



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### What do you do and who do you think you are?

*Activities speak louder than words*

Berkers, H.A.

#### Publication date

2019

#### Document Version

Other version

#### License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

#### Citation for published version (APA):

Berkers, H. A. (2019). *What do you do and who do you think you are? Activities speak louder than words*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

#### General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

#### Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

# CHAPTER 3

## Call to craft?

### The influence of calling on OCB and work overload through enhancing job crafting

Hannah A. Berkers<sup>1</sup>, Stefan T. Mol<sup>1</sup>, & Deanne N. Den Hartog<sup>1</sup>

*<sup>1</sup>Leadership & Management Group*

*Amsterdam Business School*

*University of Amsterdam*

*Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the WAOP congress in Rotterdam, November 2016, and at the mini-conference on Calling and Careers at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, October 2017. This work has been supported by the European Commission through the Marie-Curie ITN EDUWORKS (grant number PITN-GA-2013-608311), without any involvement in the design or writing of the study.

### **Abstract**

More research is needed to understand the simultaneous positive and negative effects of seeing work as a calling. Specifically, little is known about the mechanisms explaining calling as a double-edged sword. Enhancing job crafting could be as such a behavioral mechanism that can explain why calling is related to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and work overload. Doing more than required is a common theme in enhancing job crafting, OCB, and work overload, and likely driven by calling. We hypothesize that employees with a calling will help others and have more opportunities to do so after they have exhausted possibilities to engage deeper in their job through enhancing job crafting. We also hypothesize that employees with a calling will experience work overload, because enhancing job crafting requires resources. In a multisource study, a sample of 100 employee-supervisor dyads completed surveys. The results supported our hypotheses and indicate that employees with a calling engage in more enhancing job crafting, which in turn is related to both higher supervisor-rated OCB and higher experienced work overload. These findings suggest that for employees with a calling engaging in enhancing job crafting behavior may at times be harmful to themselves even if they are benefitting others.

Since people increasingly strive to do work they love, the study of callings may enhance our understanding of how employees experience work (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Dempsey & Sanders, 2010; Duffy & Dik, 2013). A calling is defined as a subjective approach to work that is motivated by enjoyment that comes from the work itself. Having a calling is often contrasted with approaches to work focused on either financial benefits or possibilities for career advancement (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). A growing number of studies on calling explore the many positive outcomes associated with having a calling, including high intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, career success and well-being, and increased identification and commitment (Cardador et al., 2011; Duffy, Dik, et al., 2011; Duffy et al., 2016; Hirschi & Herrmann, 2012).

Despite research providing evidence that having a calling can function as a buffer against burnout (Duffy et al., 2016; Hagmaier, Volmer, & Spurk, 2013), it is increasingly recognized that the deep investment and identification of employees who see their job as a calling might also have a downside in that it is neither predictably nor necessarily only beneficial (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Cardador & Caza, 2012). Calling, for example, has been found to be associated with high sacrifices in pay, personal time, and physical comfort, higher risk of exploitation, and lower work recovery (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Clinton et al., 2017; Schabram & Maitlis, 2017). Bunderson and Thompson (2009) thus proclaim calling to be a double-edged sword. There are, however, few quantitative studies that simultaneously capture both the positive and negative effects of calling, and those that have yielded inconclusive results (Duffy et al., 2016).

Moreover, little is known about the mechanisms that can explain why seeing work as a calling is related to both positive and negative outcomes, as most research has focused on explaining only one of the two (Duffy & Dik, 2013). In addition, this stream of research has mainly evoked attitudinal explanatory mechanisms, including career commitment (Duffy, Dik, et al., 2011), perceived organizational instrumentality (Cardador et al., 2011), organizational commitment (Rawat & Nadavulakere, 2015), occupational self-efficacy (Park, Sohn, & Ha, 2016), disengagement (Hagmaier et al., 2013), and detachment (Clinton et al., 2017). The lack of attention to potential behavioral mechanisms is surprising, because there is almost no empirical evidence for how callings drive behavior even though it is likely that a calling functions as an energetic and motivational force (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Elangovan et al., 2010). Specifically, we

propose that seeing work as a calling instigates enhancing job crafting, defined as the bottom up, proactive changes employees physically and cognitively make to expand and increase the number and complexity of tasks and interactions at work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

We propose that enhancing job crafting is especially relevant in understanding the simultaneous positive and negative outcomes of calling, because as a positive motivational force calling drives employees to do more which may be beneficial for the organization but unintentionally harmful to employees' well-being. Previous related findings show that calling is indeed related to working longer and even un-paid hours (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Clinton et al., 2017; Serow, 1994; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). In that way, enhancing job crafting can on the one hand relate calling to organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), because employees with a calling will likely focus on the next most salient target by helping others after they exhaust possibilities to engage deeper in the job they love through enhancing job crafting (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010). The drive of employees with a calling to do more is thus expected to spill-over from taking on additional work to showing more OCB, as the discretionary nature of OCB implies sufficient flexibility to go the extra mile. Enhancing job crafting can on the other hand explain how employees who see their job as a calling become overloaded, because additional resources are required for the extra effort they need for adding tasks, responsibilities, and complexity to their job (Bergeron, 2007).

The purpose of this study is to explain how calling can simultaneously result in OCB and work overload through enhancing job crafting. We use a quantitative, multisource survey comprised of 100 employee-supervisor dyads to test our hypotheses. The contribution of this study to the extant literatures on calling and job crafting is threefold. First, we contribute to a better understanding of calling as a double-edged sword, by quantitatively investigating both a positive and negative outcome (Duffy & Dik, 2013; Duffy et al., 2016). Second, we offer initial evidence for a behavioral explanation of calling as a double-edged sword, and test whether the relationships of calling with both OCB and work overload are mediated by enhancing job crafting behavior (Duffy & Dik, 2013). Third, this study contributes to the literature on job crafting, a construct which has mainly been portrayed in a positive light (Wang, Demerouti, & Bakker, 2016), whereas we test whether a darker side to crafting might exist while elucidating calling as a motivational driver of job crafting (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

## SEEING WORK AS A CALLING

Calling has been interpreted in many different ways, which has led to a lack of consensus on the definition of the concept (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011). Here we adopt the definition of Wrzesniewski and colleagues (1997) of a calling as an approach to work in which work is inseparable from someone's life and brings fulfillment by itself. This definition of calling is often contrasted with the other two approaches to work namely that it can either be focused on the material benefits rather than the enjoyment of work itself (i.e., job orientation), or on the possibilities of advancement in the occupational structure and the status and power that comes with it (i.e., career orientation) (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Seeing work as a calling thus encompasses a subjective approach to work that is motivated by the work itself or the enjoyment of doing something that is fulfilling and that is usually seen as socially valuable.

Calling is conceptualized as a work orientation, a mind-set, or a perspective (Duffy & Dik, 2013) and is highly personal and subjective in nature (Hall & Chandler, 2005). The degree to which people endorse work as a calling can vary along a continuum (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011; Duffy & Dik, 2013). Although having a calling is typically associated with occupations such as teachers, doctors, or priests (and often studied in those contexts), it can actually be found in a wide variety of occupations (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Calling is relatively stable over time, compared to the more momentary connections to work that are encapsulated in the work engagement and flow constructs (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). Having said that, calling is also not completely static and immutable (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dobrow, 2013; Hall & Chandler, 2005). Calling is conceptually similar to constructs such as commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), job involvement, work centrality (Paullay, Alliger, & Stone-Romero, 1994), passion (Vallerand et al., 2003), and career salience (Greenhaus, 1971). Although each of these constructs refers to the importance employees place on their work and careers and their emotional involvement with both, calling is unique as it is directed towards a particular field of work, occupation, or job rather than work in general (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011).

### Calling and OCB

Calling is often seen as a desirable orientation towards work with benefits for both employees and their organizations. Employees who see their

job as a calling tend to show greater organizational and career commitment, higher organizational identification, higher job satisfaction, lower withdrawal intentions, lower absenteeism, and higher subjective career success (Cardador et al., 2011; Duffy, Allan, & Dik, 2011; Duffy, Dik, et al., 2011; Elangovan et al., 2010; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Calling is also related to occupational identity, person-job fit, occupational self-efficacy, life satisfaction, enjoyment, fulfillment, and work engagement (Berg, Grant, & Johnson, 2010; Duffy et al., 2016; Harzer & Ruch, 2012; Hirschi, 2012; Hirschi & Herrmann, 2012). The positive outcomes of calling can be explained by the meaning those with a calling attribute to work (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011; Duffy & Dik, 2013; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). This experienced meaningfulness promotes psychological health and well-being by buffering against anxiety and depression (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Duffy, Douglass, Autin, & Allan, 2014). Calling has therefore been found to buffer the effects of exploitation and burnout on job satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2016; Hagmaier et al., 2013).

In light of the lack of studies that have investigated behavioral outcomes of calling, here, we focus on one particular positive outcome exhibited by employees who see their job as a calling, namely affiliative OCB. OCB is beneficial for the organization, tends to exceed an employee's job description or formal role requirements, and is usually discretionary rather than enforced (Organ, 1988, 1997; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). Affiliative OCB, including helping, is an interpersonal form of extra-role behavior focused on strengthening relationships and cooperation. Employees with a calling will likely engage in helpful behavior toward co-workers based on their willingness to go beyond their self-interest (Rawat & Nadavulakere, 2015), because they want to act in accordance with their self-concept and try to do good (Young, Chakroff, & Tom, 2012). As a result, employees with a calling are likely driven to make a positive contribution to the lives of others (Elangovan et al., 2010; Dik & Duffy, 2009; Duffy & Dik, 2013), which may not only include the direct beneficiaries of their work but also their colleagues and organization. A sense of calling is thus expected to foster more prosocial behavior (Cardador & Caza, 2012) and a more active investment in the organization (Cardador et al., 2011), especially in the form of more OCB. Although the empirical evidence is limited, the positive relationship between calling and OCB has received some preliminary empirical support in a sample of South Korean salespersons (Park et al., 2016).

### **Calling and work overload**

The potential negative ramifications of calling are far less studied than the positive ones (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Cardador & Caza, 2012; Clinton et al., 2017; Duffy & Dik, 2013; Duffy et al., 2016; Hagmaier et al., 2013; Schabram & Maitlis, 2017). Cardador and Caza (2012) differentiate between the healthy and unhealthy pursuit of callings. The unhealthy pursuit is characterized by increased strain on personal relationships inside and outside work, and an increase in personal sacrifices. These personal sacrifices, in the form of time, energy, pay, physical comfort, and personal relations, were indeed found in studies among zookeepers (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), employees in animal shelters (Schabram & Maitlis, 2017), church ministers (Clinton et al., 2017), and social entrepreneurs (Dempsey & Sanders, 2010). These negative effects can be explained by the strong sense of commitment associated with calling, which might result in an overestimation of the benefits of a job, while underestimating costs (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Elangovan et al., 2010). Calling can therefore be associated with workaholism (Keller, Spurk, Baumeler, & Hirschi, 2016) and career inflexibility (Lysova, Jansen, Khapova, Plomp, & Tims, 2017) or career tunnel vision, defined as career pursuit against negative advice (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2012).

Here, we focus on work overload, a particularly vexing outcome for employees who see their job as a calling, especially when they are exposed to it for a longer time periods. Work or role overload is defined as the experience that too many activities or responsibilities are expected of the employee considering the available time, resources, and abilities of that employee (Rizzo et al., 1970). Employees who see their job as a calling tend to work more hours and make sacrifices in their energy and time to carry out their job (Clinton et al., 2017; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997; Serow, 1996). As a result, employees with a calling may become overwhelmed by the time and energy they feel they have to invest. As a result they may start to struggle to complete all their tasks and feel overloaded (Bolino & Turnley, 2005). However, to the best of our knowledge, the relationship between calling and work overload has not yet been studied.

### **The mechanism behind the relationships between calling, OCB, and work overload**

The pursuit of a calling is an energetic and focused motivational force (Elangovan et al., 2010). We argue that this force drives employees' decisions to engage in certain behaviors at work. Indeed, a high level of intrinsic motivation

or drive to engage in the job is part of how calling is defined (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). According to self-determination theory, intrinsic motivation causes individuals to actively engage in behaviors solely out of interest (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Since the work itself is the interest of employees with a calling, they are likely to be naturally drawn to engage in work activities. The intrinsic motivation associated with calling can be seen as autonomous, which implies that employees integrate activities into their sense of self and initiate their own actions (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Elangovan et al., 2010). Employees with a calling are also known to strongly identify with their work (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Shamir (1991) underscores how identity affirmation is as an intense motivational force, especially when that identity is indispensable to defining who one is.

Calling is expected to motivate 'enhancing' (Bindl, Unsworth, & Gibson, 2014) or 'expansion-oriented' job crafting behavior (Laurence, 2010), characterized by increasing the number and complexity of tasks, the quality and/or quantity of interactions at work, seeking resources, and seeking challenges. The high intrinsic motivation of employees with a calling may instigate the use of enhancing job crafting as a way to get more deeply involved and engage in more novel and challenging work activities (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Thus, employees who see their job as a calling are likely to take on more responsibility and increase their number of tasks. Behaviors such as enhancing job crafting can be anticipated especially because employees are most motivated to engage in proactive behavior instrumental to the highest valued target (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010), which in the case of employees who see their work as a calling is the work itself rather than material benefits or career advancement (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). While the specific relationship between calling and enhancing job crafting has not yet been studied, it is in line with previous related findings that show these employees are inclined to work longer and go through great lengths to do their job (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Clinton et al., 2017; Serow, 1994; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997).

Enhancing job crafting could be the behavioral mechanism that links calling to OCB. It is still unclear why employees with a calling engage in more affiliative OCB. Employees with a calling may tend to see themselves as "good people" who make a difference in others' lives, and their job provides a means to act on this part of who they are, which is a strong motivational force (Shamir, 1991). It is likely, however, that these employees use this motivational drive from their calling to first show more enhancing job crafting behavior. As said,

enhancing job crafting is an opportunity to contribute and further enact the work role that they enjoy and love. In addition to and after taking on extra core task work through enhancing job crafting, employees with a calling will likely focus on the next most salient target given their prosocial nature (Belschak & Den Hartog, 2010), namely helping others. Their drive will spill-over from taking on additional role prescribed work to showing more affiliative OCB. Enhancing job crafting behavior will likely manifest itself in OCB, as its discretionary nature implies there is most opportunity to take on extra work. At a daily level, enhancing job crafting, in particular seeking challenges, has already been found to be related to another form of affiliative OCB, namely altruism (Demerouti, Bakker, & Halbesleben, 2015).

Enhancing job crafting could also be the behavioral mechanism that links calling to work overload. Enhancing job crafting pertains to adding tasks, responsibilities, and complexity, and therefore requires additional resources on the part of an employee with a calling, who, like all employees, is constrained in time and energy (Bergeron, 2007). In addition, it is likely that these employees do not stop doing more and more, despite their actions creating an escalation of commitment to a potentially ineffective course of action (i.e., not being able to complete all tasks). In other words, employees with a calling might be limited in balancing their resource investments across different life domains, because that would be inconsistent with their self-concept (Brockner et al., 1986; Shamir, 1991). Moreover, the enhancing job crafting of employees with a calling is driven by the motivation to engage more in their job rather than to (strategically) lessen their workload. However, as a result, the enhancing job crafting behavior is likely to leave employees with a calling feeling overloaded. We thus hypothesize:

*Hypothesis 1: Enhancing job crafting mediates the positive relationship between calling and a) OCB and b) work overload.*

## METHOD

### Procedure

Participants responded to an email including a personalized link (i.e., to allow matching employee and employee data), which directed them to a consent form and communication about the approval of the ethical committee of the University Economics and Business faculty. Participants who provided consent were then directed to an online questionnaire available in Dutch (translated using a back and forth translation method) and English. Supervisors answered

questions for every focal employee separately in a different online questionnaire ( $N = 13$  supervisors rated more than one employee), also available in both Dutch and English. A raffle of gift cards for a Dutch online retailer was used to stimulate participation and to show appreciation for the invested time and effort. Two reminder e-mails were sent. In total 413 questionnaires were distributed of which 277 were completed by participants and their supervisors (response rate of 67.07%). Only participants ( $N = 100$ ) who worked at least three days per week and whose supervisor participated ( $N = 81$ ), were included in the final sample.

### **Participants**

The sample of 100 employee-supervisor dyads working in the Netherlands was recruited as part of a larger data collection effort through the undergraduate program of a Dutch university. Of the employees ( $N = 100$ ) who participated 50.6% self-identified as female ( $M_{age} = 36.40$ ;  $SD = 13.37$ ). The average tenure of employees was 6.49 years ( $SD = 8.44$ ) and the average contractual work hours per week were 33.27 ( $SD = 13.23$ ). Participants held a wide variety of job titles, including consultant, dental assistant, software engineer, teacher, nurse, chef, bartender, and HR advisor, and were working in a variety of sectors (e.g., 16% in education, 12% industry, 10% consulting and financial services, 10% health care, 7% IT, 6% government, 6% retail and hospitality, 5% construction, 4% non-profit, and 24% other). The supervisors ( $N = 81$ ) who participated included 44% who self-identified as female ( $M_{age} = 43.44$ ;  $SD = 11.47$ ).

### **Measures**

Focal employees completed measures of calling, enhancing job crafting, work overload, and demographics, and their supervisors rated the OCB of the focal employee, affective regard, and their demographics. All response options unless indicated otherwise ranged from 1 = *totally disagree* to 7 = *totally agree*.

*Calling.* Calling was measured with the scale of Leana, Appelbaum, and Shevchuk (2009), who used the conceptualization of calling and adapted the items from Wrzesniewski et al. (1997). The scale for calling consisted of four items, which we supplemented with the two items for job orientation because these can be seen as counter-indicative items for calling (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). Examples are “I would choose my current work life again if I had the

opportunity” (indicative) and “when I am not at work, I do not think much about my work” (counter-indicative). The item “my work is a chance to give back to the community”, did not function as expected (when included  $\alpha = .598$ ; item-total correlation  $r = .23$ ). The differential reaction of Dutch respondents to this item might be explained from a societal and cultural perspective, since the Netherlands has a strong governmental social system and Dutch people have a rather “down to earth” attitude based in a Calvinistic moral system. As claiming that you are contributing to society is not very modest, participants may have scored lower on this specific item ( $M = 4.26$ ,  $SD = 1.70$ ), compared to the other items (e.g.,  $M = 5.40$ ,  $SD = 1.35$  for “I would choose my current work life again if I had the opportunity”). After excluding this item, reliability improved but was still somewhat low ( $\alpha = .60$ ).

*Enhancing job crafting.* We used the 14 items from the Job Crafting Questionnaire (Bindl et al., 2014) to measure Enhancing job crafting. The questionnaire included items such as “I actively took on more tasks in my work”, and “I thought about how my job contributed to the organization’s goals” ( $\alpha = .90$ ).

*Work overload.* We used the three item measure for work overload from Bolino and Turnley (2005). The measure included items such as “it often seems like I have too much work for one person to do” ( $\alpha = .86$ ).

*Affiliative OCB.* Supervisors rated the OCB of the focal employee with six items from Van Dyne and LePine (1998) and that cover helping behavior, such as “this employee helps others in this team to learn about the work” ( $\alpha = .85$ ). We focused on helping behavior, defined as the small acts of consideration that helps to build and preserve relationships, as something that extends task performance and that could be rated by supervisors because of its direct and clear affiliative nature (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998).

*Affective regard as a control variable for OCB.* Previous research has shown that the quality of the relationship between employee and supervisor impacts appraisal given by the supervisor (Lefkowitz, 2000). To control for this on our dependent variable OCB, we measured affective regard of the supervisor for the employee (Wayne & Ferris, 1990) with four items such as “supervising this employee is a pleasure” ( $\alpha = .73$ ). Affective regard was indeed significantly related to OCB ( $r = .21$ ,  $p = .037$ ).

*Intention to stay as a control variable for OCB.* OCB is driven by a variety of predictors, including employees’ commitment (Schappe, 1998). It is possible that OCB is not influenced by the enhancing job crafting of employees with a

calling, but by organizational commitment which is confounded with calling (Duffy, Dik, et al., 2011). We control for this organizational driven aspect through including intention to stay with the organization as an indicator of commitment, measured with two reverse coded intent-to quit items (Becker, 1992) ( $\alpha = .68$ ). Intention to stay indeed significantly correlated with calling ( $r = .43, p = .000$ ) and marginally with OCB ( $r = .17, p = .084$ ), which is in line with previous research (Becker, 1992).

*Age as a control variable for Work Overload.* Previous research found a significant relationship between age and work overload and controlled for it (Bolino & Turnley, 2005), because being exposed to too much work for a prolonged period of time is more likely the case for older employees (Brewer & Shapard, 2004). Age significantly correlated with calling ( $r = .26, p = .011$ ) and work overload ( $r = .24, p = .016$ ). Following the recommendations of Bernerth and Aguinis (2016), we therefore also control for age.

### **Data analysis**

We used Mplus to perform SEM with robust maximum likelihood estimation to test for full mediation (specified in model 1) and partial mediation (specified in model 2) using the scale means. We used the chi-square statistic ( $\chi^2$ ), the root mean square of error of approximation (RMSEA), the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) to assess model fit using the conventional cut-off values of these fit indices based on Hu and Bentler (1999) (i.e.,  $\chi^2$  non-significant, RMSEA < .06, CFI > .95, TLI > .95, SRMR < .08). In addition, we used the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) for comparing the two models, with lower values indicating a more parsimonious model. To account for the complex sampling features created by the indices in which supervisors ( $N = 13$ ) rated the performance of multiple employees we used a sandwich estimator (i.e., Type = Complex).

## RESULTS

**Table 1: Correlations between Calling, OCB, Work Overload, and Control Variables**

Construct	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Calling	4.95	0.91	(.60)						
2. Enhancing Job Crafting	4.97	0.93	.294**	(.90)					
3. OCB <sup>1</sup>	5.78	0.72	.155	.232*	(.85)				
4. Work Overload	3.34	1.47	.190	.229*	.025	(.86)			
5. Affective Regard <sup>1</sup>	5.76	0.75	-.120	.026	.209*	-.157	(.73)		
6. Intention to Stay	5.26	1.43	.429**	-.071	.174	-.020	-.131	(.68)	
7. Age	36.40	13.37	.256**	-.068	-.001	.242*	-.157	.244*	
8. Gender	1.52	0.50	-.042	-.070	-.092	-.016	-.067	-.056	.195


Note:  $N = 100$  (correlations with age  $N = 98$ ). \*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ . Gender is rated as 1 = male, 2 = female  
Cronbach's alphas are reported diagonally. <sup>1</sup>items scored by supervisors.

### Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and bivariate correlations between all included variables. Calling significantly correlated with enhancing job crafting ( $r = .29$ ,  $p = .003$ ), but not with work overload ( $r = .19$ ,  $p = .059$ ) nor OCB ( $r = .16$ ,  $p = .124$ ), which by itself is insufficient evidence to reject the existence of any indirect effects (Hayes, 2009). Enhancing job crafting significantly correlated with OCB ( $r = .23$ ,  $p = .020$ ) and work overload ( $r = .23$ ,  $p = .022$ ). These results indicate that calling may be only indirectly related to OCB and work overload through enhancing job crafting behavior, which we test below.

### Model 1

In the first model we simultaneously examined whether enhancing job crafting behavior mediated the relationships between calling and OCB, and calling and work overload. This fully mediated model showed that all hypothesized paths were significant (including the control variables affective regard, intention to stay, and age) and that the fit of the model was good (see Figure 1) ( $\chi^2$  ( $df = 9$ ) = 10.288,  $p = .332$ ; TLI = .940; CFI = .964; RMSEA = .037; SRMR = .054). A higher degree of experienced calling related to more enhancing job crafting behavior, which in turn was positively associated with higher supervisor rated OCB and higher experienced work overload.




**Figure 1: Fully Mediated Model including Calling, Enhancing Job Crafting, OCB, and Work Overload**

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . Standardized coefficients are reported. Estimator = MLR, maximum likelihood parameter estimates with standard errors and chi-square test statistics that are robust to non-normality. Model fit indices showed good fit  $\chi^2(9, N = 100) = 10.288, p = .332$  (TLI = .940, CFI = .964, RMSEA = .037, and SRMR = .054). We controlled for the relationship between Affective Regard and OCB ( $r = .24, p = .028$ ), Intention to Stay and OCB ( $r = .27, p = .004$ ), and Age and Work Overload ( $r = .26, p = .004$ ). The indirect effect of calling on OCB (estimate = .078, 95%CI = [.001, .154]) and Work Overload (estimate = .072, 95%CI = [.005, .138]) were significant. We explained 8.5% of variance in Enhancing Job Crafting ( $p = .176$ ), 18.8% in OCB ( $p = .011$ ), and 13.6% in Work Overload ( $p = .048$ ). Without control variables all coefficients remain the same and significant, however, model fit cannot be estimated (overfitted).

## Model 2

In the second model we included the direct effects of calling on OCB and work overload to examine the difference between a fully and a partially mediated model. This partially mediated model showed that calling was not significantly related to OCB nor work overload (see Figure 2). In addition, the fit of the partially mediated model was only acceptable according to the SRMR, but not to the CFI, TLI, and RMSEA indices ( $\chi^2(df = 7) = 9.717, p = .205$ ; TLI = .830; CFI = .921; RMSEA = .060; SRMR = .053). In order to formally evaluate the performance of both models, we compared the change in model fit, which turned out to be not significant ( $\Delta\chi^2 = .571, \Delta df = 2, p = .752$ ), meaning that the fully mediated model 1 does not show significant better fit than the partially mediated model 2. However, both the AIC (815.478) and BIC (846.498) of model 1 were slightly lower compared to model 2 (AIC = 818.877; BIC = 855.067), indicating that model 1 was somewhat more parsimonious. In combination with the inadequate model fit and insignificant direct effects of calling on OCB and work overload, we find more support for the fully than for the partially mediated model.



**Figure 2: Partially Mediated Model including Calling, Enhancing Job Crafting, OCB, and Work Overload**

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ . Standardized coefficients are reported. Estimator = MLR, maximum likelihood parameter estimates with standard errors and chi-square test statistics that are robust to non-normality. Model fit indices showed reasonable fit  $\chi^2(7, N = 100) = 9.717, p = .205$  (TLI = .830, CFI = .921, RMSEA = .060, and SRMR = .053). We controlled for the relationship between Affective Regard and OCB ( $r = .21, p = .029$ ), Intention to Stay and OCB ( $r = .25, p = .007$ ), and Age and Work Overload ( $r = .24, p = .011$ ). The indirect effects of calling on OCB (estimate = .074, 90%CI = [.009, .139]) and Work Overload (estimate = .066, 95%CI = [.001 - .130]) were significant. We explained 8.5% of variance in Enhancing Job Crafting ( $p = .176$ ), 18.7% in OCB ( $p = .012$ ), and 13.8% in Work Overload ( $p = .040$ ). Without control variables the coefficients remain the same, however, model fit cannot be estimated (overfitted).

### Hypothesis testing

Finally, we tested the significance of the indirect effects of calling on OCB and work overload through enhancing job crafting in model 1 (see Figure 1). The standardized 95% confidence interval (CI) did not include zero for the indirect effect of calling on OCB (estimate = .078, 95%CI = [.001, .154],  $p = .046$ ) and work overload (estimate .072, 95%CI = [.005, .138],  $p = .034$ ). We thus find support for our mediation hypotheses 1a and 1b.

### DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to contribute to the emerging literature on calling as a potentially double-edged sword. Most research to date has touched upon the positive side of calling and much less research has focused on the downside or on specific behavioral outcomes of calling. Moreover, the mechanisms that explain why calling is simultaneously related to positive and negative outcomes are mainly unknown. Here we did not find direct relationships with these outcomes, but we did find indirect ones and showed that enhancing job crafting is one such mechanism that connects calling to more distal outcomes, because it explains the relationship of calling with both OCB and work overload. Employees who see

their work more as a calling spend additional time and energy to help others around them as they expand their own job. It seems, however, that this process of expanding one's job also instigates the experience of being overloaded.

First, these findings contribute to a better understanding of both the bright and the dark sides of calling and go beyond the outcomes normally studied in association with calling, such as commitment and job satisfaction (Berkelaar & Buzzanell, 2015; Duffy & Dik, 2013). This study provides behavioral evidence for the bright side of calling by evidencing the direct relationship of calling with enhancing job crafting behavior and the indirect one with OCB. However, our results also indicate that seeing work as a calling is not solely beneficial. Employees with a calling also experience a higher work overload as a result of their enhancing job crafting behavior. The findings suggest that the experience of overload is specific to these employees, which may be because they tend to overinvest and feel more obliged than those low on calling to keep doing more even when they are confronted with their own time and energy limits. This is in line with the evidence for the high personal sacrifices made by employees who pursue their calling (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Clinton et al., 2017; Dempsey & Sanders, 2010; Schabram & Maitlis, 2017). In other words, a calling can be consuming (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011) and can motivate employees to behave in a way that can result in the experience of being overloaded despite their good intentions.

Second, there are still many questions to be answered about the mechanisms underlying the relationship between calling and its outcomes (Duffy & Dik, 2013). Most research has suggested attitudinal mechanisms. Positive outcomes of calling, such as satisfaction and attachment, have been explained through various mechanisms including career commitment (Duffy, Dik, et al., 2011), organizational instrumentality (Cardador et al., 2011), vocational identity (Hirschi & Herrmann, 2012), occupational self-efficacy (Park et al., 2016), and (lower) disengagement (Hagmaier et al., 2013). Whereas negative outcomes of calling, such as lower recovery from work and willingness to sacrifice, have been explained by detachment, sleep quality (Clinton et al., 2017), and moral duty (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Our findings suggest that enhancing job crafting forms an alternative behavioral mechanism through which calling affects OCB and work overload. Whereas attitudes are likely to be aligned with calling to create consistent self-concepts (Shamir, 1991) and prevent cognitive dissonance, behavior such as enhancing job crafting, could explain (in)effective

courses of action that may be typical for employees who score high on calling.

Third, we contributed to the literature on job crafting by showing that calling may be an antecedent that motivates enhancing job crafting behavior. Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) already theorized that employees with a calling would be motivated to craft. However, empirical support for the relation between calling and job crafting was to the best of our knowledge not yet available. Leana et al. (2009), for example, did not find a relationship between the calling and individual or collaborative job crafting of childcare workers. These non-significant findings may have been due to the lack of differentiation made between enhancing and limiting job crafting, because employees with a calling are unlikely to drastically limit their tasks and relationships. This is in line with other studies that have shown that employees with a calling indeed tend to do more (Clinton et al., 2017; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997; Serow, 1996). We also contributed to the job crafting literature by showing that at least for employees with a calling, job crafting is not solely beneficial. Research showed that job crafting is sometimes related to more emotional exhaustion and counterproductive work behavior (Demerouti et al., 2015; Petrou, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2015), and this could help to further nuance the mainly positive view on job crafting and proactive behavior in general.

### **Future research**

The results of our study offer several potential directions for future research. First, if calling is related to at least short-term feelings of work overload through enhancing job crafting behavior, more evidence is needed on what the long-term effects may be. Over time, feelings of work overload can come at the cost of general well-being and work-life balance (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009), eventually undermining the positive and buffering effects of calling (Cardador & Caza, 2012; Hagmaier et al., 2013), and gradually escalating into a burnout (Schabram & Maitlis, 2017). As the negative effects may exacerbate over time, it could become increasingly difficult to sustain the positive effects of calling over the course of one's career. Nurses and teachers, for example, often have a calling but also often suffer from these increasingly negative effects, which translates in high rates of burnout and turnover (Hakanen et al., 2006; Hartnett & Kline, 2005; Sherman, 2004; Vinje & Mittelmark, 2007, Bakker et al., 2005). It would therefore be useful to longitudinally study these effects to better understand how the downward spiral that Schabram and Maitlis (2017) report on in their

qualitative study unfolds over time.

Second, we argued that calling affects behavior through its motivational aspects, however, more research is needed to support this explanation, as we did not directly measure (intrinsic) motivation. Alternatively, employees with a calling may see helping their colleagues as instrumental to achieving the meaningful goal of their calling (Cardador et al., 2011). Some animal shelter workers with a calling, for example, supported their colleagues if they aimed to lead change in their shelters (Schabram & Maitlis, 2017). We, however, argued based on the work of Shamir (1991) that doing more in the job (i.e., enhancing job crafting) and for others (i.e., OCB) even without sufficient resources (i.e., work overload) occur as this is in line with how employees with a calling see themselves. Bunderson and Thompson (2009) showed that the sense of moral duty of employees with a calling plays an important role in their work experience. More research that connects this sense of moral duty to self-concepts and work motivation would potentially lead to a better understanding of what drives these employees to engage in behavior that is not necessarily goal-oriented or instrumental. To study these deep underlying decisional processes and cognitions, qualitative research may be most suitable.

Third, more research is needed to understand potential moderators that assess the specific circumstances under which employees with a calling can suffer from higher work overload. Following Cardador and Caza (2012), one could distinguish between the healthy and unhealthy pursuit of calling. Similar results were found in research on passion, where a distinction is made between harmonious and obsessive passion (Vallerand et al., 2003). Only obsessive passion is associated to mixed outcomes including both negative affect, anxiety, positive affect, and intrinsic motivation (Birkeland & Buch, 2015; Curran, Hill, Appleton, Vallerand, & Standage, 2015; Vallerand et al., 2003). The reason underlying these mixed outcomes of obsessive passion is an unstoppable urge to self-validate one's identity through engaging in activities linked to one's passion. It would be interesting to study whether a similar distinction can be observed for obsessive and harmonious calling. More research about the similarities and differences between employees with harmonious and obsessive calling, would make it possible to uncover traits or behavior of employees who manage to find sufficient balance to avoid the aforementioned downward spiral and offer guidance for those who have not managed that.

### **Practical implications**

The practical implications of this study include that organizations need to take a certain responsibility towards their employees who see their work more as a calling. Our results showed that while organizations might benefit from the expanding job crafting and prosocial behavior that callings elicit, the employee is also at risk to overinvest and become overloaded. Similar to Bunderson and Thompson (2009), we showed that individuals who see their work as a calling might be vulnerable to exploitation as they work ever more and continue to help others even in the face of being overloaded. Organizations should try to ensure that these employees can keep doing their job in a sustainable and healthy way by helping these employees set boundaries and not take on too much. If these employees keep doing more and more based on their intrinsic motivation, in the long run they may abandon their calling and employers could benefit from preventing the overburdening of these highly committed employees to keep their motivation levels high (Hartnett & Kline, 2005). Further teasing out how seeing work as a calling can be a double-edged sword allows for customized interventions that protect the positive effects while safeguarding against the costs for employees with a calling.

### **Limitations**

This study has some limitations. First, this study cannot test the direction of causality due to its cross-sectional design. Although the multisource design allowed us to limit common source bias for some relationships by asking supervisors rather than employees themselves to rate OCB, all other variables were measured at one moment in time and self-rated by the focal employees. Calling as a subjective way of viewing work and experienced work overload are best measured by self-report measures. Enhancing job crafting as well is only measured through self-report measures, because the behavior is by definition not always visible for other parties such as supervisors or colleagues. This is in line with other studies on job crafting (Laurence, 2010; Leana et al., 2009; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012).

Second, we did have some unexpected problems with the Leana et al. (2009)'s scale for calling. Although the scale previously showed sufficient reliability, our study showed that scale properties may be different in the Netherlands. In particular, the item pertaining to giving back to the community did not function as expected, potentially because of cultural and institutional

differences in the Netherlands compared to the United States. In future studies we will need to address this and use a scale more culturally appropriate for the Dutch context. The presence of Calling subscale from the Brief Calling Scale (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) is, for example, successfully used by Lysova and colleagues (2017) in a survey among Dutch employees. Moreover, the item that had to be dropped was an adaptation made by Leana et al. (2009) that did not appear among the original items of Wrzesniewski et al. (1997), which may explain why the item did not performed as intended<sup>6</sup>. Although this was not an option for this study because we intended to look at a wide variety of jobs across industries, another possibility for future research is to use the domain-specific scales of Bunderson and Thompson (2009) or Dobrow and Tosti-Kharas (2011) which might not instigate similar problems. These challenges with quantitatively capturing calling and its double-sided outcomes show that much more can be done to advance the field of calling. It would be interesting to see if more research could show whether “actions speak louder than attitudes” for employees with a calling.

---

<sup>6</sup> The use of the same calling measure by Leana et al. (2009) in Study 1 of Chapter 4 among a sample in the US, however, showed sufficient reliability ( $\alpha = .77$ ). This indicates that it is more likely that the issue with the particular item in this sample is due to cultural differences.