行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫成果報告

領隊人員工作雕琢與工作產出關係之研究 ‐‐ 知覺組織支持之干擾

The relationship between job crafting and job outcomes of the tour leaders: The moderating effect of perceived organizational support

ABSTRACT

Job design is an important issue in human resource management. Although the practice of job crafting policy has been extensively discussed, still there remain inconsistent research findings to explain the relationship between job crafting and it effects. The purpose of this study is to fill this gap by examining the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes from the perspective of travel industry. This study collected data from 355 tour leaders of 32 consolidated travel agencies headquartered in Taipei. Results indicate that individual crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Moreover, collaborative crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. However, POS does not moderate the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. The results of this study can be used as a reference for strategic directions for travel managers in terms of human resource management and organizational behavior. Implications of these findings as well as future research are subsequently discussed.

Keywords: Tour leader, Job crafting, Job performance, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment

INTRODUCTION

In many Asian countries and areas, such as Taiwan, Japan, Hong Kong, Korea, China, etc., the group package tour (GPT) is one of the main modes of outbound travel (Wang, Hsieh, & Chen, 2002; Yamamoto & Gill, 1999), while the tour leader is a key person in GPT (Zhang & Chow, 2004). The tour leader is a person who actually escorts the tour participants throughout their journey (Bowie & Chang. 2005). Wong and Wang (2009) found that the job nature of tour leader requires a high degree of emotional labor. Performing emotional labor may lead to burnout, dissatisfaction with the job and finally a high turnover rate (Mak, Wong, & Chang, 2011; Wong & Wang, 2009). Therefore, how to alter the task and relational boundaries of their jobs has become an issue of great concern to tour leaders.

For decades, studies of how employees experience their jobs have centered largely on the effects of job design on employee attitudes and behaviors (Fried & Ferris, 1987; Parker, Wall, & Cordery, 2001). Traditionally, job design theory focused on the top-down process of managers designing jobs for employees (Campion & McClelland, 1993; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). However, more recently, researchers have suggested the role that employees play in the design of their jobs, highlighting the proactivity of their efforts (Black & Ashford, 1995; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Miner, 1987). Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) proposed the construct of job crafting, which defined as the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their job. Leana, Appelbaum, and Shevchuk (2009) described that job crafting can be classified in two categories, individual crafting and collaborative crafting. Job crafting enables tour leaders to shape their own

work identities and work roles through personal construction of their jobs and the execution of the work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Therefore, the job crafting behaviors can shape how they understand the purpose of their work and define themselves as tour leaders, which is essential to enhance job outcomes and provide a quality service for tourists.

In the research of human resource management (HRM), many researchers have examined the relationship between HRM practices and organizational performance (Messersmith & Guthrie, 2010; Tremblay, Cloutier, Simard, Chnevert, & Vandenberghe, 2010; Vlachos, 2008). Among all the practices, job design is one of the key factors within the practices of HRM. To service employees, organizational performance is reflected by employees' job outcomes. In the past, many researchers have suggested job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as important employees' job outcomes (Karatepe & Kilic, 2009; Riggle, Edmondson, & Hansen, 2009). The job crafting behaviors will revise both employees' work identities and work meanings, which will in turn enhance employees' job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ghitulescu, 2006; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012; Tims & Bakker, 2010). However, Leana et al. (2009) found that individual crafting is negatively related to job satisfaction and not related to organizational commitment. Obviously, previous researches seem to suggest inconsistent explications on the relationship between job crafting and employees' job outcomes. Therefore, a deeper understanding of job crafting and its effects is warranted.

In addition, previous researcher suggested that perceived organizational support (POS) plays an important role on employees' attitudes and outcomes (Levinson, 1965). POS refers to employees' beliefs concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hunchison, & Sowa, 1986). On the basis of the norm of reciprocity, employees will trade effort and dedication to their organization for such socioemotional benefits as esteem, approval, and caring (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Hence, POS is associated with higher job performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Based on the above reasoning, higher POS would enhance the relationship between job crafting and employees' job outcomes. Therefore, POS seems to play a major contextual role in the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes.

The above findings indicate that job crafting is significantly related to tour leaders' job outcomes. However, whether such effect is positive or negative cannot be determined clearly. In addition, more recent studies have established job crafting as a form of employee proactivity among child care educators (Leana et al., 2009), special education teachers (Ghitulescu, 2007), nurse midwives (Caza, 2007), manufacturing company and non-profit organization (Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2010) and salespersons (Lyons, 2008). There has been relatively little work addressing the travel industry. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to fill this gap by examining the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. And this research also examines the moderating effect of perceived organizational support on the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. The result of the study can suggest strategic directions for travel managers in terms of human resource management practices and organizational behavior.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The role of tour leader

The tour leader is a leader of the tour for the whole journey. A tour leader is the front line employee who provide the moment of truth for tourists. He/She serves as the coordinator in the destination and a buddy for the tour members. A tour leader also serves the role motivator and entertainer with the responsibility to elicit tourists' positive feelings and create a warm atmosphere during the tour. Instrumentally, a tour leader plays many roles on a tour, such as leader, communicator, organizer, salesperson, consultant, entertainer, and representative of the travel agents (Cohen, 1985; Geva & Goldman, 1991; Heung, 2008; Holloway, 1981; Ryan & Dewar, 1995). Wang et al. (2002) also found that tour leader as endorser has a positive effect on advertising (Lin, Wang & Chen, 2008). Therefore,

many travel agencies view tour leaders as the spokesmen of GPT products or travel brands. The tour leader plays an important role during the tour because the tourists rely on the tour leader to ensure what core service is delivery and how this core service is performed. Therefore, the tour leader within the group is considered to be indispensable by the tourists themselves (Quiroga, 1990; Zhang & Chow, 2004).

The tour leader conducting a tour needs a variety of skills and faces may challenges. Under considerable pressure during the service encounter, the tour leader requires patience and care to accomplish the task (Bowie & Chang, 2005). Mancini (1996) also offered strategies for managing a tour group, suggesting that the tour leader must be fair; praise a tour group's behavior; exceed the customer's expectations; be firm when facing disruptive behavior; encourage customer adulthood; exercise leadership; and be flexible. Therefore, a tour leaders' work in particular exhibit high levels of skill variety, task complexity, and work discretion.

Job crafting

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) described job crafting as an individual activity that employees undertake by themselves to better match their own needs, aspirations, and circumstances to their jobs. They argued that job boundaries, the meaning of work, and work identities are not fully determined by formal job requirements. Instead, employees often alter the task and relational boundaries of their jobs, and these actions shape how they understand the purpose of their work and define themselves as workers. Grant and Ashford (2008) considered that job crafting is employee-initiated and constitutes a form of proactive behavior at work. It is largely informal and is not found in a written job description. Instead, it reflects an employee's efforts to make a job a better fit to his or her own preferences and competencies.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) indicated that crafting a job involves shaping the task boundaries of the job (either physically or cognitively), the relational boundaries of the job, or both. Changing task boundaries refers to altering the form or number of activities one engages in while doing the job, whereas changing cognitive boundaries means altering how individual sees the job. Changing relational boundaries refers to exercising discretion over with whom on interacts while doing the job. By changing any one of these elements, an employee alters the design of the job and the social environmental in which he or she works. Such actions will alter both the meaning of the work and one's work identity.

Job crafting can be classified in two categories: individual crafting and collaborative crafting (Leana et al., 2009). Individual crafting describes the active role that an individual plays in altering the boundaries of his/her job and shaping actual work practice. Collaborative crafting involves joint effort among employees in the service of changing work process. Individual and collaborative job crafting are not mutually exclusive and, indeed, individuals can engage in both (Leana et al., 2009).

Tims et al. (2012) recently defined job crafting as the changes employees may make to balance their job demands and job resources with their personal abilities and needs. Job demands refer to physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort or skills. Job resources refer to those aspects of the job that function in achieving work goals, reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, and stimulate personal growth, learning, and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). This conceptualization takes the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) as a starting point. According to Tims et al. (2012), job crafting can take the form of three different types of behaviors: increasing (structural or social) job resources; increasing job demands or challenges; and decreasing job demands. They argued that employees who optimize their work environment would report the highest levels of engagement.

Job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes

Job crafting is a creative and improvised process that captures how individuals locally adapt their jobs in ways that create and sustain a viable definition of the work they do and who they are at work

(Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Based on the JD-R Model, Tims and Bakker (2010) suggested that employees who engage in job crafting might increase their job demands or job resources in order to match these demands and resources to their individual needs. Challenging job demands stimulate employees to develop their knowledge and skills or to attain more difficult goals (LePine, Podsakoff, & LePine, 2005). Job crafting can alter the boundaries of tour leaders' jobs by taking on more or fewer tasks, expanding or diminishing the scope of tasks, or changing how they perform tasks. Job crafting can help tour leaders get more enjoyment and meaning out of work, cope with diversity, and perform better. Since job crafting influences which tasks gets completed, how employees complete them, and the interpersonal dynamics of the workplace, it has the potential to greatly impact job performance.

Crawford, LePine, and Rich (2010) found that the challenging job demands were positively related to job engagement. Employees who craft their job characteristics will in turn experience more job engagement. Job crafting captures what tour leaders do to redesign their own jobs in ways that can foster job engagement, resilience, and thriving at work (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). In addition, crafting more challenges at work is an important way to increase personal growth and job performance (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012). The JD-R model has been used in relation to employees' evaluations of work engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and job performance (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004). Consequently, Job crafting allows tour leaders to match their work with personal preferences, styles and abilities (competencies). Tour leaders' ability to craft the job they are performing is expected to increase their engagement into their job. In turn, this positive relation is expected to translate into higher levels of job performance. Based on these assertions, it could be theorized that job crafting may be positively related to tour leaders' job performance. Therefore, this research proposes the following hypothesis:

H1-1: Individual crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance.
H1-2: Collaborative crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance.

According to Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 2001), people seek to obtain, retain, and protect that which they value, e.g. material, social, personal, or energetic resources. Job crafting changes the meaning of work by altering tasks and relationships at work in ways that allow people to reframe the purpose of their job in broader terms (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Janssen, Peeters, De Jonge, Houkes, and Tummers (2004) used the JD-R model to investigate the relationship between job resources and job satisfaction. In their research, job control was included as a measure for job resources. Job control and job crafting show considerable similarities. Both concepts look at the autonomy an employee has over their own work. Jansen et al. (2004) also found that the hypothesized positive relation between job control and job satisfaction. Therefore, previous literature found a significant positive link between job crafting and job satisfaction (Ghitulescu, 2006)

Tour leaders who perceive they have more control are likely to experience their work differently and see how their work relates in meaningful ways to the work of others in the organization. Tour leaders who are active in shaping their environment are also more likely to experience better well-being because they might feel that they have more control over their environment and experience more job resources. Consequently, tour leaders who engage in job crafting are likely to alter their jobs in ways that increase the job resources of what they do at work. This in turn will increase their level of job satisfaction. According to the above research, it could be theorized that job crafting may be positively related to tour leaders' job satisfaction. Therefore, the following hypothesis is presented:

H2-1: Individual crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job satisfaction.
H2-2: Collaborative crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job satisfaction.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) indicated that job crafting can enhance the meaning of work and a positive work identity. Drawing from identity theory, researchers have conceptualized work commitment as the relative importance of work to one's sense of self (Loscocco, 1989). When tour

leaders perceive their work as more meaningful, work will be perceived as having increased importance for their sense of self-worth, thus enhancing their levels of identification and commitment to their work.

In addition, by making changes in the job it will be possible to experience the job in another way and to craft another purpose of the work. When tour leaders redraw the boundaries of their jobs to fit their own conceptions of the work and the best way to carry it out, they should be more attached to the jobs and less likely to leave their organization. Therefore, job crafting may enhance person-job fit and that this, in turn, may lead to high levels of organizational commitment (Kristof- Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005). Based on the above research, tour leaders who craft their jobs more will feel more committed to their organization. Therefore, the following hypothesis is presented:

H3-1: Individual crafting is positively related to tour leaders' organizational commitment.
H3-2: Collaborative crafting is positively related to tour leaders' organizational commitment.

The role of perceived organizational support

POS reflects an employee's overall assessment of all organization members who control resources and rewards (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Organizational support theory suggests that an employee perceives that the organization values and supports employee, an implied obligation develops between the organization and it employees. POS is thought to develop over time through multiple interactions between individuals and their employers and to reflect the degree to which individuals perceive that their organizations are committed to them (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Therefore, POS can be described as an indicator of the organization's benevolent or malevolent intent in the expression of exchange of employee effort for reward and recognition (Lynch, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 1999). POS helps to fulfill important employee needs for emotional support, positive self-esteem, approval, and affiliation (Lee & Peccei, 2007), which in turn enhance employees' level of work engagement (Zacher & Winter, 2011). Based on the principle of reciprocity, employees with high POS are obliged to respond favorably to the organization in the form of positive job attitudes or organizational behaviors. Thus, high POS not only help coworkers, but also enhance job satisfaction and organizational commitment, thus stimulating employee job performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003).

Previous researches have demonstrated the importance of POS in moderating several organizational relationships. For example, POS has been shown to reduce the negative effects of stressors and job outcomes (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Stamper & Johlke, 2003; Wallance et al., 2009). POS has also been shown to enhance the positive relationship social skills and job performance (Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway, & Ferris, 2006). This research has suggested that organizational support is beneficial in that it can positively influence the relationship among important organizational variables and outcomes.

High levels of organizational support provide aid to employees, not only in terms of socio-emotional needs but also in terms of equipment, funding, technology, ideas, and physical assistance (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Thus, high POS offers employees additional resources that better enable employees to accomplish work objectives (Hochwarter et al., 2006). In addition, high POS also cultivates communication and cooperation between coworkers that often take the form of helping behaviors (Erdogan, Kraimer, & Liden, 2004; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). As a result, individuals engage in mutually benefiting actions with the group. In contrast, low POS implies that managers are neither providing sufficient resources nor promoting a climate of job crafting to meet organizational objectives. Without such resources, achieving quality and quantity performance expectations is difficult. Therefore, it is expected that the relationship job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes will be stronger for higher levels of POS due to the increased availability of resources and to the bolster from socio-emotional support. Based on the above literature, this study hypothesized that the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes will be stronger for high POS than low POS. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is presented:

H4: Perceived organizational support moderates the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes.

RESEARCH METHOD

Sample and data collection

The group tour leaders are the subjects of the survey and questionnaires are used to collect the data for this study. Prior to data collection, we conducted a pilot test with a sample of 50 tour leaders who work for travel agencies to ensure clarity, reliability, and comprehensiveness of the questionnaire following the same procedures used in the main survey.

In order to confirm respondents' willingness to complete the questionnaires, the researchers made phone calls to the general managers of 58 consolidated travel agencies in Taipei, Taiwan, explaining the purpose of this research and inquiring about their willingness to cooperate. Thirty-two travel agencies agreed to participate in the research process. The managers who agreed to participate in the research were provided letters to circulate within the organization. The letters described the research as well as the questionnaire to tour leaders, explaining that participation was voluntary, and asking for their participation. A total of 436 tour leaders agreed to participate in this survey. The general managers assured the researchers that the list of tour leaders would be kept confidential. Those tour leaders who agreed to participate were mailed a set of questionnaires to their homes with a stamped and self-addressed return envelope. Also, to thank the respondents for participating in the survey, the researchers provided each respondent with a coupon from one of the famous Taiwan coffee chains. Responses were mailed by participants directly to the researchers. The process ensures that the subjects were protected and the questionnaires were secure. Of the 436 questionnaires distributed, 355 usable questionnaires were gathered, representing a response rate of 81.4 percent.

Non-response bias was tested by comparing the responses of late responders to those of early responders (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). The mean values of all variables did not statistically differ between early and late responders (at the level of p = .05 or less), implying a low likelihood of non-response bias.

Measures

Job crafting was measured using 12 items proposed by Leana et al. (2009), individual crafting and collaborative crafting were each measured with six items. Employees indicated their agreement with each item using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Higher scores reflect a greater degree of employees' perceived job crafting.

This study measured job performance using a seven-item scale and a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" (Williams & Anderson, 1991). A higher score on this scale indicated a high degree of employees' perceived job performance. This study measured job satisfaction using a five-item scale and a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" (Johlke & Duhan, 2000). A higher score on this scale indicated a high degree of employees' perceived job satisfaction. This study measured organizational commitment using a six-item scale and a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" (Porter et al., 1974). A higher score on this scale indicated a high degree of employees' perceived organizational commitment.

POS was measured using an eight-item scale and a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997). A higher score on this scale indicated a high degree of employees' perceived organizational support.

Distributive justice refers to the amount of resources or rewards that is distributed to employees (Milkovich & Bewman, 2005). Previous literature indicated that distributive justice is a key antecedent of employees' job outcomes (Harris, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2007; McCain, Tsai, & Bellino, 2010). Moreover, past research (Karatepe, Uludag, Menevis, Hadzimehmedagic, & Baddar, 2006;

Karatepe & Tekinkus, 2006) has demonstrated that employees' job outcomes are related to employees' age and organizational tenure. We therefore controlled for their effects in all of our analyses. Distributive justice was measured using five items assessing the fairness of different work outcomes, including pay level, work schedule, workload, and job responsibilities. It was measured with a subscale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) and a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." A higher score on this scale indicated a high degree of employees' perceived distributive justice.

Questions relating to demographic data, including gender, age, education, marital status, organizational tenure, and personal monthly income, were also included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was originally written in English and then translated into Chinese. Translation was completed by the researchers along with two other native English speakers who worked in the travel industry. Before finalizing the questionnaire design, back translation was done to reduce translation bias, as suggested by Van de Vijver and Hambleton (1996).

RESULTS

Characteristics of the sample

Table 1 provides a demographic characteristic profile of the respondents. Among the 355 respondents, 152 respondents (42.8%) were male and 203 respondents (57.2%) were female. 41.4% of the respondents were aged between 21 and 30 years. Educational levels were fairly high, with 87.3% having college experience or above. The majority (59.7%) of the respondents was single and 45.3% had tenure in their organizations of less than 5 years. The majority (45.9%) of the respondents indicated that they had personal monthly incomes in the range of NT$20,001-NT$30,000

Table 1. Demographic characteristic profile of respondents (n=355)

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	152	42.8
Female	203	57.2
Age		
20 and below	1	0.3
21-30	147	41.4
31-40	105	29.6
41-50	74	20.8
51 and above	28	7.9
Education level		
Senior/business high school and below	45	12.7
College	113	31.8
University	177	49.9
Graduate school	20	5.6
Marital status		
Single	212	59.7
Married	137	38.6
Others	6	1.7
Organizational tenure		
Less than 5 year	161	45.3
Less than 10 years	92	25.9
Less than 15 years	30	8.5
Less than 20 years	49	13.8
20 years and over	23	6.5
Personal monthly income		
NT$ 20,000 and below	38	10.7
NT$ 20,001-30,000	163	45.9
NT$ 30,001-40,000	80	22.5
NT$ 40,001-50,000	29	8.2
NT$ 50,001-60,000	21	5.9
NT$ 60,001 and above	24	6.8

Measurement properties

To validate the constructs, the research model was estimated with the CFA in which all measurement items were loaded on their expected constructs, and the constructs were correlated in the analysis (Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). Since the chi-square statistic is sensitive to sample size, this study relied on other indices in the testing models (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). In the testing model for CFA, all factor loadings were significant ($p < 0.001$). The indexes of the model provide a good fit: $\chi^2 = 1436.76$, df = 545, χ^2/df = 2.64, GFI (goodness-of-fit index) = 0.93, AGFI (adjusted goodness-of-fit index) = 0.90, RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) = 0.05, NFI (normed fit index) = 0.92, and CFI (comparative fit index) = 0.95, which was above the model adaptability standard suggested by Hair et al. (2006) (χ^2/df < 3, GFI $\geqq 0.90$, AGFI $\geqq 0.90$, RMSEA $\leqq 0.05$, NFI $\geqq 0.90$, CFI $\geqq 0.90$), showing unidimensionality of the scales. Table 2 shows that the composite reliability ranged from 0.87 to 0.94, or greater than the standard of 0.6 (Hair et al., 2006). The researchers also employed a set of established procedures to check for convergent validity and discriminant validity of our scales. The average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct was between 0.52 and 0.76, which was either equal to or higher than 0.5 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981), supporting convergent validity. The researchers measured discriminant validity by calculating the AVE for all pairs of constructs and comparing this value to the squared correlation between the two constructs of interest. The research results show the squared correlation between any pair of constructs in all cases was less than the respective AVE of each of the constructs in the pair (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), supporting discriminant validity.

Table 2. Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Constructs	Factor loadings	Composite reliability	AVE
Job crafting			
Individual crafting		0.89	0.54
Introduce new approaches on your own to improve your work in the job	0.75		
Change minor work procedures that you think are not productive on your own	0.70		
On your own, change the way you do your job to make it easier to yourself	0.77		
Rearrange equipment in the areas of your job on your own	0.76		
Organize special events in your job on your own	0.77		
On your own, bring in other materials from home for the job	0.67		
Collaborative crafting		0.94	0.73
Work together with your coworkers to introduce new approaches to improve your work in the job	0.82		
Decide together with your coworkers to change minor work procedures that you think are not productive	0.85		
Decide together with your coworkers to change the way you do your job to make it easier to yourself	0.84		
Decide together with your coworkers to rearrange equipment in the areas of your job	0.88		
Decide together with your coworkers to organize special events in your job	0.88		
Decide together with your coworkers to bring in other materials from home for the job	0.85		
Job performance		0.88	0.52
I adequately completes assigned duties	0.73		
I fulfills responsibilities specified in job description	0.68		
I performs tasks that are expected of him/her	0.75		
I meets formal performance requirements of the job	0.83		
I engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation	0.70		
I neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform (R)	0.64		
I fails to perform essential duties (R)	0.69		
Job satisfaction		0.87	0.58
I feel that my job is valuable	0.61		
In my job, I feel that I am doing something worthwhile	0.79		
I feel that my job is interesting	0.72		
I feel that my job is satisfying	0.85		
If I had to do it all over again, I would choose another job (R)	0.82		
Organizational commitment		0.89	0.58

I really care about the fate of this organization	0.70	
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond what normally is expected in order to help this organization be successful	0.83	
The organization really inspires me to put forth my best effort	0.70	
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	0.69	
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined	0.84	
Overall, I am very committed to this organization	0.78	
Perceived organizational support	0.90	0.54
My organization really cares about my well-being	0.79	
My organization cares about my opinions	0.82	
My organization strongly considers my goals and values	0.83	
My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part	0.66	
Help is available from my organization when I have a problem	0.76	
My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor	0.78	
My organization shows very little concern for me (R)	0.61	
If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me (R)	0.59	
Distributive justice	0.94	0.76
My work schedule is fair	0.79	
I think that my level of pay is fair	0.88	
I consider my work load to be quite fair	0.89	
Overall, the rewards I receive here are quiet fair	0.91	
I feel that my job responsibilities are fair	0.87	

Note: R refers to reversed question items.

AVE refers to average variance extracted.

Correlation analysis

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations of all variables. Individual crafting was positively related to tour leaders' job performance ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .40$, $p < .01$) and organizational commitment ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). Collaborative crafting was positively related to tour leaders' job performance ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .47$, $p < .01$) and organizational commitment ($r = .49$, $p < .01$). In addition, POS was positively related to tour leaders' job performance ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .37$, $p < .01$) and organizational commitment ($r = .57$, $p < .01$). The results provided an initial examination of the proposed relationships.

Table 3. Means, standard deviations and correlations of all variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Individual crafting	4.21	0.52									
2.Collaborative crafting	4.07	0.67	.60**								
3.Job performance	4.16	0.57	.39**	.46**							
4.Job satisfaction	4.08	0.59	.40**	.47**	.54**						
5.Organizational commitment	3.88	0.66	.38**	.49**	.45**	.63**					
6.POS	3.52	0.66	.15**	.27**	.31**	.37**	.57**				
7.Age	35.40	9.17	.24**	.17**	.17**	.05	.21**	.09			
8.Organizational tenure	8.69	7.30	.22**	.17**	.15**	-.01	.16**	.06	.70**		
9.Distributive justice	3.30	0.78	.12*	.24**	.23**	.34**	.45**	.68**	.11*	.10	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis

The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of job crafting on tour leaders' job outcomes. To test the hypotheses adequately, a series of regression analyses were conducted. First, this study adopted individual crafting and collaborative crafting as independent variables, job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as dependent variables, and established multiple regression models to test the hypotheses of this study. The criteria used to determine whether or not the hypotheses are supported include the standardized regression coefficient (β), significance level,

9

F-statistic (for the composite set of independent variables), amount of variance for after each step (R^2) and the incremental variance accounted for (ΔR^2) between the second and third step. The use of hierarchical regression allowed us to pinpoint and control the predictive power of these contextual factors. Therefore, according to the characteristics of the data, we found it appropriate to use hierarchical multiple regression analyses as the data analysis of this study. Its functionality also conformed to our research objectives. Control variables were entered in five steps. In step 1, the demographics of age, organizational tenure were installed; in step 2, distributive justice was installed; in step 3, individual crafting and collaborative crafting were installed; in step 4, POS was installed; and finally in step 5, the interaction of job crafting and POS was installed. The results of each step are presented in Table 4.

Overall, the model predicted that job performance was significant (F = 20.20, p < .01), explaining 25 percent of the variance. After individual crafting and collaborative crafting were entered in step 3, the increase in explained variance was 16 percent. Individual crafting (β = .19, p < .01) and collaborative crafting (β = .28, p < .01) were statistically significant. The results indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting were positively related to tour leaders' job performance. Thus, H1-1 and H1-2 were supported.

In addition, the model predicted that job satisfaction was significant (F = 28.36, p < .01), explaining 32 percent of the variance. After individual crafting and collaborative crafting were entered in step 3, the increase in explained variance was 19 percent. Individual crafting (β = .22, p < .01) and collaborative crafting (β = .29, p < .01) were statistically significant. The results indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting were positively related to tour leaders' job satisfaction. Thus, H2-1 and H2-2 of this study were supported.

Besides, the model predicted that organizational commitment was significant (F = 51.60, p < .01), explaining 47 percent of the variance. After individual crafting and collaborative crafting were entered in step 3, the increase in explained variance was 15 percent. Individual crafting (β = .14, p < .05) and collaborative crafting (β = .32, p < .01) were statistically significant. The results indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting were positively related to tour leaders' organizational commitment. Thus, H3-1 and H3-2 were supported.

Finally, after the interaction term of job crafting and POS was entered in step 5, the increase in explained variance was non-significant. Job performance (β = -.35, p > .05), job satisfaction (β = .06, p > .05) and organizational commitment (β = -.06, p > .05) were not statistically significant. The results indicated that POS did not moderate the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. Thus, H4 was not supported.

Table 4. Hierarchical multiple regression results of job crafting on job outcomes

Step	Job performance			Job satisfaction			Organizational commitment		
	β	t	ΔR^2	β	t	ΔR^2	β	t	ΔR^2
1.Demographics			0.03			0.01			0.04
Age	0.07	0.96		0.02	0.33		0.11	1.79	
Organizational tenure	-0.01	-0.14		-0.14*	-2.26		-0.03	-0.56	
2.Distributive justice	0.15**	3.12	0.04	0.25**	5.50	0.10	0.35**	7.93	0.18
3.Individual crafting	0.19**	3.16	0.16	0.22**	3.97	0.19	0.14*	2.52	0.15
Collaborative crafting	0.28**	4.71		0.29**	5.13		0.32**	5.88	
4.POS	0.21**	3.23	0.02	0.18**	2.93	0.02	0.43**	7.99	0.10
5.Job crafting × POS	-0.35	-0.75	0.00	0.06	0.13	0.00	-0.06	-0.15	0.00
F		20.20**			28.36**			51.60**	
R^2		0.25			0.32			0.47	

* p < .05
** p < .01

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes in order to suffice the inconsistent previous research findings on this subject matter. Empirical results of this research demonstrated that individual crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Collaborative crafting is positively related to tour leaders' job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. However, POS does not moderate the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. Job design is an important issue in HRM; even though the practice of job crafting policy has been extensively discussed, still there remain inconsistent research findings to explain the relationship between job crafting and it effects. Through the research findings attained from this study, contributions can be made to the theory and practice of and the clarification of the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes.

The results of this study indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting are associated with higher tour leaders' job performance. Tour leaders who engage in job crafting are more likely to deeply understand the interconnections among the tour activities they enact and the mechanisms that relate task performance processes to group package tours. They are better able to try new ways of performing their tasks and to respond to unpredictable situations in the tour journey. This will in turn results in higher job performance. This finding is consistent with that found by Tims et al. (2012).

In addition, the results also indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting are associated with higher tour leaders' job satisfaction. Job crafting is a means of describing the ways in which employees utilize opportunities to customize their jobs by actively changing their tasks and interactions with others at work. Tour leaders who engage in job crafting are likely to gain job resources, which will in turn lead to higher job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with previous empirical research (Ghitulescu, 2006). However, empirical findings of this study contradict that of Leana et al. (2009), which found that individual crafting is negatively related to job satisfaction.

Besides, the results of this study indicated that individual crafting and collaborative crafting are associated with higher tour leaders' organizational commitment. Job crafting enable tour leaders to alter the task and relational boundaries of theirs jobs to create work identity and the meaning of work. Also, tour leaders participate in the creation of their work identity with others and enable the creation of desirable identities that fulfill a need for positive self-assessment. Therefore, tour leaders to craft the job they are performing are expected to increase their fit or attachment to their job and commitment to their organization. This finding is consistent with that found by Ghitulescu (2006). However, empirical findings of this study is inconsistent with that of Leana et al. (2009), which suggested that individual crafting is not related to organizational commitment.

In addition, the results of this study suggested that collaborative crafting is more strongly related to tour leaders' job outcomes than individual crafting, although the difference between the coefficients was statistically significant only in organizational commitment ($t = 2.11$, $p < .05$) (Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, & Piquero, 1998). Individual's interactions with their colleagues are more helpful in achieving tour leaders' job outcomes. This is because interpersonal interactions help in the sharing of rich, contextual, situated knowledge in organization (Bechky, 2003; Orr, 1990). Crafting the relational boundaries of work by interacting more frequently with others provide tour leaders with novel sources of task knowledge or cues that they can use to craft better task strategies. For example, when tour leaders share stories about their previous experiences in solving difficult problems with the tour journey, their communication contributes both a tour leaders' work identity and the efficient work of other tour leaders. Moreover, the tour leaders' service tends to be organized as a collaborative endeavour with a tour leader and other employees working together to provide quality service for the tour members. In the context of travel industry, it is not surprising that the results indicated that collaborative crafting have a higher relationship with tour leaders' job outcomes than individual crafting.

Based on the JR-D model, a recent review by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) called for further

research to investigate the phenomenon of job crafting and thereby in the dynamics of employees' well-being (outcomes). In this research, we respond to their call by investigating how job crafting may influence tour leaders' job outcomes. According to the findings of this study, the researchers suggest that job crafting is an important antecedent of job performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment for tour leaders. The finding of this study is consistent with that of the JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker et al., 2004; Demerouti et al., 2001; Llorens, Bakker, Salanova, & Schaufeli, 2006).

This study extends existing research on job crafting in several ways. First, it attempts to explain the relationship between job crafting and employees' job outcomes from the perspective of travel industry. Second, previous researches seem to suggest inconsistent explications on the relationship between job crafting and employees' job outcomes. Therefore, a major contribution of this study is to fill this gap by providing empirical findings and implications on the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes. Third, the researchers complement and respond to the call made by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) for further research into related subject matters involving job crafting.

Results of this study possess several managerial implications. First, job crafting theory does not devalue the importance of job designs assigned by travel managers. It simply values the opportunities tour leaders have to change them. For travel manager, socialization and training programs would benefit from a recognition that job crafting activities occurs. Also, providing some incentives may be one way to encourage tour leaders to share the results of their job crafting efforts, or their ideas about how to initiate useful changes. Second, travel managers should attempt to evaluate their tour leaders' job characteristics over time. Besides, travel managers should collect and analyze data on tour leaders' career dynamics, stages, plans and expectations. Travel managers may use role-playing and scenario designs to gain initial insight into how temporal career dynamics affect job design reactions and job crafting efforts. Third, job crafting is not always positive for travel agency. It has the potential to cause harm if the job crafting produces negative effects or goes against organizational goals. Even when the job crafting is beneficial for the tour leaders, it still may be harmful to the overall travel agency. Thus, in addition to designing jobs that allow for crafting, travel managers should create and sustain a work environment that cultivates beneficial job crafting. Besides, maintaining open lines of communication with employees about how they would like to craft their jobs and whether it would be beneficial for the travel agency may help travel managers promote favorable crafting and avoid detrimental crafting.

The present study has several methodical limitations. First, this study measures tour leaders' job outcomes in a self-report manner, which may lead to a social desirability response bias. Second, since this study takes samples from consolidated travel agencies with headquarters in Taipei, the results of this study may not be effectively and accurately generalized toward other tourism segments. Third, the cross-sectional research design limits the extent to which cause-effect relations can be inferred from our research findings. Finally, samples for the main survey were drawn from the travel industry, which might limit the generalization of the results to other industries.

From an academic viewpoint, several areas for further research arise from this study. First, this study only focuses on the tour leaders of travel agencies. Future studies can further explore other segments of the tourism industry. Second, we suggest future studies to make a comparison between industries and conduct more in-depth discussions on the effect of job crafting on employees' job outcomes. Third, future research that adopts a longitudinal design would be better suited to addressing the causal status of the variables examined in this research. A longitudinal study would allow us to measure the effectiveness of both the short- and long-term effects of job crafting. Finally, we suggest future studies to examine whether other mediators or moderators exist in the relationship between job crafting and tour leaders' job outcomes.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14(3), 396-402.

Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 76-94.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-328.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83-104.

Bechky, B. A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 312-330.

Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158-186.

Black, J. S., & Ashford, S. J. (1995). Fitting in or making jobs fit: Factors affecting mode of adjustment for new hires. *Human Relations*, 48(4), 421-437.

Bowie, D., & Chang, J. C. (2005). Tourist satisfaction: A view from a mixed international guided package tour. *Journal of Vocation Marketing*, 11(4), 303-322.

Campion, M. A., & McClelland, C. L. (1993). Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 339-351.

Caza, B. B. (2007). *Experiences of adversity at work: Toward an identity-based theory of resilience.* Doctoral Dissertation: University of Michigan.

Cohen, E. (1985). The tourist guide: The origins, structure and dynamics of a role. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(1), 5-29.

Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95, 834-848.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 499-512.

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 812-820.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structure equations models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.

Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (1987). The validity of the job characteristics model: A review and meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2), 287-322.

Gerbing, D. W., & Anderson, J. C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(2), 186-192.

Geva, A., & Goldman, A. (1991). Satisfaction measurement in guided tours. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 177-185.

Ghitulescu, B. E. (2006). *Job crafting and social embeddedness at work.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Ghitulescu, B. E. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting.* University of Pittsburgh.

Grant, A., & Ashford, S. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. In A. Brief & B. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 28, 3-34. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Harris, K. J., Andrews, M. C., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). The moderating effects of justice on the relationship between organizational politics and workplace attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 2(2), 135-144.

Heung, V. C. S. (2008). Effect of tour leader's service quality on agency's reputation and customers' word-of-mouth. *Journal of Vocation Marketing*, 14(4), 305-315.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.

Holloway, J. C. (1981). The guided tour: A sociological approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(3),

377-402.

Janssen, P. P. M., Peeters, M. C. W., de Jonge, J., Houkes, I., & Tummers, G. E. R. (2004). Specific relationships between job demands, job resources and outcomes and the mediating role of work home interference: A cross cultural validation study among nurses. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 411-429.

Johlke, M. C., & Duhan, M. D. (2000). Supervisor communication practices and service employee job outcomes. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(2), 154-165.

Karatepe, O., & Kilic, H. (2009). The effects of two directions of conflict and facilitation on frontline employees job outcomes. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(7), 977-993.

Karatepe, O. M., & Tekinkus, M. (2006). The effects of work-family conflict, emotional exhaustion, and intrinsic motivation on job outcomes of front-line employees. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 24(3), 173-193.

Karatepe, O. M., Uludag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmedagic, L., & Baddar, L. (2006). The effects of selected individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 27(4), 547-560.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.

Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(6), 1169-1192.

LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 725-741.

Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9(4), 370-390.

Lin, C. T., Wang, K. C, & Chen, W. Y. (2008). Female tour leaders as advertising endorsers. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(9), 1265-1275.

Llorens, S., Bakker, A. B., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Testing the robustness of the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(3), 378-391.

Loscocco, K. A. (1989). The interplay of personal and job characteristics in determining work commitment. *Social Science Research*, 18, 370-394.

Lyons, P. (2008). The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 23(1-2), 25-36.

Mak, A. H. N., Wong, K. K. F., & Chang, R. C. Y. (2011). Critical issues affecting the service quality and professionalism of the tour guides in Hong Kong and Macau. *Tourism Management*, 32(6), 1442-1452.

Mancini, M. (1996). *Conducting Tours*, 2nd edn. New York: Delmar Publishers.

McCain, S. C., Tsai, H. and Bellino, N. (2010). Organizational justice, employees' ethical behavior, and job satisfaction in the casino industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(7), 992-1009.

Messersmith, J. G., & Guthrie, J. P. (2010). High performance work systems in emergent organizations: Implications for firm performance. *Human Resource Management*, 49(2), 241-264.

Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2005). *Compensation Management*, 8th Ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Miner, A. S. (1987). Idiosyncratic jobs in formalized organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32(3), 327-351.

Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationships between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.

Parker, S. K., Wall, T. D., & Cordery, J. (2001). Future work design research and practice: Towards an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74(4), 413-440.

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36, 859-866.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in

behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.

Podsakoff, P., & Organ, D. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulina, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603-609.

Quiroga, I. (1990). Characteristics of package tours in Europe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(2), 185-207.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.

Riggle, R. J., Edmondson, D. R., & Hansen, J. D. (2009). A meta-analysis of the relationship between perceived organizational support and job outcomes: 20 years of research. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 1027-1030.

Ryan, C., & Dewar, D. (1995). Evaluating the communication process between interpreter and visitor. *Tourism Management*, 16(4), 295-303.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.

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, 173-183.

Tremblay, M., Cloutier, J., Simard, G., Chnevert, D., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). The role of HRM practices, procedural justice, organizational support and trust in organizational commitment and in-role and extra-role performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(3), 405-433.

Tsaur, S. H., Yen, C. H., & Yang, W. Y. (2011). Do job characteristics lead to employee creativity in travel agencies? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 191-204.

Van de Vijver, F., & Hambleton, R. (1996). Translating tests: Some practical guidelines. *European Psychologist*, 1, 89-99.

Vlachos, I. (2008). The effect of human resource practices on organizational performance: evidence from Greece. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(1), 74-97.

Wang, K. C., Hsieh, A. T., & Chen, W. Y. (2002). Is the tour leader an effective endorser for group package tour brochures? *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 489-498.

Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.

Wong, J. Y., & Wang, C. H. (2009). Emotional labor of the tour leaders: An exploratory study. *Tourism Management*, 30(2), 249-259.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201.

Yamamoto, D., & Gill, A. M. (1999). Emerging trends in Japanese package tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(2), 134-143.

Zhang, H. Q., & Chow, I. (2004). Application of importance-performance model in tour guides' performance: Evidence from mainland Chinese outbound visitors in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 81-91.