the lens of JIT, contributes to cognitive crafting and psychological safety relationship where deeper meaning at work is flourished on the feeling of safety as well as self-determination and the basic needs are added to the literature where few studies exist in scrutinization of this relationship.

The other contribution of this study, also from JIT and happiness at work relationship where job crafting is positively relationship to engagement, commitment and satisfaction level. Again, it was shared above, JDR has the dominance on this broad subject, even the studies from JIT are conducted mostly in particular facets of crafting as well as happiness in the organization studies (Rudolph et al. 2017; Frederick & VanderWeele, 2020) despite some aims for reconciliation of cognitive crafting as the antecedent of happiness, cognitive facet of crafting is indicated the highest results among the other facets of crafting in the relationship with the happiness at work. In other words, cognitive crafting is the litmus test to differentiate JIT and JDR; and this study uncovers this test in focusing of cognitive crafting to indicate the importance of identification. On the other hand, satisfaction results of this study need to be focused on evaluating the components of satisfaction when it is considered that wage is one of the critical parts of satisfaction level measurement and satisfaction relationship with job crafting is indicating relatively low relationship among the facets of happiness measurement.

As Wresniewski and Dutton (2001) asserts basic needs are replaced by psychological safety and meaningfulness is replaced by workplace happiness figures out the role of job crafting as mediate between those variables. In other words, literature and a few studies indicate all facets of crafting with happiness studies but including psychological safety as the antecedent in this relationship as the mediator role of job crafting add the importance of self-determination theory as well as its requirements of the fearless environment as well as self-realization in self-esteem are explored.

The study results indicate important implications for the management of the companies specifically, the call center firms where the strict control of the employees is conducted in the hands of technology as well as supervisor, quality control teams, random listening instrument and standardized scripts which are pre-determined and assigned for the agents to sustain during the calls which are considered as “bête noire” as it was mentioned above for the academicians to investigate also be implies or commented the difficulty for the managers at call center firm. The core reason lies behind this difficulty rise from the strict control mechanism amongst expectancy for both the observer roles which is in actuality only 15% of the calls are conducted in the same with the written documents (Rafaeli et al., 2008) where need-satisfaction has become the major agent for agents ‘role in the calls. The dilemma of the control mechanism and the need - satisfaction in self-determination is related to unhappiness in the workplace in the form of disengagement, turnover and dissatisfaction among the members in the place of unsafety in defining the role and identity of the agents. So, it is important for the managers to comprehend this dichotomy in the means of while agents feel and identify their role in the job during the altering process, the mechanism of control implies the restriction or being the same as it is written rules. On condition of safety as well as fearless environment, this feeling and identity attributed by the agents in the form of psychological safety. Agents in the identity process of crafting feel the situation of confidence to the company as well as managers to evaluate the safety environment which is called intrapsychic (Edmonson et al., 2004) of determination by the call center agents which in the first phase, as misinterpretation and misjudgment, the first glance, it can be asserted as detecting is hard but in reality exploration is easy to evaluate through understanding if a mistake occurs when and how the mistake is shared among themselves with other groups or with the management, without any doubt in self-protection or self-image concern about the mistakes among the group in open manner to voice about the issue as well as open to discuss even a mistake or an idea, a creativity or any challenge to the status quo in the aim of development of the existing processes, and interaction among the membership of the group as well other groups information, knowledge and experience sharing in the common level of shared belief among the colleagues as well as the management categories to trust each other’s, without taking a risk for any danger for the self-image, self-career or being discriminated

among the group and company belief in the interaction are the essence of the clues for existing psychological safety environment. As above, it was underlined as Edmondson's (1996) discovery ended with scale for measurement of psychological safety is the most used scale for measuring of psychological safety (Edmondson and Lei 2014; Newman et al. 2017; Frazier et al. 2017) help for the managers to evaluate psychological safety level of the employees as well as make intrapsychic definition to extra-psychic form to reveal the indications of fearless working conditions. The scale compromises the conditions for psychological safety as a guide for the managers; to avoid any discrimination as well as among the teams to have rejections due to the individual differences and create an atmosphere for the respecting differences let flourishing safety spaces for each team members. And also, skill valuation, utilization and effort are the key factors for the employees to create new ideas as well as respecting and recognition of them not only for the managers but also at the team and organizational level are crucial for sustaining the space for need-satisfaction as well as self-determination of the agents in fearless of making mistakes or punishment. Those understandings are crucial for the managers to obtain job crafting, commitment, satisfaction and engagement in the workplace, which are positively related to psychological safety as the study results indicated.

Engagement is one of the pillars of happiness as improving shared trust and belief for involvement in the workplace. As it was stated above, the current study yielded the same results as Kahn's (1990) analogy for adding spirit as engagement is related to psychological safety which is linked to need-satisfaction, avoidance for burn-out as disengagement protection for the employees; psychological safety is an antecedent for engagement process to yield emotional ties to the company as well as taken jobs in the company as active role and behavioral demonstration in enthusiasm and passion for taking responsibilities and ideas in the company which are heated by it. The managers, to create space for new idea development as well as business development perspective, should sustain a psychological safety environment for having an engagement process like productivity and dynamics with motivation to sustain the role they are assigned. Managers should care for the needs-satisfaction to perform agent call to contribute both for themselves as well as the company. And also, for continuing relations, the turn-cover ratio and follow-up of the rules have an impact on the commitment which should be monitored

by the managers. In other words, like engagement but in the long run term, commitment is influenced by shared belief also (Chen et al, 2014) where psychological safety had positive relations with commitment as well as the result of this study. In this context, if managers desire to decrease the turnover ratio and increase the emotional strength of the employees as well as dedication and belonging to the organization of the agents, they need to establish or sustain a psychological safety environment where fearless speaking, sharing ideas and thought exists among individuals, teams as well as organizational level. Fearless thinking, acting and relationship building have positive relationships with agents' commitment as well as expand commitment among the employees in the company. Managers should emphasize the importance of sustaining the commitment level for giving importance of self-determination in the meaning of self-expression in the organization. In other words, voice and self-expression are components of the psychological safety level for the agents and their relationships in the shared target and values.

The study highlights the importance of self-expression and lower anxiety levels in withstanding employee satisfaction, with psychological safety playing a key role in fostering these conditions. In other words, psychological safety is positively linked to employee satisfaction, which is influenced by factors such as promotion opportunities, salary, and job nature. Even the salary and promotion are important components in the satisfaction level are influenced by psychological safety. If it is re-written, it can be asserted that on condition of lack of psychological safety, the essential or material aspects of satisfaction can be challenged by the employees. So, managers should sustain firstly psychological safety in the manner of self-determination to create or sustain satisfaction level among the whole unit of organizations.

As in the previous paragraphs, self-determination and self-expression are the key elements for both psychological safety and happiness at work. This self-expression has the form for meditating between those variables as job crafting. Mkhwanazi and Dhanpat (2023) assert the importance of job crafting in sustaining engagement process where the call center operations are expected as high standardized and high managerial control and this study revealed the mediation role of job crafting, as task, cognitive and relational,

between psychological safety and happiness at work. To put it differently, job crafting in the forms of cognitive crafting, task crafting and relational crafting are the altering ways of self-expression and determination (O'Neill & Arendt, 2008) where JIT posits the importance of three facets and cognitive crafting as a key factor in the identification process which are flourished in the psychological safety environment and increase the level of happiness at work. On condition that managers seek this increase, the availability of crafting and promotion of crafting is needed to be accumulated to the agents to create the identification by the managers. This study indicates the encouragement of altering processes which are supported by psychological safety and exist in the essence of the agents even if they are under strict control. Any threat to this altering process can cause harm not only the job crafting but also to the psychological safety level and its relationship between the facets of happiness at work: engagement, commitment and satisfaction among the employees. The current study mentions the types of altering process either in cognitive form as in the mind of the agents to alter their jobs, the way of doing job -calls- and their relationship with the other side of the call as well as the colleagues and the company. In cognitive crafting, belief is important in the altering process, the way the agent considers himself and the job in the mind during the altering process need to be scrutinized to create happiness at workplace. The attribution of cognitive crafting is not only for the job itself but also for the higher and ultimate goals such as the society as well as the company with a crucial target in personal life should be understood by the managers. Even in cognitive side and reflect to the job itself lead to general happiness for the crafters, so the managers need to open space and give opportunities to alter and develop cognitive crafting for the agents if the managers seek success for the company. In the other facet of crafting, the study indicates that managers should support the agents' task crafting in developing new ideas and attitudes for the task and changes either minor or major without any measurement and giving spaces for the agents to take both responsibility and roles in the task yields the task crafting which exist in the place of safety in positive relationship within happiness at work in the form of engagement commitment and satisfaction.

In the last facet of crafting as relational crafting, the study depicted relational crafting also mediates between psychological safety and happiness at work. The relationship between

the agents is crucial for creating safety zones in the interactions between them as well as their interaction with the managers and the workplace where altering the relationship in the form of interaction with others, to be side of open at interaction and communication with helping the colleagues and the other side of the call are the forms of altering process, those are also contributed by psychological safety, in the land of fearless, there is no need for closing the relationship with other in sustaining the needs as well as determination are the steps for happiness at workplace. So, managers should avoid any obstacles for deterring the relational crafting with the negative interference of the relationship building but also promote and create opportunities for designing fearless land in the workplace to safety environment.

Like any other studies, this study has several limitations both in the methodology and sample selection as well as theoretical side of the study, yet it contributes to JIT literature in which the relationship between psychological safety, job crafting and the happiness at work are scrutinized. In methodology, the survey was conducted at a single firm which sourced the employees as sub-contractor and monitoring role for the companies' operations as outsourced employees who answered the questionnaire of the surveys. Also, single method bias exists in the survey due to the gathering the data at the same time and participants may act to answer in align with the expectation of the company or social acceptance in response bias. The data collection is conducted through designed choices rather than free-text in the survey, as with any quantitative methodology, the answers are restricted or may not ultimately be the same as the answers of the participants.

In order to expand the findings in this study, it may be collecting data from both different national and international call-center firms to generalize the findings as future research. And also due to the fact that culture and company culture, although the call center firm as the outsource of other companies, may have impact over the results to investigate the unit of analysis for psychological safety and job crafting results which are mostly analyzed either at individual, group and organizational level of the unit of analyze. So, both layers and the differences in the layers may be evaluated by comparison of these studies results. In other words, individual level and group level analysis may be influenced by the company culture, but the group level dynamics as well as individual

(Edmondson & Brandsy, 2023) level comparison may be added value to this study as well as results of it in the future studies. The group comparison within qualitative and quantitative analyzes may further investigate the deeper understanding of cognitive facet of job crafting as well as relational and task crafting side. Another further study may be linked to this quantitative analysis which may investigate the relationship between the facets of crafting; the cause-and-effect relationship between do not occur in the existing literature but the impact of their role to each other in the mean of strengthening sides of the crafting may add value to the literature of crafting specifically in need-satisfaction theory within psychological safety. And also, it is important to stress that this study does not allow for causal interference in seeking cause-and-effect relationships as well as counterfactuals in the absence of the cause scenario and also for the comparison of cause-and-effect relationships between facets of crafting and happiness at work.

Another limitation is also related to the individual culture and bias due to the answers are sourced by the participants as common method variance. Gathering data from the peers as well as management side and also time different measurement may be a future study to compare the results in the period term and evaluate the previous findings as well as analyzing the common method issue to understand the potential errors in bias as well as attributions of the participants. Finally, another further study may investigate demographic differences specifically in the attribution of gender-based studies. It may be important to evaluate gender and role-based evaluations specifically at the call-center based research.

REFERENCES

- Aboramadan, M., & Kundi, Y. M. (2022). Emotional culture of joy and happiness at work as a facet of wellbeing: a mediation of psychological safety and relational attachment. *Personnel Review*.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity and innovation in organizations (Vol. 5). Harvard Business School.
- Baer, M., & Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(1), 45-68
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., De Boer, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003a). Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 62(2), 341-356.
- Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2003b). Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the job demands–resources model. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 12(4), 393-417.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career development international*.
- Bakker, A. B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., & Sanz Vergel, A. I. (2016). Modelling job crafting behaviours: Implications for work engagement. *Human relations*, 69(1), 169-189.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 22(3), 273.

- Bakker, A. B., & Oerlemans, W. G. (2019). Daily job crafting and momentary work engagement: A self-determination and self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 112, 417-430.
- Basit, A. A. (2017). Trust in supervisor and job engagement: Mediating effects of psychological safety and felt obligation. *The Journal of Psychology*, 151(8), 701-721.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
- Bell, N. E., & Staw, B. M. (1989). People as sculptors versus sculpture: The roles of personality and personal control in organizations. *Handbook of career theory*, 232, 251.
- Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). What is job crafting and why does it matter. Retrieved from the website of Positive Organizational Scholarship on April, 15, 2011.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158-186.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., Grant, A. M., Kurkoski, J., & Welle, B. (2022). Getting unstuck: The effects of growth mindsets about the self and job on happiness at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Bienefeld, N., & Grote, G. (2014). Speaking up in ad hoc multiteam systems: Individual-level effects of psychological safety, status, and leadership within and across teams. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 23(6), 930-945.
- Bindl, U. K., Unsworth, K. L., Gibson, C. B., & Stride, C. B. (2019). Job crafting revisited: Implications of an extended framework for active changes at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(5), 605.

- Boehnlein, P., & Baum, M. (2022). Does job crafting always lead to employee well-being and performance? Meta-analytical evidence on the moderating role of societal culture. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(4), 647-685.
- Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of applied psychology*, 81(4), 358.
- Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A role–resource approach–avoidance model of job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 499-522.
- Buonocore, F., de Gennaro, D., Russo, M., & Salvatore, D. (2020). Cognitive job crafting: A possible response to increasing job insecurity and declining professional prestige. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 30(2), 244-259.
- Buonocore, F., Agrifoglio, R., & de Gennaro, D. (2021). The role of digital competencies and creativity for job crafting in public administration. In *Digital Transformation and Human Behavior* (pp. 87-97). Springer, Cham.
- Burch-Parker, L. (2021). *Organizational Culture, Organizational Commitment, and Perception of Meaningful Work among Social Workers in the Public Sector throughout the United States* (Doctoral dissertation, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology).
- Burris, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: the mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(4), 912.
- Carmeli, A., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Ziv, E. (2010). Inclusive leadership and employee involvement in creative tasks in the workplace: The mediating role of psychological safety. *Creativity Research Journal*, 22(3), 250-260.
- Carmeli, A., Sheaffer, Z., Binyamin, G., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Shimoni, T. (2014). Transformational leadership and creative problem-solving: The mediating role of

- psychological safety and reflexivity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 48(2), 115-135.
- Carmeli, A., & Gittell, J. H. (2009). High-quality relationships, psychological safety, and learning from failures in work organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(6), 709-729.
- Chen, C., Liao, J., & Wen, P. (2014). Why does formal mentoring matter? The mediating role of psychological safety and the moderating role of power distance orientation in the Chinese context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(8), 1112-1130.
- Cheng, J. C., Chen, C. Y., Teng, H. Y., & Yen, C. H. (2016). Tour leaders' job crafting and job outcomes: The moderating role of perceived organizational support. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 20, 19-29.
- Chinelato, R. S. D. C., Tavares, S. M. D. O., Ferreira, M. C., & Valentini, F. (2021). Predictors of Job Crafting Behaviors: A Mediation Analysis. *Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa*, 36.
- Clark, T. R. (2020). *The 4 stages of psychological safety: Defining the path to inclusion and innovation*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 17(3), 336-354.
- Costantini, A. (2022). Rethinking work: How approach and avoidance features of cognitive crafting are linked with job crafting behaviors and work engagement. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1-21.
- Cuellar, A., Krist, A. H., Nichols, L. M., & Kuzel, A. J. (2018). Effect of practice ownership on work environment, learning culture, psychological safety, and burnout. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 16(Suppl 1), S44-S51.

- Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- De Clercq, D., & Rius, I. B. (2007). Organizational commitment in Mexican small and medium-sized firms: the role of work status, organizational climate, and entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of small business management*, 45(4), 467-490.
- De Gennaro, D. (2019). *Job crafting: The art of redesigning a job*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Self-determination theory. *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology: Volume 1*, 416–437.
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your job through job crafting. *European psychologist*, 19(4), 237.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Gevers, J. M. (2015). Job crafting and extra-role behavior: The role of work engagement and flourishing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91, 87-96.
- Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door open?. *Academy of management journal*, 50(4), 869-884.
- Detert, J. R., & Edmondson, A. C. (2011). Implicit voice theories: Taken-for-granted rules of self-censorship at work. *Academy of management journal*, 54(3), 461-488.
- Doeringer, P. B., & Piore, M. J. (1970). *Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis*.
- 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.

- Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the “central life interests” of industrial workers. *Social problems*, 3(3), 131-142.
- Dutton, J., Debebe, G., & Wrzesniewski, A. (1998). Being valued and devalued at work
- Edmondson, A. C. (1996). Learning from Mistakes is Easier Said Than Done: Group and Organizational Influences on the Detection and Correction of Human Error. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 32(1), 5–28.
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative science quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2002a). *Managing the risk of learning: Psychological safety in work teams* (pp. 255-275). Cambridge, MA: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.
- Edmondson, A. C. (2002b). The local and variegated nature of learning in organizations: A group-level perspective. *Organization science*, 13(2), 128-146
- Edmondson, A. C. (2003). Speaking up in the operating room: How team leaders promote learning in interdisciplinary action teams. *Journal of management studies*, 40(6), 1419-1452.
- Edmondson, A. C., Kramer, R. M., & Cook, K. S. (2004). Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: A group-level lens. *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches*, 12(2004), 239-272.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Mogelof, J. P. (2006). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams: organizational culture, team dynamics, or personality?. In *Creativity and innovation in organizational teams* (pp. 129-156). Psychology Press.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an interpersonal construct. *Annual review of organizational psychology and organizational behavior*, 1(1), 23-43.

- Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological safety comes of age: Observed themes in an established literature. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 55-78.
- Gartner, Inc. (2022, August 31). *Gartner predicts conversational AI will reduce contact center agent labor costs by \$80 billion in 2026*. Gartner. <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2022-08-31-gartner-predicts-conversational-ai-will-reduce-contact-center-agent-labor-costs-by-80-billion-in-2026>
- Ge, Y. (2020). Psychological safety, employee voice, and work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 48(3), 1-7.
- Geldenhuys, M., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2021). How task, relational and cognitive crafting relate to job performance: A weekly diary study on the role of meaningfulness. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(1), 83-94.
- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: a guide for non-statisticians. *International journal of endocrinology and metabolism*, 10(2), 486.
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh).
- Fisher, V. E., & Hanna, J. V. (1931). The dissatisfied worker.
- Fisher, C. D. (2010). Happiness at work. *International journal of management reviews*, 12(4), 384-412.
- Fu, H., Guan, J., Zhong, Q., Fu, L., Jian, Y., & Li, J. (2024). Landscape Elements, ecosystem services and users' Happiness: An indicator framework for park

- management based on cognitive appraisal theory. *Ecological Indicators*, 165, 112209.
- Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 113-165.
- Frederick, D. E., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2020). Longitudinal meta-analysis of job crafting shows positive association with work engagement. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1), 1746733.
- Fritz, M. S., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological science*, 18(3), 233-239
- Fryer, N. J. (2019). *Correlates and outcomes of task crafting: Linking task crafting to promotion* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).
- Fornes, S. L., Rocco, T. S., & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace commitment: A conceptual model developed from integrative review of the research. *Human resource development review*, 7(3), 339-357.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hagger, M. S., & Hamilton, K. (2021). General causality orientations in self-determination theory: Meta-analysis and test of a process model. *European Journal of Personality*, 35(5), 710-735.
- Halbesleben, J. R., Neveu, J. P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the “COR” understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of management*, 40(5), 1334-1364.
- Hao, N., Wu, M., Runco, M. A., & Pina, J. (2015). More mind wandering, fewer original ideas: Be not distracted during creative idea generation. *Acta psychologica*, 161, 110-116.

- Harbridge, R., Ivanitskaya, L., Spreitzer, G., & Boscart, V. (2022). Job crafting in registered nurses working in public health: A qualitative study. *Applied Nursing Research*, 64, 151556.
- Hochschild Arlie, R. (1983). The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.
- Holman, D. J., & Wall, T. D. (2002). Work characteristics, learning-related outcomes, and strain: a test of competing direct effects, mediated, and moderated models. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 7(4), 283.
- Holman, D. J., Axtell, C. M., Sprigg, C. A., Totterdell, P., & Wall, T. D. (2010). The mediating role of job characteristics in job redesign interventions: A serendipitous quasi-experiment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(1), 84-105.
- Hopkins, W. G. (1997). *A new view of statistics*. Will G. Hopkins
- Howard, F. S. J. D. K. (2017). Reengineering, Resistance, And Reflexivity in Philippine Call Centers: Challenging The Victimized Images of Agents And Neoliberalism (Doctoral Dissertation), Central European University
- Hu, Q., Taris, T. W., Dollard, M. F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2020). An exploration of the component validity of job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 29(5), 776-793.
- Hur, W. M., Shin, Y., Rhee, S. Y., & Kim, H. (2017). Organizational virtuousness perceptions and task crafting: The mediating roles of organizational identification and work engagement. *Career Development International*.
- Ilgen, D. R., & Hollenbeck, J. R. (1991). Job design and roles. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, 2, 165-207.
- Jambrino-Maldonado, C., Rando-Cueto, D., Núñez-Sánchez, J. M., Iglesias-Sanchez, P. P., & De las Heras-Pedrosa, C. (2022). Bibliometric analysis of international scientific production on the management of happiness and well-being in organizations. *Social Sciences*, 11(7), 272.

- Judge, T. A., & Klinger, R. (2008). Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp. 393–413). Guilford Press.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kahn, W. A. (1992). To be fully there: Psychological presence at work. *Human relations*, 45(4), 321-349.
- Kaiser, H. F., & Rice, J. (1974). Little jiffy, mark IV. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 34(1), 111-117
- Kark, R., & Carmeli, A. (2009). Alive and creating: The mediating role of vitality and aliveness in the relationship between psychological safety and creative work involvement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(6), 785-804.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (2015). The social psychology of organizations. In *Organizational Behavior 2* (pp. 152-168). Routledge.
- Kerse, G. (2017). İş becerikliliği (job crafting) ölçeğini Türkçe'ye uyarlama ve duygusal tükenme ile ilişkisini belirleme. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(4), 283-304.
- Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2018). Can empowering leaders affect subordinates' well-being and careers because they encourage subordinates' job crafting behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 25(2), 184-196.
- Kim, M. J., & Kim, B. J. (2020). Analysis of the importance of job insecurity, psychological safety and job satisfaction in the CSR-performance link. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 3514.
- Kirk-Brown, A., & Van Dijk, P. (2016). An examination of the role of psychological safety in the relationship between job resources, affective commitment and

- turnover intentions of Australian employees with chronic illness. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27(14), 1626-1641.
- Kular, S., Gatenby, M., Rees, C., Soane, E., & Truss, K. (2008). Employee engagement: A literature review.
- Kuo, C. C., Ye, Y. C., Chen, M. Y., & Chen, L. H. (2019). Proactive personality enhances change in employees' job satisfaction: The moderating role of psychological safety. *Australian Journal of Management*, 44(3), 482-494.
- Lazazzara, A., Tims, M., & De Gennaro, D. (2020). The process of reinventing a job: A meta-synthesis of qualitative job crafting research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 116, 103267.
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of management Journal*, 52(6), 1169-1192.
- Lee, J. Y. (2022). How does psychological safety foster employee performance? A serial multiple mediation of job crafting and thriving. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 25(3/4), 98-112.
- Letona-Ibañez, O., Martínez-Rodríguez, S., Ortiz-Marques, N., Carrasco, M., & Amillano, A. (2021). Job crafting and work engagement: The mediating role of work meaning. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(10), 5383.
- Li, J., Li, S., Jing, T., Bai, M., Zhang, Z., & Liang, H. (2022). Psychological Safety and Affective Commitment Among Chinese Hospital Staff: The Mediating Roles of Job Satisfaction and Job Burnout. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 15, 1573.
- 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.

- Lin, B., Law, K. S., & Zhou, J. (2017). Why is underemployment related to creativity and OCB? A task-crafting explanation of the curvilinear moderated relations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 156-177.
- Llorente-Alonso, M., & Topa, G. (2019). Individual crafting, collaborative crafting, and job satisfaction: The mediator role of engagement. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(3), 217-226..
- Mäkikangas, A. (2018). Job crafting profiles and work engagement: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 106, 101-111.
- Mäkikangas, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2021). A person-centered investigation of two dominant job crafting theoretical frameworks and their work-related implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 131, 103658.
- Malinowska, D., & Tokarz, A. (2020). The moderating role of Self Determination Theory's general causality orientations in the relationship between the job resources and work engagement of outsourcing sector employees. *Personality and Individual Differences*.
- Maslow, A. H. (1942). The dynamics of psychological security-insecurity. *Character & Personality; A Quarterly for Psychodiagnostic & Allied Studies*.
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
- McClelland, G. P., Leach, D. J., Clegg, C. W., & McGowan, I. (2014). Collaborative crafting in call centre teams. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(3), 464-486.
- Meijerink, J., Bos-Nehles, A., & de Leede, J. (2020). How employees' pro-activity translates high-commitment HRM systems into work engagement: The mediating role of job crafting. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(22), 2893-2918.

- Melo, N., Dourado, D., & Andrade, J. (2021). Reclaiming cognitive crafting: an integrative model of behavioral and cognitive practices in job crafting. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*.
- Meng, Y., Wang, Y., & Tian, X. (2021). Job Crafting Paths for Job Engagement: An Empirical Study among Chinese Social Workers. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 45(2), 142-167.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89
- Michel, J. W., Tews, M. J., & Allen, D. G. (2019). Fun in the workplace: A review and expanded theoretical perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29(1), 98-110.
- Midi, H., Sarkar, S. K., & Rana, S. (2010). Collinearity diagnostics of binary logistic regression model. *Journal of interdisciplinary mathematics*, 13(3), 253-267.
- Miner, A. S. (1985). *The strategy of serendipity: Ambiguity, uncertainty and idiosyncratic jobs* (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University).
- Mkhwanazi, D., & Dhanpat, N. (2023). Call centre support staff job crafting and employee engagement: Controlling the effects of sociodemographic characteristics. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 33(3), 229-234
- Moin, M. F., Omar, M. K., Wei, F., Rasheed, M. I., & Hameed, Z. (2021). Green HRM and psychological safety: How transformational leadership drives follower's job satisfaction. *Current issues in Tourism*, 24(16), 2269-2277.
- Napier, A. D., Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2024). Crafting one's life and its relationship with psychological needs: A scoping review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 1-39.
- Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human resource management review*, 27(3), 521-535.

- Nielsen, K., & Abildgaard, J. S. (2012). The development and validation of a job crafting measure for use with blue-collar workers. *Work & Stress*, 26(4), 365-384.
- Niessen, C., Weseler, D., & Kostova, P. (2016). When and why do individuals craft their jobs? The role of individual motivation and work characteristics for job crafting. *Human relations*, 69(6), 1287-1313.
- Noesgaard, M. S., & Jørgensen, F. (2023). Building organizational commitment through cognitive and relational job crafting. *European Management Journal*,
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* 3rd edition (MacGraw-Hill, New York).
- O'donovan, R., & Mcauliffe, E. (2020). A systematic review of factors that enable psychological safety in healthcare teams. *International journal for quality in health care*, 32(4), 240-250.
- Olafsen, A. H., Marescaux, B. P., & Kujanpää, M. (2025). Crafting for autonomy, competence, and relatedness: A self-determination theory model of need crafting at work. *Applied Psychology*, 74(1), e12570.
- Olivier, A. L., & Rothmann, S. (2007). Antecedents of work engagement in a multinational company. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 33(3), 49-56.
- O'Neill, B. S., & Arendt, L. A. (2008). Psychological climate and work attitudes: The importance of telling the right story. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 353-370.
- Osei, H. V., Konadu, I. A., & Osei-Kwame, D. (2022). The relationships between team burnout and team psychological safety and civility among hospital nurses during the covid-19 pandemic: The mediating role of team thriving. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 1-12.
- Pelletier, L. G., & Rocchi, M. (2023). Organismic Integration Theory: A Theory of Regulatory Styles, Internalization, Integration, and Human Functioning in Society. *The Oxford Handbook of Self-Determination Theory*, 53-83.

- Petrov, S., Oprea, B., & Opariuc-Dan, C. (2023). Psychological Safety and Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement and Job Crafting. *Psihologia Resurselor Umane*, 21(2).
- Pimenta de Devotto, R., A de Freitas, C. P. P., & Wechsler, S. M. (2022). Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction, Job Crafting, and Meaningful Work: Network Analysis. *Trends*
- Plester, B. A., & Lloyd, R. (2023). Happiness Is 'Being Yourself': Psychological Safety and Fun in Hybrid Work. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(10), 218.
- Plomp, J., Tims, M., Khapova, S. N., Jansen, P. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2019). Psychological safety, job crafting, and employability: A comparison between permanent and temporary workers. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 974.
- Preacher, K. J., & Leonardelli, G. J. (n.d.). *Calculation for the Sobel test: An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests.* QuantPsy. <https://quantpsy.org/sobel/sobel.htm>
- Rabbanee, F. K., Haque, M. M., Banik, S., & Islam, M. M. (2019). Managing engagement in an emerging economy service. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 29(5/6), 610-638.
- Rafaeli, A. (1989). When cashiers meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers. *Academy of management Journal*, 32(2), 245-273.
- Rafaeli, A., Ziklik, L., & Doucet, L. (2008). The impact of call center employees' customer orientation behaviors on service quality. *Journal of service research*, 10(3), 239-255.
- Rathert, C., Ishqaidaf, G., & May, D. R. (2009). Improving work environments in health care: test of a theoretical framework. *Health care management review*, 34(4), 334-343.
- Reeve, J. (2023). Cognitive evaluation theory: The seedling that keeps self-determination theory growing. *The Oxford handbook of self-determination theory*, 33-52.

- Rofcanin, Y., Bakker, A. B., Berber, A., Gölgeci, I., & Las Heras, M. (2019). Relational job crafting: Exploring the role of employee motives with a weekly diary study. *Human relations*, 72(4), 859-886.
- Romeo, M., Yepes-Baldó, M., Westerberg, K., & Nordin, M. (2018). Impact of job crafting on quality of care: The moderating effect of commitment. *Psychology*, 9(12), 2649-2661.
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in organizational behavior*, 30, 91-127.
- Rothmann, S., & Rothmann Jr, S. (2010). Factors associated with employee engagement in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(2), 1-12.
- 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.
- Ruparel, N., Choubisa, R., & Seth, H. (2022). Imagining positive workplaces: extrapolating relationships between job crafting, mental toughness and authentic happiness in millennial employees. *Management Research Review*, 45(5), 599-618.
- Ryan, R. M. (1993). Agency and organization: intrinsic motivation, autonomy, and the self in psychological development.
- Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9, 139-170.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). Self-determination theory: An introduction and overview. *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*, 10(978.14625), 28806.

- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2019). Brick by brick: The origins, development, and future of self-determination theory. In *Advances in motivation science* (Vol. 6, pp. 111-156). Elsevier.
- Ryan, R. M., Duineveld, J. J., Di Domenico, S. I., Ryan, W. S., Steward, B. A., & Bradshaw, E. L. (2022). We know this much is (meta-analytically) true: A meta-review of meta-analytic findings evaluating self-determination theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 148(11-12), 813.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of managerial psychology*.
- Sakuraya, A., Shimazu, A., Imamura, K., & Kawakami, N. (2020). Effects of a job crafting intervention program on work engagement among Japanese employees: A randomized controlled trial. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 235.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative science quarterly*, 224-253.
- Salas-Vallina, A., Alegre, J., & Fernandez, R. (2017a). Happiness at work and organisational citizenship behaviour: is organisational learning a missing link?. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(3), 470-488.
- Salas-Vallina, A., López-Cabrales, Á., Alegre, J., & Fernández, R. (2017b). On the road to happiness at work (HAW) Transformational leadership and organizational learning capability as drivers of HAW in a healthcare context. *Personnel Review*, 46(2), 314-338.
- Salas-Vallina, A., & Alegre, J. (2021). Happiness at work: Developing a shorter measure. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 27(3), 460-480.
- Sanner, B., & Bunderson, J. S. (2015). When feeling safe isn't enough: Contextualizing models of safety and learning in teams. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 5(3), 224-243.

- Schachler, V., Epple, S. D., Clauss, E., Hoppe, A., Slemp, G. R., & Ziegler, M. (2019). Measuring job crafting across cultures: Lessons learned from comparing a German and an Australian sample. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, 991.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness studies, 3*(1), 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement?. In *Employee engagement in theory and practice* (pp. 29-49). Routledge.
- Schein, E. H., & Bennis, W. G. (1965). *Personal and organizational change through group methods: The laboratory approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Schein, E. H. (1971). The individual, the organization, and the career: A conceptual scheme. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 7*(4), 401-426.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Increasing organizational effectiveness through better human resource planning and development. *Readings in human resource management*, 376.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). How can organizations learn faster? the problem of entering the Green Room.
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems practice, 9*(1), 27-47.
- Schoemann, A. M., Boulton, A. J., & Short, S. D. (2017). Determining power and sample size for simple and complex mediation models. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 8*(4), 379-386.
- Schriesheim, C., & Tsui, A. S. (1980). Development and validation of a short satisfaction instrument for use in survey feedback interventions. In *Western Academy of Management Meeting* (Vol. 1980, pp. 115-17).
- Seligman, M. E. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. *Handbook of positive psychology, 2*(2002), 3-12.

- Sender, G., Carvalho, F., & Guedes, G. (2021). The happy level: A new approach to measure happiness at work using mixed methods. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 16094069211002413.
- Sheldon, K. M., Turban, D. B., Brown, K. G., Barrick, M. R., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Applying self-determination theory to organizational research. In *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 357-393). Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Sherman, C. L. (2022). *Employee Engagement, Brain-based Psychological Safety, and the Sales Professional* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Global).
- Shuck, B. (2011). Integrative literature review: Four emerging perspectives of employee engagement: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328.
- Silvestri, L. (2020). *Collective job crafting: How groups shape their identity and work over time* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University).
- Slemp, G. R. (2013). *Rethinking work: Job crafting, self-determination, and employee well-being* (Doctoral dissertation, Monash University).
- Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2013). The Job Crafting Questionnaire: A new scale to measure the extent to which employees engage in job crafting. *International Journal of wellbeing*, 3(2).
- Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2014). Optimising employee mental health: The relationship between intrinsic need satisfaction, job crafting, and employee well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(4), 957-977.
- Slemp, G. R., Kern, M. L., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2015). Workplace well-being: The role of job crafting and autonomy support. *Psychology of Well-being*, 5, 1-17.
- Slemp, G. R. (2016). Job crafting. *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of positivity and strengths-based approaches at work*, 342-365.

- Song, L., & Jo, S. J. (2023). How job crafting behaviors influence the innovative behavior of knowledge workers in the gig economy: based on the organismic integration theory. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1228881.
- Sprigg, C. A. (2011). *Psychosocial risk factors for call centre employees* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sheffield).
- Staw, B. M., & Boettger, R. D. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(3), 534-559.
- Swendiman, R. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Mahmoud, N. N. (2019). Burnout in surgery viewed through the lens of psychological safety. *Annals of Surgery, 269*(2), 234-235.
- Taylor, P., & Bain, P. (1999). 'An assembly line in the head': work and employee relations in the call centre. *Industrial relations journal, 30*(2), 101-117
- Tian, W., Wang, H., & Rispens, S. (2021). How and when job crafting relates to employee creativity: the important roles of work engagement and perceived work group status diversity. *International journal of environmental research and public health, 18*(1), 291.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(2), 1-9.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of vocational behavior, 80*(1), 173-186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 18*(2), 230.
- Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Job crafting and its relationships with person-job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 92*, 44-53.

- Tovar, J. (2020). Call center agents' skills: Invisible, illegible, and misunderstood. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 14(4), 437-458.
- Tsai, C. J. (2016). Boredom at work and job monotony: An exploratory case study within the catering sector. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 27(2), 207-236.
- Ulusoy, N., Mölders, C., Fischer, S., Bayur, H., Deveci, S., Demiral, Y., & Rössler, W. (2016). A matter of psychological safety: commitment and mental health in Turkish immigrant employees in Germany. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(4), 626-645.
- Van Maanen, J. E., & Schein, E. H. (1977). Toward a theory of organizational socialization.
- Wallace, J. E. (1997). Becker's side-bet theory of commitment revisited: Is it time for a moratorium or a resurrection?. *Human Relations*, 50(6), 727-749.
- Wang, H. J., Demerouti, E., Blanc, P. L., & Lu, C. Q. (2018). Crafting a job in 'tough times': When being proactive is positively related to work attachment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(3), 569-590.
- Wang, H., Li, P., & Chen, S. (2020). The impact of social factors on job crafting: a meta-analysis and review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 8016.
- Wanless, S. B. (2016). The role of psychological safety in human development. *Research in Human Development*, 13(1), 6-14.
- Weiner, Bernard & Frieze, Irene & Kukla, Andy & Reed, Linda & Rest, Stanley & Rosenbaum, Robert. (1971). Perceiving the Causes of Success and Failure.
- Wołowska, A. (2014). Determinants of organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, 8(1).
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 179-201.

- Wrzesniewski, A., Dutton, J. E., & Debebe, G. (2003). Interpersonal sensemaking and the meaning of work. *Research in organizational behavior*, 25, 93-135.
- Wrzesniewski, A., Berg, J. M., Grant, A. M., Kurkoski, J., & Welle, B. (2012, August). Job crafting in motion: Achieving sustainable gains in happiness and performance. In *Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA*.
- Wrzesniewski, A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J. E., & Berg, J. M. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. In *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 281-302). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Yanikkaya, B. (2015). A Discussion on Teaching & Ethics And Teaching Communication Ethics in the Digital Age. *Dijital Çağda Öğretim & Etik ve İletişim Etiği Öğretimi Üzerine Bir Tartışma*, 6(11), 532-553.
- Yener, S. (2015). PSİKOLOJİK RAHATLIK ÖLÇEĞİNİN TÜRKÇE FORMUNUN GEÇERLİK VE GÜVENİRLİK ÇALIŞMASI. *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(13), 280-305.
- Yozgat, U., & Bilginoğlu, E. (2020). İşyerinde mutluluk ölçeği türkçe formunun geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi*, 15, 201-206.
- Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 40(2), 126-146.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Result of the Evaluation by the Ethics Committee

Result of the Evaluation by the Ethics Committee is available in the printed version of this dissertation.



Appendix B. Survey

Değerli Katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, İ. Bilgi Üniversitesi İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Organizasyon Yönetimi Bilim Dalında Doktora tez öğrencisi olan Onur Uçar tarafından yürütülen tez araştırmasında kullanılmak amacıyla hazırlanmıştır.

Araştırma, psikolojik güvenlik ve iş zanaatkârlığının iş yeri mutluluğuna ile olan ilişkisini ölçmek amacı ile yapılmaktadır. Bu bilimsel çalışmanın doğru ve anlamlı sonuçlara ulaşabilmesi için, ankette yer alan her bir soruyu gerekli özeni göstererek cevaplamanız büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Yaklaşık olarak 15 dakika sürecek olan bu anket çalışması, anket 4 bölümden oluşmaktadır. Katılımınızın gönüllü olacağı, istediğiniz zaman ara verip tekrar devam edebileceğinizi belirtmek isteriz. Bu nedenle, lütfen hiçbir ifadeyi atlamadan ve boş bırakmadan değerlendirmenizi yapmanızı rica ederiz.

Ayrıca, tüm toplanan veriler ve bu çalışmaya katılan kişilerin vereceği her türlü bireysel bilgi tarafımızdan kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve hiçbir kişi veya kuruma aktarılmayacaktır. Anket verileri araştırmacıda saklı kalacak olup, kişisel hiçbir veri tutulmayacak, raporlanmayacak ve çalışmış olduğunuz firma ile de paylaşılmayacaktır.

Değerli zamanınızı ayırarak katıldığınız ve görüşlerinizi bizimle paylaştığınız için teşekkürü şimdiden bir borç biliriz.

Anketimize değerli katımlarınız için tekrar teşekkür ederiz.

Saygılarımızla,

1.Bölüm

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri okuduktan sonra kendinizi değerlendirip, sizin için en uygun olan seçeneği 1-Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 5- Kesinlikle katılıyorum aralığında işaretleyiniz.

- 1.Bu işyerinde bir hata yaparsanız, bu genellikle tüm çalışanlar tarafından aleyhinizde kullanılır.
- 2.Bu işyerinde çalışanlar karşılaştıkları problemleri ve çözülmesi zor sorunları açıkça dile getirirler.
- 3.Bu iş yerinde çalışanlar, diğer çalışanların fikirlerine sırf farklı (yaş, ırk, dil, din) oldukları için karşı çıkarlar.
- 4.Bu işyerinde işlerin yürütmesi için hesaplı risk alınabilir. Sonuç olumsuz olsa da çalışan zarar görmez.
- 5.Bu işyerinde çalışanlardan kolay kolay yardım istenmez.
- 6.Bu işyerinde hiç kimse benim çabalarımı kasıtlı olarak engelleyecek şekilde davranmaz.
- 7.Bu işyerinde insanlar ile çalışırken, bana özel beceri ve yeteneklerime değer verilir ve bu yeteneklerim kullanılır.

2.Bölüm

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri okuduktan sonra kendinizi değerlendirip, sizin için en uygun olan seçeneği 1-Kesinlikle katılmıyorum 5- Kesinlikle katılıyorum aralığında işaretleyiniz.

- 1.İşimi geliştirmek için yeni yaklaşımlar/ bakış açıları sunarım.
- 2.İşimde yaptığım görevlerin türünü veya kapsamını değiştiririm.
- 3.Yeteneklerime ve ilgi alanıma daha uygun olan yeni iş görevleri ortaya çıkarırım.
- 4.Yaptığım işte, ek görevler üstlenmeyi severim.
- 5.Yeteneğime ve ilgi alanıma uygun görevler üstlenmeyi tercih ederim
- 6.İşimin, yaşamımdaki asıl amaca nasıl katkı sağladığını düşünürüm
- 7.Yaptığım işin örgütün başarısındaki öneminin farkındayım.
8. Yaptığım işin daha geniş topluluklar (toplum) için önemli olduğunun farkındayım.

9. İşimin, yaşamıma sağladığı olumlu yönlerdeki katkıları düşünürüm.
10. İşimin genel anlamda refahımda / mutluluğumda oynadığı rolü düşünürüm.
11. İşletmemde, insanları tanımaya gayret ederim
12. İşle ilgili sosyal faaliyetler (konferans, seminer, sergi vb.) organize ederim veya bu faaliyetlere katılırım.
13. İşyerinde özel bazı etkinlikler (arkadaşımın doğum günü kutlaması, yıl dönümü gibi) düzenlemeye çalışırım.
14. Yeni başlayan çalışanlara işle ilgili veya iş dışı konularda danışmanlık yapar, onlara yardımcı olurum.
15. Benimle benzer yeteneğe ve ilgiye sahip olan işyerindeki diğer bireylerle arkadaşlıklar kurarım.

3. Bölüm

Aşağıda, çalışanların işte mutluluklarını değerlendirmeye yönelik ifadeler yer almaktadır. Lütfen, dikkatli bir şekilde okuyarak, 5 en yüksek tamamen katılıyorum, 1 en düşük tamamen katılmıyorum aralığında, size en uygun şekilde cevaplayınız.

1. İşimde kendimi güçlü ve enerjik hissediyorum
2. İşim konusunda hevesliyim
3. Çalışırken kendimi kaptırırım
4. Yaptığım işin doğasından memnunum
5. Aldığım ücretten memnunum
6. Çalıştığım kurumdaki ilerleme (terfi) olanaklarından memnunum
7. Kariyerimin geri kalanını bu kurumda geçirmekten çok mutlu olurum
8. Çalıştığım kuruma duygusal olarak bağlı olduğumu hissediyorum
9. Çalıştığım kuruma dair güçlü bir aidiyet hissediyorum

4. Bölüm

Demografik bilgiler

1. Cinsiyet: (Kadın) (Erkek)
2. Yaş aralığınız: (18-23) (24-29) (30-35) (36 ve üstü)
3. Eğitim düzeyiniz: (Lise) (Yüksekokul) (Üniversite) (Yüksek Lisans) (Doktora)

4. Toplam iş deneyimiz: (İlk işim 1 yıldan az) (1-3 yıl) (4-5 yıl) (5 yıl ve üstü)
5. İş yerinizdeki ünvanız: (Müşteri temsilci-agent) (Takım lideri) (Bölüm müdürü)
6. Müşteri temsilci iseniz; ne tür bir ekipte yer alıyorsunuz:
(Sadece gelen çağrı) (Sadece giden çağrı) (Hem gelen hem giden çağrı)
(Hiçbiri)
7. Hizmet verdiğiniz operasyonda ağırlıklı kullandığınız dili işaretleyiniz:
(Türkçe) (Yabancı dil)