


RESEARCH ARTICLE

How proactive personality and ICT-enabled technostress creators configure as drivers of job crafting

Jestine Philip*  and Vasiliki Kosmidou

Department of Management, Pompea College of Business, University of New Haven, 300 Boston Post Rd., West Haven, CT 06516, USA

*Corresponding author: E-mail: jphilip@newhaven.edu

(Received 27 October 2021; revised 2 May 2022; accepted 7 June 2022)

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine configurations of proactive personality and ICT-enabled technostress creators as drivers of job crafting for Gen Z, Gen Y, and Gen X+ workers. Adhering to configurational theorizing, the study was conducted using fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA). Survey responses collected from 335 full-time workers revealed that the presence of a proactive personality was a necessary condition for job crafting to occur within the context of ICT demands for these generations. Four configurations for Gen Z, five configurations for Gen Y, and four configurations for Gen X+ workers revealed sufficient conditions for job crafting. The present research contemporizes Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory by incorporating ICT as a modern-day job demand. In using fsQCA as a novel qualitative methodological tool, this research offers new meaning to the prior regression-based findings regarding proactive personality trait's relationship with job crafting.

Key words: Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis; ICT; job crafting; Prolific; technostress creators

Introduction

The increased presence of information and communication technologies (ICT), which enabled employees to connect to work remotely, has led to many workers experiencing fatigue and work overload due to the technologies' overuse. This was fueled even further by the coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) pandemic when employees compelled to work from home experienced techno-overload (Ingusci et al., 2021) and elevated technostress levels (stress associated with ICT (over)usage) (Hamouche, 2021; Molino et al., 2020). Employees initiating efforts to alter aspects of their job tasks and work relationships to meet such new demands were seen as a response behavior (Laker, Patel, Budhwar, & Malik, 2020). In particular, job crafting – an individual behavior displayed to decrease work demands and increase one's job-related resources – has been critical in helping employees build resilience (Berg, Dutton, & Wrzesniewski, 2008), improve well-being and performance (Rudolph, Katz, Lavigne, & Zacher, 2017), and reduce stress when ICT-overload led to fatigue (Laker et al., 2020).

Common examples of employees displaying a minor form of job crafting behavior during ICT over-exposure is when they proactively take regular breaks away from their work desk or computer (Baker & Slemp, 2018) or when they engage in task crafting by learning to use a new project management software for online document management, thereby using one technology to manage another (Wrzesniewski, LoBuglio, Dutton, & Berg, 2013). Thus, it would appear that a variety of ICT demands put on employees drive them to engage in such and other crafting response behaviors.

However, despite the recognized importance of response behaviors in stressful work situations, a holistic understanding of the combination of factors that influences employees to job craft remains understudied as prior research has mostly analyzed its predictors separately. Whereas personality researchers have found that individual differences like increased age or traits like proactive personality are positively related to job crafting (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2016; Wong & Tetrick, 2017), others have studied how various situational factors like job autonomy, workload, or technostress creators influence this behavior (Ingusci et al., 2021; Rudolph et al., 2017).

Hence, the purpose of this research is to examine a collection of drivers of job crafting pertaining to ICT usage. In doing so, we consider the notion that a combination of interlinked factors could be associated with driving this behavior rather than assuming that each predictor would have a linear, independent, or moderating effect on the outcome (Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2016). Such a varied empirical investigation allows us to reveal how theoretically congruent factors like ICT-enabled technostress creators and proactive personality combine to drive job crafting behavior.

Because traditional linear and symmetric analytical approaches like regression analysis and structural equation modeling assume independence among all variables in a statistical model (Greckhamer, Misangyi, Elms, & Lacey, 2008), extant literature has not adequately considered the combined effects and intricately complex conditions under which individuals would (or would not) engage in job crafting. Furthermore, in acknowledging the body of research that has found low to moderate differences in workplace values, attitudes, and intentions among individuals belonging to different generational groups worldwide (e.g., Bresman & Rao, 2017; Cennamo & Gardner, 2008; Cucina, Byle, Martin, Peyton, & Gast, 2018), this study extends related literature by offering comparisons of a work behavior across generations (Gen Z, Gen Y, Gen X, and Baby Boomers). Lastly, the present study also attempts to narrow the research gap in behavioral literature which has examined job crafting for each generation, like millennials, separately (e.g., Gong, Greenwood, Hoyte, Ramkissoon, & He, 2018).

The current examination of the drivers of job crafting is conducted using fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA), which is a non-linear configuration-based analytical approach that recognizes synergistic effects (Supplementary Appendix 1). Following Gabriel, Campbell, Djurdjevic, Johnson, and Rosen's (2018) recommendations for using fsQCA for person-centered research, the methodology was deemed appropriate for two reasons. First, we are interested in discovering theoretically aligned antecedent combinations that lead to not just the *presence* but also the *absence* of an outcome. The constructs in this research – proactive personality trait and technostress creators – can theoretically combine to form configurations that reveal occurrences of job crafting. Using Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory and relying on prior literature, this research integrates proactive personality as a key personal resource (Bakker & de Vries, 2021) that employees utilize and ICT-enabled technostress creators as job demands they face. Unlike correlation-based quantitative methods, fsQCA allows the examination of logical connections between trait and technostress creating conditions that are *necessary* and/or *sufficient* (Dul, 2016) for job crafting to occur. Subsequently, two research questions pertaining to the necessary condition are derived in a following section. Moreover, fsQCA facilitates the interpretation of the simultaneous effects of multiple predictor variables, which is often considered challenging in inferential statistics (Harms, Kraus, & Schwarz, 2009; Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2016).

Second, a review of qualitative job crafting research found that the literature stream theorizing job crafting through a demands-resources lens has largely focused on quantitative research designs to examine and interpret its antecedents (Lazazzara, Tims, & De Gennaro, 2020). Hence, as a novel qualitative methodological tool, fsQCA, would aid in extracting nuances for this literature stream that have not been achieved using conventional quantitative approaches.

Overall, the present research contributes to several bodies of literature, theory, methodology, and management practice. By analyzing a positive behavior (i.e., job crafting) displayed by individuals to reduce ICT-enabled technostress, we build on and extend the fsQCA-based

examination of technostress creators and job burnout (a negative behavior) conducted by Khedhaouria and Cucchi (2019). As noted in the following section, the current research aids configurational theorizing of JD-R theory by applying the fsQCA methodology. Additionally, utilizing a configurational approach to theorize the role of proactive personality in job crafting behavior is a new contribution to extant literature because the proactive trait is mainly known to share correlational statistical significance with job crafting (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012). The findings of this study are also useful for organizations that rely on ICT-based devices to operate and manage their workforce as well as for employees who use technology at their work every day. Moreover, this research distinguishes how proactive personality and ICT-enabled technostress creators configure as drivers of job crafting for Gen Z, Gen Y, and Gen X+ workers, thereby offering unique findings and implications for each generation in the workplace.

Theoretical development and literature review

Job demands-resources and configurational theorizing

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Bakker, Demerouti, Taris, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2003) is a theoretical framework of workplace stress which helps explain the consequences of an imbalance among the various demands and resources at one's job. Such a well-grounded perspective of work stress is appropriate as the current research pertains to ICT-enabled technostress creators. Within job crafting literature, the framework has been largely employed to understand crafting behavior in light of the demands employees face at work and the resources that help reduce those demands. The JD-R model posits that when hindering job demands increase, employees job craft by increasing (utilizing) their job, social, or self-resources (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Tims & Bakker, 2010). In this regard, the job crafting construct consists of four factors that relate to demands and resources, namely, decreasing hindering job demands (e.g., organizing tasks to reduce cognitive overload), increasing challenging job demands (e.g., taking on new projects), increasing structural job resources (e.g., seeking learning and developmental opportunities), and increasing social job resources (e.g., improving work relationships, seeking feedback etc.) (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). Proactive personality trait is anchored as a personal resource that employees would tap into to job craft when facing job demands because proactive individuals are known to take initiatives to create a conducive working environment for themselves (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). On the other hand, this research theorizes factors of technostress creators – like invasion of privacy resulting from using employer ICT to work during one's personal time (Ayyagari, Grover, & Purvis, 2011) – as job demands. Hence, the duality of the JD-R model lends an appropriate theoretical lens for the current research by facilitating the categorization of the study antecedents as job demands (i.e., technostress creators) and resources (i.e., proactive personality).

Moreover, by employing fsQCA to analyze the JD-R framework, this research also adheres to configurational theorizing (Cornelissen, Höllerer, & Seidl, 2021), which allows the integration of various combinations of attributes to explain an outcome phenomenon. Moreover, grounding the exploratory fsQCA methodology in JD-R theory provides strong epistemological basis and ensures rigor because JD-R theory organically lends itself to a configuration-based evaluation as it entails understanding job crafting behaviors through a demands-resources categorization. Furthermore, as with qualitative methodologies that have limited generalizability, the application of fsQCA allows us to propose a midrange theory of the JD-R framework that is contextualized for workplace ICT. In other words, the theoretical contribution of the current fsQCA-based research is specific to job crafting behaviors that are enabled by the presence of ICT demands.

ICT-enabled technostress creators as job demands

Highly demanding workplace situations (i.e., job demands) can result in negative outcomes like psychological strain and burnout (Bakker & de Vries, 2021). When viewed through the JD-R

perspective, technostress creators are seen as a form of ICT-related job demand which negatively impacts employee well-being (Pfaffinger, Reif, & Spieß, 2022). Knowing that job crafting is a behavior displayed to decrease job demands, such technostress-inducing situations can combine to act as drivers of job crafting. Therefore, ICT-enabled technostress creators are positioned as job demands in the current research because the technostress creators construct consists of the following five factors that are associated with elevated stress experienced by employee (over)usage of ICT (Ayyagari, Grover, & Purvis, 2011).

Each of the five technostress-creating factors has been theorized as job demands in extant literature. Work-home conflict relates to the tension between fulfilling work and home responsibilities due to work ICT use at home. A study of Australian workers examined the job demands of work-home conflict and work pressure (i.e., having an overload of work to complete in little available time) using the JD-R model to investigate their workplace stress (Pignata, Winefield, Provis, & Boyd, 2016). Work (techno) overload creates demanding situations of excessive work for employees due to ICT. In their research on job crafting, Ingusci et al. (2021) employed techno overload as a modern job demand that workers are experiencing from the need to work faster, respond to queries quicker, and multi-task because technology facilitates such actions. Invasion of privacy describes situations wherein work ICT usage may violate employee privacy through tracking and surveillance. Such an invasion is seen as a job demand as prior research has emphasized the psychological strain that ICT invasion has on employees and recommends managers to alleviate these concerns by creating and following ICT work norms (Ayyagari, Grover, & Purvis, 2011). Role ambiguity results from being unable to prioritize and allocate appropriate time for job tasks due to ICT problems, which can be a stressful situation for workers particularly during work overload. When analyzing job demands that nurses face, Boudrias, Trépanier, Foucreault, Peterson, and Fernet (2020) found that role ambiguity and role conflict contributed to negative outcomes like turnover intentions. As one of the most common job stressors, job insecurity – which relates to fear of job loss from new and advanced ICT – qualifies as a job demand that leads to anxiety and depression (Aguar-Quintana, Nguyen, Araujo-Cabrera, & Sanabria-Díaz, 2021).

Proactive personality as a resource

The proactive personality trait has a positive association with employees increasing social and structural job resources (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012) within the JD-R framework. Loi, Liu, Lam, and Xu (2016) studied proactive personality as a personal resource and proposed that employees become more proactive about their turnover intentions in a highly demanding work environment. JD-R theory recognizes the role of both organizational/job-related resources like managerial support as well as an employee's personal resources like proactive personality trait in mitigating job demands and reducing job strain (Bakker & de Vries, 2021). Proactive personality is considered a personal resource that facilitates the effective utilization of organizational resources while job crafting because proactive employees are more likely to reach out and seek support to complete difficult tasks (Hardré, 2003). Individuals using their proactive trait as a resource to confront demanding situations were shown to mitigate the negative effects of ICT-enabled technostress like communication overload (Sumiyana & Sriwidharmanely, 2020). Although the application of fsQCA in micro-focused proactive personality literature is limited, studies have found that configurations containing the presence of this trait in CEO's and entrepreneurs influence strategic outcomes (e.g., Denoo & Soh, 2018; Yang, Bai, & Yang, 2021).

Age range/generation

For the identified research gap, generational age range is incorporated into the present comparative analysis so as to detect configurational drivers of job crafting behaviors among Generations X+, Y, and Z. Although this research does not incorporate age range itself as a driver of job crafting,

a comparison across generations is useful for the present ICT-related research because Gen Z, or digital natives, tend to be more comfortable with and immersed in ICT-device usage than their older counterparts like Gen X (Vigo, 2019). An assumption that younger employees may experience less technostress warrants an investigation of whether different generations are affected differently by technostress creators and the role that proactive personality plays in this context.

Research questions

Like qualitative studies that were designed to be exploratory (e.g., Palmer, Phadke, Nair, & Flanagan, 2019), this research also does not involve the development of formal hypotheses regarding expected relationships due to fsQCA's exploratory and qualitative nature (Greckhamer et al., 2008; Khedhaouria & Cucchi, 2019). Hence, the present study is not exploratory in terms of its variables (as established measurement scales for job crafting, technostress creators, and proactive personality are used). The study is, however, exploratory for the *configurations of variables* we attempt to find because there lacks clear literature on how to hypothesize the combinatorial effects of these attributes (see Supplementary Appendix 1 for details on exploratory nature and net effects). Hence, in line with prior fsQCA literature in behavioral management (e.g., Gabriel et al., 2018), we offer two research questions pertaining to necessary conditions that can be adequately answered through this analysis. Specifically, with the purpose of this research being to examine a collection of job crafting drivers and having identified technostress creators and proactive personality as two theoretically congruent antecedents, the current research questions pertain to identifying fsQCA-based configurations and necessary conditions for the three generations.

Research Question 1a: Are there configurations of proactive personality trait and ICT-enabled technostress creators that are necessary for job crafting to occur?

Research Question 1b: Do the necessary conditions differ for each generation?

Methodology

Data sample

Data were collected through Prolific which is an online crowdsourced recruitment platform like the popular Mechanical Turk.¹ Utilizing the several pre-screening filters that Prolific allows, we targeted fully employed US-based workers who worked under a direct supervisor, used technology/software applications more than once a day at their job, and listed their occupation as senior manager, middle manager, supervisor or team leader, or non-managerial employee/worker/non-supervisory staff. These filters were applied to ensure that the sample consisted of individuals who worked with ICT and potentially engaged in job crafting behaviors. We launched separate surveys with the same questions for three-generational age groups – under 25 years (Gen Z; born 1997–2012), 25–40 years (Gen Y – millennials; born 1981–1996), and over 40 years (Gen X & Baby Boomers; born 1946–1980).² Consistent with Prolific's recommendation, participants were paid at a rate of least US \$6.50 per hour. All participants were over 18 years of age, voluntarily agreed to participate in this study, and completed the entire survey in one sitting.

¹Mechanical Turk (MTurk) is a widely used platform used in organizational research (Cheung, Burns, Sinclair, & Sliter, 2017). However, Prolific was chosen as the current study's sample recruitment source as participants recruited through Prolific are demographically diverse and provide better quality responses than MTurk participants (Palan & Schitter, 2018). MTurk respondents are known to pass attention and manipulation checks easily due to their extensive survey-taking experience (Peer, Brandimarte, Samat, & Acquisti, 2017).

²We name this age group Gen X+.

Pre-test sample

Prior to collecting the main sample, we pre-tested the survey questionnaire to ensure measurement scale reliability and assess questionnaire clarity (Hair, Celsi, Money, Samouel, & Page, 2015). With 12 participants per age group, the final pre-test sample size was 35, after removing one participant who failed the two attention checks. The pretest sample was similar in demographic diversity to the main sample and consisted of non-managerial workers (72% in Gen Z; 50% in Gen Y; 75% in Gen X+) employed in software/IT (36% in Gen Z; 25% in Gen Y; 0% in Gen X+), finance (10% in Gen Z; 16% in Gen Y; 8% in Gen X+), retail (10% in Gen Z; 0% in Gen Y; 17% in Gen X+), and educational (10% in Gen Z; 42% in Gen Y; 17% in Gen X+) industries among miscellaneous others. As the reliability coefficients (provided in the Measures section) were satisfactory, the main sample was collected with no changes to the questionnaire

Main sample

Prior to launching the survey for the three age groups for the main sample, the 'previous study' pre-screener in Prolific was applied to exclude pre-test respondents. With 120³ responses collected per age group (360 in total), the final main sample size was 335 (Gen Z = 97; Gen Y = 118; Gen X+ = 120) after data cleaning and removing attention checks fails. The sample was evenly split at 50.15% (49.85%) male (female) with an average age of 35.76 years (18–69 years). The racial composition was 73.78% Caucasian, 5.67% African American, 3.51% Hispanic, 13.78% Asian American, and other. The majority of the overall sample (67.83%) had over 5 years of work experience. The occupational and industry composition of the main sample consisted of largely non-managerial workers (80% in Gen Z; 53% in Gen Y; 48% in Gen X+) employed in software/IT (13% in Gen Z; 20% in Gen Y; 22% in Gen X+), finance (7% in Gen Z; 7% in Gen Y; 11% in Gen X+), retail (23% in Gen Z; 7% in Gen Y; 4% in Gen X+), and educational (15% in Gen Z; 13% in Gen Y; 17% in Gen X+) industries among miscellaneous others.

Measures

Job crafting

Job crafting was measured using the scale developed by Tims, Bakker, and Derks (2012). All 21 items (in Supplementary Appendix 2) were based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *never*, 5 = *very often*) and had a Cronbach's alpha of .87 for the pilot sample and .89 for the main study sample.

Proactive personality

We measured proactive personality using the scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). All 17 items (in Supplementary Appendix 2) were based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). The items had a Cronbach's alpha of .91 for the pilot sample and .91 for the main study sample.

ICT-enabled technostress creators

The technostress creators scale by Ayyagari, Grover, and Purvis (2011) consisted of 17 items (in Supplementary Appendix 2) based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*), where each item relates to one of the five sub-factors. The scale included an instruction for the survey-takers that the term ICT referred to 'Information and Communication Technologies including smartphones, laptop computers, and video conferencing tools like Zoom.' The Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .94 for the pilot sample and .93 for the main study sample.

³Like prior behavioral management papers that have employed fsQCA and following scholarly recommendation, a sample size of around 100 - a number too large for traditional qualitative analysis and considered small for traditional quantitative analysis - was deemed appropriate. More details are provided in Supplementary Appendix 1.

Data analysis and calibration

A factor analysis was conducted to confirm the structure of the three main study constructs – job crafting, technostress creators, and proactive personality – and to assess the convergent and discriminant validities of the scales. Most of the factor loadings (presented in Supplementary Appendix 2) were either very close or above the recommended .70 threshold (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010), indicating good convergent validity for these constructs. Additionally, as shown in Table 1, the square roots of the average variance extracted (AVE) values calculated using the factor loadings were all greater than the correlations between constructs, thereby displaying good discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2010).

All scale items were subjected to a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using the open-source structural equation modeling software, Ω nyx.⁴ The fit indices for the three-factor structure ($\chi^2 = 596.18$; $df = 190$, $p < .001$, CFI = .88, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .08) were all acceptable as they were very close to the recommended thresholds (CFI > .90, RMSEA < .05, SRMR < .09) (Hu & Bentler, 1999). A common latent factor (CLF) test was also run in Ω nyx by following prior research and comparing the standardized regression weights of all items for two distinct models – one model with and one model without a common latent factor (Serrano Archimi, Reynaud, Yasin, & Bhatti, 2018). The observed differences in the majority of the obtained regression weights were smaller than the recommended threshold (of less than .20), confirming that common method variance was not a major issue in the dataset (Gaskin, 2018).

The analysis was conducted using the fsQCA 3.0 software⁵ (Ragin & Davey, 2016). The first step involved data calibration, which involved translating all conditions into sets, and whereby each variable value was calibrated to range from 0 to 1 (Ragin, 2000). Given that all study variables were measured via 5-point Likert scales and to avoid the crossover point or point of ‘maximum ambiguity’ (Ragin, 2008, p. 30; Verkuilen, 2005), we used 0 to indicate full non-membership, 1 to indicate full membership, and input .33 and .66 for any in-between anchors. In other words, we avoided the midpoint value (i.e., .5) in the calibration to prevent risking the fsQCA software dropping it from the analysis as the software deems .5 as uninterpretable (neither in nor out of the set). Hence, during the data calibration process, the Likert scale values of 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 were transformed to 0, .33, .66, 1, and 1, respectively. Any in-between values were calibrated to the lower ends. For instance, 1.5, 2.5, and 3.5 were coded as 0, .33, and .66, respectively, whereas 4.5 was coded as 1. This way, full membership was only assigned to those cases that exhibited high values (i.e., >4.0) in the respective variables.

The second step involved constructing a data matrix called the ‘truth table’, which includes all possible combinations of the antecedents examined (Ragin & Davey, 2016). As this study involved 5 technostress creator indicators and proactive personality (6 in total), the initial truth table consisted of 64 rows (2⁶). In a subsequent step, all the rows that included combinations with zero observations were removed and only those configurations that were empirically observed were retained. To further refine the truth table, we relied on the frequency metric, which reflects the extent to which the combinations of attributes have sufficient empirical presence (Ragin, 2000). As the study variables were all continuous, the case threshold was set to 3, following expert guidelines, thereby disregarding configurations with fewer than 3 cases from the analysis (Cheng, Chang, & Li, 2013). In the final step, configurations exhibiting high values in job crafting were determined based on the consistency metric at a threshold cutoff of .80 (Cheng, Chang, & Li, 2013; Covin, Eggers, Kraus, Cheng, & Chang, 2016; Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2018).

Following the above steps, we obtained the three solutions (named complex, parsimonious, and intermediate) that the fsQCA Quine-McCluskey algorithm derives (Fiss, 2011). These

⁴<https://onyx-sem.com/>.

⁵The software is available for free at: <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/software.shtml>. Interested researchers can access the following detailed manual of the software with step-by-step instructions on preparing the dataset and running the analysis - <http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~cragin/fsQCA/download/fsQCAManual.pdf>.

Table 1. Correlations of study variables

Gen Z (N = 97)	1	2.i	2.ii	2.iii	2.iv	2.v	3
1. Job crafting	.73						
2. Technostress creators							
i. Work home conflict	.11	.93					
ii. Privacy invasion	.04	.27**	.88				
iii. Work overload	-.13	.52**	.45**	.80			
iv. Role ambiguity	.05	.40**	.20*	.57**	.81		
v. Job insecurity	.10	.21*	.18	.29**	.40**	.74	
3. Proactive personality	.48**	.02	-.12	-.11	-.01	.01	.68
Gen Y (N = 118)	1	2.i	2.ii	2.iii	2.iv	2.v	3
1. Job crafting	.73						
2. Technostress creators							
i. Work home conflict	-.12	.90					
ii. Privacy invasion	-.13	.48**	.84				
iii. Work overload	-.04	.70**	.62**	.85			
iv. Role ambiguity	-.05	.65**	.56**	.82**	.89		
v. Job insecurity	-.09	.44**	.42**	.56**	.57**	.82	
3. Proactive personality	.48**	-.33**	-.26**	-.26**	-.32**	-.12	.67
Gen X+ (N = 120)	1	2.i	2.ii	2.iii	2.iv	2.v	3
1. Job crafting	.74						
2. Technostress creators							
i. Work home conflict	.13	.92					
ii. Privacy invasion	-.07	.46**	.81				
iii. Work overload	.17	.73**	.65**	.85			
iv. Role ambiguity	.15	.69**	.54**	.85**	.92		
v. Job insecurity	.05	.30**	.46**	.44**	.48**	.81	
3. Proactive personality	.56**	.01	-.11	.06	-.11	-.04	.69
Overall Sample (N = 335)	1	2.i	2.ii	2.iii	2.iv	2.v	3
1. Job crafting	.76						
2. Technostress creators							
i. Work home conflict	.04	.92					
ii. Privacy invasion	-.06	.44**	.82				
iii. Work overload	.02	.67**	.60	.84			
iv. Role ambiguity	.06	.60**	.48**	.76**	.88		
v. Job insecurity	.09	.33**	.38**	.44**	.50**	.80	
3. Proactive personality	.52**	-.11*	-.17**	-.10	-.12*	-.05	.65

Note: **(*) indicates that correlations are significant at the .01(.05) level. Diagonal elements (in bold) are the square roots of the average variance extracted (AVE).

solutions differ based on how they treat ‘logical remainders’ (i.e., the discrepancy between logically possible combinations of conditions and empirically observed cases) (Mello, 2014). Specifically, the complex solution does not make any assumptions regarding cases that are not empirically observed in a dataset even though they could logically be observed, and is therefore, considered a conservative solution. The parsimonious solution, on the other hand, includes the logical remainders, but without evaluating their plausibility. The intermediate solution – which falls between the complex and parsimonious solutions – allows researchers to determine how the logical remainders should be treated on a theoretical basis. In that regard, the intermediate solution is considered superior to the other two (Ragin, 2000), as it neither ignores the logical remainders like complex solution does nor integrates them without a valid theoretical reason like the parsimonious solution. For these reasons, and consistent with previous fsQCA studies (e.g., Covin et al., 2016; Kosmidou & Ahuja, 2019), we only report the intermediate solution in the results.

Moreover, a robustness check was performed, wherein we repeated the previous analytical steps (that had applied a 3-case threshold and .80 consistency cutoff) using 4 cases as the threshold and .85⁶ as the consistency cutoff point. We observed no significant differences among the findings across multiple analyses.

Results and findings

Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics for each generation including means, standard deviations, and minimum/maximum values observed for study variables. Descriptive statistics are reported for both uncalibrated (raw) and calibrated data. Table 1 presents the correlations between study variables for each generation and for the entire sample. Although the study was designed to collect and analyze equal (120) responses per generational group, the final sample sizes for the three groups were unequal from respondents being dropped (see Main sample section) and we, therefore, acknowledge the possibility of unequal variances among samples when interpreting the results. A preliminary reading of the correlations table reveals that proactive personality had a statistically significant relationship with job crafting for all generations and for the entire sample.

Table 3 shows results of the necessary conditions analysis and reveals whether any factor’s presence or absence is necessary for job crafting to be observed. In other words, an individual factor is considered *necessary* when its absence cannot be compensated by the presence of any other factor in the model (Dul, 2016). Necessary conditions are assessed through their consistency scores of at least .90 (Schneider & Wagemann, 2010). These scores reflect how consistently such conditions predict an outcome variable like job crafting. As seen in Table 3, the *presence* of proactive personality had the highest consistency score across the three generations (Gen Z = .96, Gen Y = .96, and Gen X+ = .97) among all observed conditions in their presence as well as in their absence. All other variable scores being lower than .90 indicates that neither the presence nor absence of any factor in technostress creators was necessary for job crafting to occur. Hence, we answer Research Question 1a by stating that proactive personality is a necessary attribute found in all obtained configurations of ICT-enabled technostress creators that show the presence of job crafting. In other words, proactive personality configures with technostress creators to drive job crafting because employees must possess this trait for them to display job crafting behavior when they are faced with technostress creating demands at work. Furthermore, as proactive personality was found to be a necessary condition for job crafting consistently for Gen Z, Gen Y, and Gen X+ workers, this necessary condition did not differ for each generation, thus answering Research Question 1b.

⁶Setting a higher raw consistency and case threshold increases confidence that the initial results were not produced due to random chance.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for uncalibrated and calibrated data

	N	Uncalibrated data statistics				Calibrated data statistics			
		Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Gen Z (Born 1997–2012)									
<i>Job crafting</i>	97	3.02	.61	1.62	4.71	.49	.21	.00	1.00
<i>Technostress creators</i>									
Work home conflict	97	2.84	1.10	1.00	5.00	.52	.32	.00	1.00
Privacy invasion	97	3.32	1.03	1.00	5.00	.65	.32	.00	1.00
Work overload	97	2.89	1.06	1.00	5.00	.54	.33	.00	1.00
Role ambiguity	97	2.49	.95	1.00	4.75	.40	.31	.00	1.00
Job insecurity	97	2.37	.87	1.00	5.00	.37	.29	.00	1.00
<i>Proactive personality</i>	97	3.56	.61	2.12	4.94	.69	.21	.00	1.00
Gen Y (Born 1981–1996)									
<i>Job crafting</i>	118	3.13	.66	1.67	5.00	.54	.22	.00	1.00
<i>Technostress creators</i>									
Work home conflict	118	2.41	1.08	1.00	5.00	.38	.35	.00	1.00
Privacy invasion	118	2.87	1.29	1.00	5.00	.51	.38	.00	1.00
Work overload	118	2.41	1.11	1.00	5.00	.37	.33	.00	1.00
Role ambiguity	118	2.31	1.07	1.00	5.00	.34	.31	.00	1.00
Job insecurity	118	2.42	1.08	1.00	5.00	.38	.34	.00	1.00
<i>Proactive personality</i>	118	3.74	.60	2.29	5.00	.74	.21	.00	1.00
Gen X+ (Born 1946–1980)									
<i>Job crafting</i>	120	2.89	.67	1.48	5.00	.46	.23	.00	1.00
<i>Technostress creators</i>									
Work Home conflict	120	2.33	1.07	1.00	5.00	.34	.33	.00	1.00
Privacy invasion	120	2.90	1.19	1.00	5.00	.53	.36	.00	1.00
Work overload	120	2.36	1.14	1.00	5.00	.37	.36	.00	1.00
Role ambiguity	120	2.09	1.01	1.00	4.75	.28	.31	.00	1.00
Job insecurity	120	2.28	1.04	1.00	5.00	.34	.32	.00	1.00
<i>Proactive personality</i>	120	3.60	.68	1.71	5.00	.68	.23	.00	1.00

Note: N = 335.

Beyond discovering the necessary conditions, fsQCA also displays results for sufficient conditions. Tables 4 and 5 include all the *sufficient* configurations for the presence and absence of job crafting, respectively, that bear relevance for job crafting literature. Sufficient conditions are those that produce the outcome of interest by themselves (Fainshmidt, Witt, Aguilera, & Verbeke, 2020). The strength of these configurations is assessed based on their consistency and coverage metrics (Ragin, 2008). Whereas the consistency metric captures the extent to which the configurations can produce (i.e., are consistent with) the examined outcome (Fainshmidt et al., 2020) and is the equivalent of statistical significance in a regression model, the coverage metric reflects the extent to which the configurations can sufficiently explain job crafting and is similar to the

Table 3. Analysis of necessary conditions for presence of job crafting

	Consistency	Coverage
Gen Z (Born 1997–2012)		
Work home conflict	.717	.677
~Work home conflict	.645	.667
Privacy invasion	.827	.632
~Privacy invasion	.513	.716
Work overload	.724	.662
~Work overload	.658	.706
Role ambiguity	.620	.774
~Role ambiguity	.783	.639
Job insecurity	.579	.762
~Job insecurity	.830	.655
Proactive personality	.965	.687
~Proactive personality	.509	.819
Gen Y (Born 1981–1996)		
Work home conflict	.520	.746
~Work home conflict	.776	.679
Privacy invasion	.622	.669
~Privacy invasion	.637	.701
Work overload	.520	.768
~Work overload	.791	.680
Role ambiguity	.494	.792
~Role ambiguity	.822	.676
Job insecurity	.561	.793
~Job insecurity	.756	.667
Proactive personality	.958	.699
~Proactive personality	.417	.886
Gen X+ (Born 1946–1980)		
Work home conflict	.529	.722
~Work home conflict	.781	.547
Privacy invasion	.708	.614
~Privacy invasion	.633	.628
Work overload	.565	.702
~Work overload	.750	.554
Role ambiguity	.470	.781
~Role ambiguity	.834	.535
Job insecurity	.541	.739
~Job insecurity	.811	.568
Proactive personality	.970	.656
~Proactive personality	.515	.756

Note: ~ indicates absence of the variable.

Table 4. Causal configurations leading to presence of job crafting

	Gen Z					Gen Y					Gen X +			
	C1	C2	C3	C4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	
<i>Technostress creators</i>														
Work home conflict	○		●	●	○	○	●		●	●	●		○	
Privacy invasion			●	●	●		●		○		●	●	●	
Work overload	○	○		●		○	●	○	○	○		●	○	
Role ambiguity	○	○	○		○	○	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	
Job insecurity	○	○	○		○	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	●	
<i>Proactive personality</i>														
Raw coverage	.49	.59	.58	.58	.38	.35	.27	.35	.22	.30	.30	.34	.28	
Unique coverage	.01	.02	.07	.17	.10	.08	.02	.12	.02	.04	.01	.14	.09	
Consistency	.77	.83	.82	.86	.89	.90	.91	.92	.93	.88	.88	.91	.90	
Solution coverage	.87				.69					.60				
Solution consistency	.76				.81					.84				

Notes: QCA output of all three solutions. 'C' stands for (sufficient) 'condition'. Black circles ('●') indicate the presence of causal antecedents and white circles ('○') indicate the negation or absence of causal antecedents. Large circles indicate core conditions or conditions that are part of both parsimonious and intermediate solutions. Small circles refer to peripheral conditions or conditions that occur only in the intermediate solution. The cells that are left blank indicate the 'irrelevant' conditions (e.g., Neither the presence nor absence of privacy invasion in Gen Z, C1 changes the configurational make-up of C1 for the presence of job crafting).

Table 5. Causal configurations leading to the absence of job crafting

	Gen Z					Gen Y					Gen X+						
	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7
<i>Technostress creators</i>																	
Work home conflict	○	○	●	●	●	○	●	○	○	○	●	○	●	○	○	○	○
Privacy invasion	○	○	○	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	●	●
Work overload	○	○	○	●	●	○	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Role ambiguity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
Job insecurity	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○
<i>Proactive personality</i>																	
Raw coverage	.50	.55	.60	.45	.45	.43	.32	.26	.42	.35	.26	.32	.26	.35	.18	.42	.44
Unique coverage	.04	.01	.03	.03	.03	.02	.02	.05	.00	.00	.02	.04	.02	.09	.02	.00	.00
Consistency	.81	.79	.86	.88	.91	.82	.91	.89	.82	.89	.86	.95	.88	.97	.88	.90	.91
Solution coverage	.79				.59						.72						
Solution consistency	.77				.82						.87						

Notes: QCA output of all three solutions. Black circles (●), white circles (○), large circles (○), large circles, small circles, and blank cells are represented the same way as described in Table 4 notes.

coefficient of determination (R^2). As seen in Table 4, all consistency scores were above the recommended .75 threshold (Fainshmidt et al., 2020; Ragin, 2008) suggesting that these configurations were sufficient for the presence and absence of job crafting.

Following prior research by Fiss (2011) and Pittino, Visintin, and Lauto (2018), core and peripheral conditions are also reported in Tables 4 and 5. Because core conditions have the strongest empirical evidence linking them to job crafting, they appear in both the intermediate and parsimonious solutions. In contrast, peripheral conditions are non-essential (Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2018) for high levels in job crafting and are, therefore, eliminated from the parsimonious (i.e., reduced) solution. The configurations obtained for each generation are described and interpreted ahead. Finding multiple configurations of proactive personality and ICT-enabled technostress creators to detect the presence (absence) of job crafting is a contribution of the current fsQCA-based research in showing that many different paths, and not just one optimal path in a model, drive job crafting behaviors (equifinality), which contrasts with linear methodologies (Supplementary Appendix 1). Beyond answering the research questions posed in this study, we deem it appropriate to present and discuss the following sufficient conditions adhering to fsQCA protocol and because they bear theoretical and practical implications for job crafting research.

Gen Z configurations (under 25 years)

As shown in Tables 4 and 5, for Gen Z workers, there were four (five) configurations (sufficient conditions) leading to the presence (absence) of job crafting, respectively. Proactive personality being a necessary condition for Gen Z means that when this trait combines with the five technostress creators, there will no observable combinations that reveal the presence of job crafting if proactive personality were absent (Note that in C1 proactive personality is irrelevant,⁷ not absent). An interesting finding regarding proactive Gen Z workers is that when they experience a combination of work home conflict, privacy invasion, and work overload, they job craft (C4). Relating this finding to job crafting's factors, Gen Z – as the newest generation in the workforce – may be mitigating their ICT-enabled stress by increasing their social job resources through networking and getting coached by coworkers. Such social support from colleagues has shown to help when struggling with family-work conflicts (van Daalen, Willemsen, Sanders, & van Veldhoven, 2009). Moreover, Gen Z may be proactively seeking feedback and strategies from their supervisors on dealing with communication overload and invasion of their privacy. Also, role ambiguity and ICT-related job insecurity were not a concern for Gen Z (no configuration revealed their presence in Tables 4 or 5) perhaps due to their comfort with ICT devices and general perception of embracing technology. The configurations that showed the absence of job crafting (Table 5) for Gen Z contained peripheral conditions of work home conflict, privacy invasion, and work overload (C4 & C5). As peripheral conditions, these can be interpreted as Gen Z not engaging in craft behaviors when such ICT demands are weak.

Gen Y configurations (25–40 years)

For Gen Y workers, there were five (five) configurations leading to the presence (absence) of job crafting, respectively. Proactive Gen Y seemed to craft their job characteristics when faced with ICT work overload, role ambiguity, and job insecurity (C4). Increasing one's workload strategically is considered synonymous with crafting by increasing challenging job demands like taking on extra tasks and new projects (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). Even though these challenging job demands require more effort, employees who engage in such crafting behavior view this workload as beneficial for their career and personal growth. We contend that Gen Y, or millennials, who

⁷A condition in a configuration is considered irrelevant (or a 'do not care') if its presence or absence in no way affects the outcome and the condition does not play a role in a specific configuration (Fiss, 2011; Pappas & Woodside, 2021).

possess considerable work experience, are somewhat good with ICT (Vogels, 2019), and seek job advancement and enrichment from their work (Magni & Manzoni, 2020), could be taking advantage of their ICT-enabled work overload by strategically increasing their challenging job demands. Additionally, when faced with role ambiguity, proactive Gen Y may be job crafting by actively decreasing their hindering job demands like finding solutions to their ICT issues to prioritize work tasks. This finding is consistent with experimental research that found that proactive individuals utilized the ‘confront’ aspect of this trait to handle difficult ICT-enabled technostress-creating situations (Sumiyana & Sriwidharmanely, 2020). Finally, Gen Y revealed a configuration for the presence of job crafting (Table 4, C3) that was similar to one found in Gen Z for absence (Table 5, C4).

Gen X+ configurations (over 40 years)

Lastly, there were four (seven) configurations leading to the presence (absence) of job crafting, respectively for Gen X+ workers. Interestingly, Gen X+ (C3) shared an exact same presence configuration with Gen Y (C4). Unlike Gen Z, for whom job insecurity was not a technostress creator, Gen X+ group contained two configurations that showed high levels of this ICT demand (C3 & C4). The demands-resources perspective maintains that feelings of job insecurity can be reduced by increasing one’s structural resources like learning new skills and engaging in professional development activities (Jiang, Xu, & Wang, 2021). Being less technologically adept than younger generations, Gen X+ are likely to be concerned about ICT replacing their jobs and could be engaging in *work pressure* crafting (Kooij, Nijssen, Bal, & van der Kruijssen, 2020) to reduce job insecurity. Our findings are useful for organizations to create developmental opportunities for concerned Gen X+ workers so that they could improve their structural job resources and thereby, engage in a positive form of job crafting.

Discussion

The highlight of this research involved using a novel methodology to present the various ways in which ICT-related drivers of job crafting act in concert for Gen Z, Gen Y, and Gen X+ workers. The robustness of the sample size and study design that followed fsQCA guidelines ensured rigor in the current qualitative research. In understanding the synergistic drivers of job crafting through the lens of Job Demands-Resources theory, ICT-enabled technostress creators were contextualized as job demands. The discovery of proactive personality as a necessary attribute for job crafting complements and reinforces the prior JD-R theoretical notion and regression-based findings wherein this trait shares a statistically significant relationship with job crafting (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Plomp, Tims, Akkermans, Khapova, Jansen, & Bakker, 2016; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). Hence, a contribution of this research lies in recognizing that while proactive personality should be present when job crafting is observed, this trait is not the only reason that an individual displays craft behavior when experiencing ICT overuse.

Regarding the research gap of comparing job crafting – a specific work behavior – across generations, the study had some interesting takeaways. While Gen Y and Gen X+ shared one exact same set of drivers that led them to job craft, we also discovered that for a different set of drivers that led Gen Y to job craft, the absence of those same drivers showed the absence of job crafting in Gen Z. The emergence of such a variety of configurations informs us that both the presence and absence of certain technostress creators could result in job crafting behaviors. Such combinatorial nuances found in these generations are consistent with extant literature that has found small differences in workplace attitudes and intentions among generations. The current study validates the existence of such slight differences even for a work behavior.

For an overarching discussion, it appears that Gen Y and Gen X+ share more behavioral similarities when faced with ICT demands than Gen Z. For instance, even the absence of work home conflict could make Gen Y and Gen X+ workers job craft when job insecurity is present, which

was not the case for Gen Z. These dissimilarities observed for Gen Z are somewhat consistent with prior evidence that Gen Z see technology as an ‘extension of themselves’ (and are less threatened by it) as opposed to the older generations who hold a negative perception of the prevalence of ICT, viewing it as an invasion and addiction (Vigo, 2019). ICT-enabled role ambiguity was also not problematic for Gen Z as they seem comfortable with resolving ICT problems that hinder their work tasks. Interestingly, Gen Z – who are more engaged on social media and ICT devices – share a concern for strong privacy invading ICT demands just like the other two generations. In this regard, our study lends a perspective concerning the stereotypical notion about the younger generation’s comfortability with technology. We show that even though certain technostress creators like job insecurity may not be a concern for Gen Z, they are certainly stressed about their work ICT devices tracing or monitoring their private activities. Gen Z also seem to have some dissimilar concerns than millennials specific to ICT demands. Hence, such findings carry practical implications for managers to exercise caution in not hastily assuming that the newest generation in the workforce shares all the same concerns as its predecessor.

Theoretical implications

As a case-oriented qualitative methodology that is based on a set-theoretic approach, fsQCA enriches job crafting research by enabling a mid-range theoretical advancement of the JD-R framework (Fiss, 2007; Supplementary Appendix 1). Whereas high-level general theories can be applied to various contexts, mid-range theories provide generalizable explanations of phenomena as they occur within a given context or for a specific sample (Boer, Holweg, Kilduff, Pagell, Schmenner, & Voss, 2015). Hence, we build on JD-R’s framework to offer a midrange theory that is detailed enough to explain job crafting within the ICT setting for the specific set of cases discovered in the current study results, thereby allowing researchers to interpret these unique and mixed findings. Our explanatory study contributes to JD-R theory by contextualizing proactive personality as a necessary resource for job crafting when Gen Z, Y, or X+ individuals attempt to mitigate their ICT demands. By utilizing fsQCA for theory advancement, this study joins prior micro-focused management research that have proposed mid-range theory (e.g., Kroon & Paauwe, 2021).

The present research contemporizes and elaborates JD-R theory by incorporating ICT as a modern-day job demand. Additionally, an understanding of how different ICT demands drive individuals to job craft makes JD-R theory relevant in the Covid-19 era as organizations increased their ICT usage for teleworking. For instance, among the five technostress factors, invasion of privacy and work home conflict were the two highest number of configurations (8 and 5, respectively) that led to job crafting across generations. This finding is consistent with related research on the effects of the pandemic regarding how increased work overload and privacy invasion led to more work-home conflict for employees (Vaziri, Casper, Wayne, & Matthews, 2020). By offering comparisons of three generations, the study found that each ICT demand impacts each generation differently, thereby allowing for the varied appropriation of JD-R theory. An additional contribution of this research is in the configurational theorizing of JD-R framework by showing that job crafting is a complex, configurational outcome phenomenon that results from demands- and resources-related variables configuring in a variety of ways to create paths that cannot be adequately explained by linear relationships and singular theory.

Implications for practice and policy

The findings of this study can offer useful insights for organizational managers and policymakers toward updating management practices in today’s digital age by understanding their organization’s technostress-inducing situations. Managers must understand that configurations of proactive personality and ICT-enabled technostress creators could act as collective drivers of job crafting and utilize this understanding to minimize technostress-creating situations for their

employees. Managers should assess the potential of extensive ICT usage to increase technostress as well as understand which of their employees are engaging in crafting behaviors to reduce privacy invasion, techno overload, and work-home conflict and then attempt to reduce technostress by implementing on-demand trainings and interventions. Employees improved their wellbeing when they participated in organization-led job crafting interventions like additional training days and being allowed more hands-on time at developmental activities designed to help them become self-managers (Van den Heuvel, Demerouti, & Peeters, 2015). Managers could customize such interventions knowing that not all their employees proactively engage in job crafting.

While proactive personality is a necessary condition for job crafting to occur, there may be workers in all generations who possess a proactive personality but do not engage in job crafting (Table 5). To help reduce technostress, managers should offer proactive employees who already job craft promotion-focused job crafting tips (like leveraging ICT-based tools more to work with virtual teams) and provide guidance on prevention-focused job crafting to proactive employees who do not job craft (like reducing hindering ICT device demands and allowing them to maintain strict work and personal hours). During the Covid-19 pandemic's work-from-home situation and going forward, it has become imperative that organizational policies allow employees to access and utilize work resources with ease. In the wake of many remote employees running into technical issues with their official ICT devices or systems at home and finding it difficult to connect with the company's IT teams, experts offered suggestions like reaching out to tech-savvy colleagues and friends or even crowdsourcing solutions online (Forbes, 2021). Policymakers of multinational companies can educate themselves of such additional technostress-inducing situations for employees working from various locations and relax organizational integration norms that pressure employees to stay connected and respond to work matters outside of their working hours (Derks, van Mierlo, & Schmitz, 2014).

Knowing now that such multiple combinations of demands-resource attributes can lead to crafting behaviors differently in workers of different generations, organizations should create customized stress-reduction strategies. For instance, managers could help Gen Z employees' concerns about privacy invasion and work overload simultaneously (as they tend to occur hand-in-hand; see C4 in Table 4) and Gen X+ employees' ICT-related work home conflict, while also helping millennials address other concerning aspects of their job like finding meaning at work and obtaining more feedback (Magni & Manzoni, 2020).

Limitations and future directions

Despite the contributions of this research, the cross-sectional single-source design and US-only sample are noted as limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. Although traits like proactive personality remain relatively stable over a person's lifetime (McCrae & Costa, 1985; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986), incorporating longitudinal data in fsQCA would offer improved appraisals of ICT-related job crafting behaviors during an employee's job tenure. Even though ICT-enabled technostress creators and job crafting behaviors may be independently relevant for organizations and workers of any geographic location, the current fsQCA results obtained for a US sample are not generalizable for non-US entities (Misangyi, Greckhamer, Furnari, Fiss, Crilly, & Aguilera, 2017). Hence, future research should investigate whether ICT (over)use in various national and cultural contexts lead to consistent crafting endeavors by employees. Moreover, ICT-enabled technostress factors were examined as drivers of overall job crafting in the current study. Future research should examine configurations generated from each job crafting (resource and demand) factor to understand how various technostress creators manifest crafting behaviors (e.g., whether the presence of ICT-enabled work overload makes employees increase their challenging job demands). With the current research presenting comparisons and contrasts across three generational groups, future studies could incorporate employee age as an antecedent. Lastly, a limitation regarding configurational theorizing is

noted, in that this study did not utilize Furnari, Crilly, Misangyi, Greckhamer, Fiss, and Aguilera's (2020) suggestion of 'naming' configurations so as to further interpret emerging themes.

Conclusion

Through the demands-resources theoretical perspective and by using fsQCA, the present research configured proactive personality and technostress creators as drivers of job crafting behavior. Among the various configurations that emerged, we consistently found that employees with proactive personality in all three generations engaged in job crafting when faced with different forms of ICT demands. This finding suggests that proactive personality would dictate potential job crafting behaviors under stressful conditions like those caused by excessive ICT usage. The results of this study are particularly relevant for organizations – that employ workers of different ages – to understand which combinational factors drives each generation to job craft differently to reduce their ICT demand.

Using a novel methodology – that captures combinatorial effects as opposed to net effects – to analyze job crafting, we conducted rigorous case-oriented qualitative research for variable-oriented constructs that have, thus far, been largely analyzed through conventional quantitative linear techniques. fsQCA brought out those intricate intermingling among the resource and demand factors contextualized in this research. By offering proactive personality as a *necessary* condition within the various *sufficient* configurations of ICT demands, the present research offers new (and complementary) meaning to the prior regression-based findings regarding this trait's relationship with job crafting.

Supplementary material. The supplementary material for this article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2022.56>.

Conflict of interest. The author(s) declare none.

References

- Aguiar-Quintana, T., Nguyen, T. H. H., Araujo-Cabrera, Y., & Sanabria-Díaz, J. M. (2021). Do job insecurity, anxiety and depression caused by the COVID-19 pandemic influence hotel employees' self-rated task performance? The moderating role of employee resilience. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *94*, 102868.
- Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological antecedents and implications. *MIS Quarterly*, *35*(4), 831–858.
- Baker, R., & Slemp, G. (2018). An introduction to micro job crafting: How job crafting for 12 min or less a day contributes to sustainable positive behaviour change. CIPD Applied Research Conference.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Taris, T. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. (2003). A multigroup analysis of the job demands-resources model in four home care organizations. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *10*(1), 16.
- Bakker, A. B., & de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job demands–resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, *34*(1), 1–21.
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations*, *65*(10), 1359–1378.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*(2), 103–118.
- 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.
- Boer, H., Holweg, M., Kilduff, M., Pagell, M., Schmenner, R., & Voss, C. (2015). Making a meaningful contribution to theory. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *35*(9), 1231–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-03-2015-0119>.
- Boudrias, V., Trépanier, S. G., Foucreault, A., Peterson, C., & Fernet, C. (2020). Investigating the role of psychological need satisfaction as a moderator in the relationship between job demands and turnover intention among nurses. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, *42*(1), 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2018-0277>.
- Bresman, H., & Rao, V. D. (2017). A survey of 19 countries shows how generations X, Y, and Z are – and aren't – different. *Harvard Business Review*, *25*, 1–8.
- Cennamo, L., & Gardner, D. (2008). Generational differences in work values, outcomes and person-organisation values fit. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*(8), 891–906.

- Cheng, C. F., Chang, M. L., & Li, C. S. (2013). Configural paths to successful product innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(12), 2561–2573.
- Cheung, J. H., Burns, D. K., Sinclair, R. R., & Sliter, M. (2017). Amazon Mechanical Turk in organizational psychology: An evaluation and practical recommendations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 32(4), 347–361.
- Cornelissen, J., Höllerer, M. A., & Seidl, D. (2021). What theory is and can be: Forms of theorizing in organizational scholarship. *Organization Theory*, 2(3), 1–19.
- Covin, J. G., Eggers, F., Kraus, S., Cheng, C. F., & Chang, M. L. (2016). Marketing-related resources and radical innovativeness in family and non-family firms: A configurational approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5620–5627.
- Cucina, J. M., Byle, K. A., Martin, N. R., Peyton, S. T., & Gast, I. F. (2018). Generational differences in workplace attitudes and job satisfaction: Lack of sizable differences across cohorts. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33(3), 246–264. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-03-2017-0115>.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499.
- Denoo, L., & Soh, P. H. (2018, July). A configurational approach to when entrepreneurs use strong or weak ties to attract their customers. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2018, No. 1, p. 10849). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Derks, D., van Mierlo, H., & Schmitz, E. B. (2014). A diary study on work-related smartphone use, psychological detachment and exhaustion: Examining the role of the perceived segmentation norm. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(1), 74–84.
- Dul, J. (2016). Identifying single necessary conditions with NCA and fsQCA. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(4), 1516–1523.
- Fainshmidt, S., Witt, M. A., Aguilera, R. V., & Verbeke, A. (2020). *The contributions of qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to international business research*, 51, 455–466.
- Fiss, P. C. (2007). A set-theoretic approach to organizational configurations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1180–1198.
- Fiss, P. C. (2011). Building better causal theories: A fuzzy set approach to typologies in organization research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 393–420.
- Forbes. (2021). 16 Tips To Help Remote Workers Solve Tech Issues (And Avoid Them In The First Place). Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/07/08/16-tips-to-help-remote-workers-solve-tech-issues-and-avoid-them-in-the-first-place/?sh=346f401b21ee>.
- Furnari, S., Crilly, D., Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Fiss, P. C., & Aguilera, R. (2020). Capturing causal complexity: Heuristics for configurational theorizing. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(4).
- Gabriel, A. S., Campbell, J. T., Djurdjevic, E., Johnson, R. E., & Rosen, C. C. (2018). Fuzzy profiles: Comparing and contrasting latent profile analysis and fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis for person-centered research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(4), 877–904.
- Gaskin, J. (2018). Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Gaskination's StatWiki. Retrieved from http://statwiki.kolobkreatations.com/index.php?title=Confirmatory_Factor_Analysis.
- Gong, B., Greenwood, R. A., Hoyte, D., Ramkissoon, A., & He, X. (2018). Millennials and organizational citizenship behavior: The role of job crafting and career anchor on service. *Management Research Review*, 41(7), 774–788. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2016-0121>.
- Greckhamer, T., Misangyi, V. F., Elms, H., & Lacey, R. (2008). Using qualitative comparative analysis in strategic management research: An examination of combinations of industry, corporate, and business-unit effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 695–726.
- Gresov, C., & Drazin, R. (1997). Equifinality: Functional equivalence in organization design. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 403–428.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Hair, J., Celsi, M., Money, A., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2015). *Business research methods*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Hamouche, S. (2021). Human resource management and the COVID-19 crisis: Implications, challenges, opportunities, and future organizational directions. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2021.15>.
- Hardré, P. L. (2003). Beyond two decades of motivation: A review of the research and practice in instructional design and human performance technology. *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(1), 54–81.
- Harms, R., Kraus, S., & Schwarz, E. (2009). The suitability of the configuration approach in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 21(1), 25–49.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
- Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Giancaspro, M. L., Manuti, A., Molino, M., Russo, V., ... Cortese, C. G. (2021). Workload, techno overload, and behavioral stress during COVID-19 emergency: The role of job crafting in remote workers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1141.
- Jiang, L., Xu, X., & Wang, H. J. (2021). A resources–demands approach to sources of job insecurity: A multilevel meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(2), 108.

- Khedhaouria, A., & Cucchi, A. (2019). Technostress creators, personality traits, and job burnout: A fuzzy-set configurational analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 349–361.
- Kooij, D. T., Nijssen, H., Bal, P. M., & van der Kruijssen, D. T. (2020). Crafting an interesting job: Stimulating an active role of older workers in enhancing their daily work engagement and job performance. *Work, Aging and Retirement*, 6(3), 165–174.
- Kosmidou, V., & Ahuja, M. K. (2019). A configurational approach to family firm innovation. *Family Business Review*, 32(2), 154–173.
- Kraus, S., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., & Schüssler, M. (2018). Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) in entrepreneurship and innovation research—the rise of a method. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 14(1), 15–33.
- Kroon, B., & Paauwe, J. (2021). HRM In 21st century small organizations: A midrange typology to describe, contrast and contextualize the phenomenon. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1915359>.
- Laker, B., Patel, C., Budhwar, P., & Malik, A. (2020). How job crafting can make work more satisfying. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 62(2).
- 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.
- Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2016). Job crafting and motivation to continue working beyond retirement age. *Career Development International*, 21(5), 477–497. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-01-2016-0009>.
- Loi, R., Liu, Y., Lam, L. W., & Xu, A. J. (2016). Buffering emotional job demands: The interplay between proactive personality and team potency. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 95, 128–137.
- Magni, F., & Manzoni, B. (2020). Generational differences in workers' expectations: Millennials want more of the same things. *European Management Review*, 17(4), 901–914.
- Marx, A., Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. (2014). The origins, development, and application of qualitative comparative analysis: The first 25 years. *European Political Science Review*, 6(1), 115–142.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1985). Updating Norman's "adequacy taxonomy": Intelligence and personality dimensions in natural language and in questionnaires. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(3), 710.
- Mello, P. A. (2014). Fuzzy-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis. In *Democratic Participation in Armed Conflict* (pp. 46–62). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Meyer, A. D., Tsui, A. S., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Configurational approaches to organizational analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1175–1195.
- Misangyi, V. F., & Acharya, A. G. (2014). Substitutes or complements? A configurational examination of corporate governance mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(6), 1681–1705.
- Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., Crilly, D., & Aguilera, R. (2017). Embracing causal complexity: The emergence of a neo-configurational perspective. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 255–282.
- Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., ... Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during COVID-19 remote working: An investigation using the Italian translation of the technostress creators scale. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 5911.
- Olya, H. G., & Gavilyan, Y. (2017). Configurational models to predict residents' support for tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(7), 893–912.
- Palan, S., & Schitter, C. (2018). Prolific.ac – A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17, 22–27.
- Palmer, T. B., Phadke, S., Nair, M. V., & Flanagan, D. J. (2019). Examination of sustainability goals: A comparative study of US and Indian firms. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2019.9>.
- Pappas, I. O., & Woodside, A. G. (2021). Fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA): Guidelines for research practice in information systems and marketing. *International Journal of Information Management*, 58, 102310.
- Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 153–163.
- Pfaffinger, K. F., Reif, J. A., & Spieß, E. (2022). When and why telepressure and technostress creators impair employee well-being. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 28(2), 958–973.
- Pignata, S., Winefield, A. H., Provis, C., & Boyd, C. M. (2016). A longitudinal study of the predictors of perceived procedural justice in Australian University staff. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1271.
- Pittino, D., Visintin, F., & Lauto, G. (2016). A configurational analysis of the antecedents of entrepreneurial orientation. *European Management Journal*, 35(2), 224–237.
- Pittino, D., Visintin, F., & Lauto, G. (2018). Fly away from the nest? A configurational analysis of family embeddedness and individual attributes in the entrepreneurial entry decision by next-generation members. *Family Business Review*, 31(3), 271–294.
- Plomp, J., Tims, M., Akkermans, J., Khapova, S. N., Jansen, P. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Career competencies and job crafting: How proactive employees influence their well-being. *Career Development International*, 21(6), 587–602. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-08-2016-0145>.
- Ragin, C. C. (2000). *Fuzzy-set social science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Ragin, C. C. (2008). Measurement versus calibration: A set-theoretic approach. In *The Oxford handbook of political methodology*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0008>
- Ragin, C. C., & Davey, S. (2016). *Fuzzy-set/qualitative comparative analysis 3.0*. Irvine: Department of Sociology, University of California.
- Roig-Tierno, N., Gonzalez-Cruz, T. F., & Llopis-Martinez, J. (2017). An overview of qualitative comparative analysis: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 2(1), 15–23.
- 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.
- Schneider, C. Q., & Wagemann, C. (2010). Standards of good practice in qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) and fuzzy-sets. *Comparative Sociology*, 9(3), 397–418.
- Serrano Archimi, C., Reynaud, E., Yasin, H. M., & Bhatti, Z. A. (2018). How perceived corporate social responsibility affects employee cynicism: The mediating role of organizational trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 907–921.
- Staw, B. M., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A lifetime longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(1), 56–77.
- Sumiya, S., & Sriwidharmanely, S. (2020). Mitigating the harmful effects of technostress: Inducing chaos theory in an experimental setting. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 39(10), 1079–1093.
- 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.
- van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., Sanders, K., & van Veldhoven, M. J. (2009). Emotional exhaustion and mental health problems among employees doing “people work”: The impact of job demands, job resources and family-to-work conflict. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 82(3), 291–303.
- Van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. (2015). The job crafting intervention: Effects on job resources, self-efficacy, and affective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(3), 511–532.
- Vaziri, H., Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Matthews, R. A. (2020). Changes to the work–family interface during the COVID-19 pandemic: Examining predictors and implications using latent transition analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(10), 1073.
- Verkuilen, J. (2005). Assigning membership in a fuzzy set analysis. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 33(4), 462–496.
- Vigo, J. (2019, 13 August). Generation Z And New Technology’s Effect On Culture. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/julianvigo/2019/08/31/generation-z-and-new-technologys-effect-on-culture/?sh=7ae959ee5c2a>.
- Vis, B. (2012). The comparative advantages of fsQCA and regression analysis for moderately large-N analyses. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 41(1), 168–198.
- Vogels, E. (2019). *Millennials stand out for their technology use, but older generations also embrace digital life*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/09/09/us-generations-technology-use/>.
- Wong, C. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (2017). Job crafting: Older workers’ mechanism for maintaining person-job fit. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1548.
- 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). Bingley, West Yorkshire: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Yang, G., Bai, X., & Yang, S. (2021). Chief executive officer proactive personality and acquisitions: A fuzzy Set qualitative comparative analysis of China’s listed firms. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 703678. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.703678>.