How Job Crafting facilitate Work engagement: Exploring the mediating role of work meaningfulness in the service sector

Reviewer Affiliation
STMIK DCI
Manuscript ID:
MRR-06-2023-0464
Manuscript Type
Original Article
Keywords
Job Crafting, Service sector, JDR theory, Metacognition, Social Expansion, work meaningfulness
Field Categories
Human Resource Management
Date Assigned:
30-Aug-2023
Date Review Returned:
21-Sep-2023

---

req **1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?**

There are still very few researchers who discuss the influence of job crafting on employee work behavior using Bruning and Champion (2018) theoretical lens

req **2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?**

This paper seems to have a strong psychological emphasis, so it seems to address relevant literature in the field in relation to its goals. I recommend some additions to this particular paper.

1. I think the author can provide a paragraph on Bruning and Campion theory (taxonomy) and then highlight the role of the adopted theory in each hypothesis development.
2. Regarding the examination of the effects of mediation, please, justify the reason for studying the mediation variable. For example, it could be explained like "xxx et al. (2014) noted that studying a mediation allows one to better understand the conditions in which a variable most strongly impacts an outcome variable. According to this, the study posits that work meaningfulness of employee can explain how JC can strengthening employee work engagement.

req **3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?**

The methodological approach and conceptual framing seem very robust.
Nevertheless, and in a bid to add further clarity to the methodology section, the author should consider the following aspects:

1. There is a need to clarify the data source, it is stated in several parts that this research examines workers in the service sector, however in the sample and data collection section it is stated that the sample was taken from manufacturing and service sector companies. Clarifications on these aspects will help to confirm the data source.

2. How does the author ensure that the source data has been gathered originally using reliable instruments and would be appropriate to measure the underlying factors supporting the four variables under study? Clarifications on these aspects will help to confirm the reliability of the data set and soundness of the reported findings.

3. Which method was used for calculating the sample size?

4. What is the response rate for the data that has been distributed to respondents?

req 4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

In general, results are clear, they say what they want to say. However, the discussion should explain the results with the help of adopting theory.

1. As per the findings, the variable "Work meaningfulness" plays an important mediating role in the model (metacognition (job crafting) and work engagement). The author could have elaborated further on this finding.

2. The two relevant theories are mentioned in the first part of Introduction. Please open up an idea of how the theory explains the hypothesized relationships (in the discussion Section). For example, for the JDR Theory, the concept of job crafting suggests that employees can take individual actions to reduce avoidable job demands and to enhance desirable job resources.

3. Instead of simply listing existing research results, the focus should be on the core results obtained in this research and a comparative analysis should be conducted with existing research results to improve your logical chain and provide your own explanation.

req 5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

The paper clearly identifies implications for
practice and future of "job crafting", consistent with its findings. However it is necessary to add several important points related to the use of burning and champion theory as well as implications and further research that may be carried out in the future with and possibly with other variables

req 6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the fields and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

Paper has suitable technical content which the author described with clarity of expression and relevant knowledge. The author also makes good effort in describing the technical concepts in simple and easy to understand language.

In general, the paper is formatted and presented well. The references are up-to-date from authoritative sources.

The technical information presented in the paper is interesting and will be useful to researchers and practitioners.

Recommendation

Minor Revision

Confidential Comments to the Associate Editor-in-Chief

Comments to the Author - YOU MUST FILL THIS IN

The research systematics and methodology used are in accordance with the rules for writing scientific papers, there are only a few parts that still need improvement

Files attached

Do you want to get recognition for this review on Web of Science?

Yes

Author's Response
Files attached