Reemployment crafting

Citation for published version (APA):

Hulshof, I. L., Demerouti, E., & Le Blanc, P. M. (2020). Reemployment crafting: proactively shaping one's job search. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(1), 58–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000419>

Document license:

TAVERNE

DOI:

[10.1037/apl0000419](https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000419)

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2020

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Reemployment Crafting: Proactively Shaping One's Job Search

Inge L. Hulshof, Evangelia Demerouti, and Pascale M. Le Blanc
Eindhoven University of Technology

This article introduces the concept of reemployment crafting: the proactive, self-initiated behaviors undertaken by the unemployed to shape the environmental conditions of their job search in a way that enhances the person–environment (P–E) fit during the job search process. Using 2 longitudinal studies (Study 1: 3-wave study over a 3-month period, $N = 153$; Study 2: 4-day diary study, $N = 189$, days = 627), we investigated whether the manner in which the unemployed craft their job search is similar to the way employees craft their job. We examined whether reemployment crafting was positively related to job search performance (i.e., environmental exploration and networking behavior) and reemployment chances. Moreover, we examined whether contingency factors (i.e., social support and subjective goal attainment) affected the effectiveness of reemployment crafting. Results from both samples confirmed that the way the unemployed craft their job searches is similar to the way that employees craft their jobs. Reemployment crafting was positively related to job search performance, both within a 3-month period and within days. Moreover, reemployment crafting was especially beneficial for environmental exploration on days when social support and goal attainment were low. Last, environmental exploration was related to networking behavior, which in turn was predictive of reemployment chances. Specifically, in the diary study networking quality was related to reemployment status, while within the 3-month period, networking intensity seemed more effective. We conclude that reemployment crafting seems a promising way to enhance job search performance and ultimately the chances of finding reemployment.

Keywords: environmental exploration, job crafting, networking behavior, reemployment, reemployment crafting

Involuntary job loss has tremendous consequences for those who are affected by it. Not only are there severe financial challenges, involuntary job loss also has negative effects on health and well-being (Wanberg, 2012). Unemployed people report higher levels of health-related complaints, such as stomachaches and headaches and are more prone to develop stress-related ailments such as anxiety and depression. They are even at a higher risk to become suicidal (Wanberg, 2012). Not only does unemployment have a tremendous impact on the lives of those affected by it, it is also a problem for society as a whole. Unemployment is related to a waste of human capital (Pissarides, 1992) and each year governments spend a tremendous amount of money on unemployment benefits (e.g., UWV, 2017). Given the personal and societal relevance, it seems worthwhile to examine ways to help the unemployed find reemployment.

Trying to find a new job is something people have to do on their own initiative. That is, they have to be proactive. Proactivity is related to job search behavior (Kanfer, Wanberg, & Kantrowitz,

2001; Zacher, 2013), such that proactive people spend more time on preparatory job search activities (e.g., exploring possibilities) and active job search activities (e.g., networking behavior; Brown, Cober, Kane, Levy, & Shalhoop, 2006). The current study focuses on a specific form of proactivity: *reemployment crafting*, which refers to the proactive, self-initiated behaviors undertaken by the unemployed to shape the environmental conditions of their job search in a way that enhances the person–environment (P–E) fit during the job search process (cf. Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

Reemployment crafting enables the unemployed to shape (or create) the environmental conditions necessary to perform optimally in their job search. Reemployment crafting does not refer to the activities the unemployed undertake to find a job per se, but it refers to the actions they undertake to make their job search journey more motivating (e.g., asking a friend for advice on an application letter), challenging (e.g., learning how to make a video résumé) and less hindering (e.g., working with set timeslots when searching for vacancies). It differs from proactive job search behavior (i.e., proactively looking for job opportunities and acting upon them), as reemployment crafting enables the unemployed to shape the conditions (i.e., optimizing the available resources and existing demands/challenges) needed to see job search opportunities and act upon them. Reemployment crafting thus precedes and/or complements proactive job search behavior.

Reemployment crafting originates from the job demands–resources (JD–R) model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti, 2014) and the job crafting literature (Petrou, Demerouti, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Hetland, 2012; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski

This article was published Online First June 13, 2019.

Inge L. Hulshof, Evangelia Demerouti, and Pascale M. Le Blanc, Department of Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences, Human Performance Management Group, Eindhoven University of Technology.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Inge L. Hulshof, Department of Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences, Human Performance Management Group, Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, the Netherlands. E-mail: i.l.hulshof@tue.nl

& Dutton, 2001). Trying to find a new job takes a lot of time. Some even link the job search process to holding a full-time job (Amundson & Borgen, 1982). Therefore, it is examined whether a leading framework in industrial psychology is also applicable to the context of being unemployed. Using two longitudinal studies, this article examines whether the unemployed craft their job search in the same way that employees craft their job and whether this may be conducive to job search performance.

Employee performance is often studied using the JD–R model (e.g., Demerouti, Bakker, & Gevers, 2015; Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2014; Van Wingerden, Bakker, & Derks, 2016). In a similar way, we focus on the most prevalent performance outcome for the unemployed: finding reemployment. Reemployment crafting is expected to be positively related to the chances of finding reemployment by stimulating two behaviors that are crucial when trying to find a new job: environmental exploration and networking behavior (Lambert, Eby, & Reeves, 2006; Zikic & Klehe, 2006). Furthermore, two situational factors (i.e., contingencies) are proposed for which reemployment crafting is particularly beneficial: low subjective goal attainment and low social support. Both factors have motivational characteristics (Grebner, Elfering, & Semmer, 2010; Vinokur & Caplan, 1987) and when they are low, reemployment crafting may help the unemployed compensate to uphold their motivation and job search performance (Hobfoll, 2001).

This study contributes to the literature in at least three ways. First, it considers the *what* of reemployment crafting. What is it? Using the JD–R model and the job crafting literature, we examine whether the unemployed proactively shape their job search and, if so, whether this is beneficial for their chances of finding reemployment. This way, the applicability of a well-proven theoretical framework in industrial psychology is generalized to a context with high societal relevance.

Second, it considers the *why* of reemployment crafting. Why does reemployment crafting work? We examine this question by exploring mechanisms through which reemployment crafting relates to the chances of finding reemployment. We focus specifically on environmental exploration and networking behavior (both intensity and quality) and examine how they are related to the chances of finding a new job.

Last, it considers the *when* of reemployment crafting. When is reemployment especially beneficial? Using a diary approach, the short-term daily dynamics of reemployment crafting and the effects of two contingency factors are examined. This way, this study adds to the literature by not only showing that reemployment crafting is beneficial, but also showing under which conditions reemployment crafting may be especially valuable.

Reemployment Crafting: Why and What?

Having a job provides people with structure in their daily lives. It helps them to form a coherent social identity and a sense of purpose (Jahoda, 1981, 1982). As people are proactive agents in their job, they may craft (i.e., make small changes to) their job to enhance P–E fit (Tims & Bakker, 2010). This enables them to experience meaning and engagement in their work (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Moreover, job crafting enables employees to gather the resources they need to successfully carry out their work-related tasks (Petrou et al., 2012). Last, employees craft their job to assert control over their work, to

create a positive self-image and to fulfill the need for connectedness (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Being unemployed deprives people of the benefits of having a job. The unemployed have to deal with uncertainties which they cannot control (Price, Friedland, & Vinokur, 1998). They receive rejections, making it hard to uphold a positive self-image and, as they do not belong to an organization, their social circle “is getting smaller” (Jahoda, 1981, 1982). Job crafting contributes to feelings of control, a positive self-image and connectedness (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), thereby tapping in to some important aspects necessary to continue one's job search. Moreover, as it takes considerable time and energy to find a new job, we suggest that the strategies used by job crafters may also be beneficial to the unemployed.

In the JD–R model (Bakker, 2011; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001) *job crafting* refers to the changes employees make in their job resources and job demands (Tims & Bakker, 2010). In a similar way, we operationalize reemployment crafting as the changes the unemployed make in their job search resources and job search demands when trying to find reemployment. Job search demands are those physical, psychological or contextual aspects of the job search that require sustained physical or mental effort and are associated with physical and psychological costs (cf. Demerouti et al., 2001), such as financial hardship and high levels of uncertainty. Job search resources are the physical, psychological and contextual aspects of the job seeking process that (1) may be beneficial to achieving job search goals, (2) are able to reduce the effects of job search demands and their associated physical and psychological costs, and (3) may help increase personal growth and development (cf. Demerouti et al., 2001), such as feedback and social support. Through reemployment crafting, the unemployed shape their job search activities in similar ways as job crafters shape their work activities in order to experience meaning and motivation (Bakker et al., 2012; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). This way, the unemployed can enhance their P–E fit similar to the way that job crafters enhance theirs when crafting their job (Lu, Wang, Lu, Du, & Bakker, 2014; Tims, Derks, & Bakker, 2016). In line with the work of Petrou et al. (2012), three types of reemployment crafting are defined to examine how the unemployed proactively shape (i.e., craft) their job search: seeking resources, seeking challenging demands, and reducing hindering demands.

Seeking Resources

Human motivation is aimed at the accumulation of resources which are relevant to protect other valued resources (Hobfoll, 2001). There are some universally valued resources such as health, well-being and a positive sense of self (Hobfoll, 2011). As the unemployed experience lower levels of health and well-being (Jahoda, 1981; Wanberg, 2012) and have to deal with rejections (making it hard[er] to uphold a positive sense of self), seeking resources may be especially valuable. It may include proactive behaviors such as asking for feedback on a motivation letter or asking for advice on how to apply for a specific job or at a specific organization (Lee, 1997).

Reducing Hindering Demands

Demands are those aspects of the job search that exceed one's capabilities and therefore get in the way of reaching job search

goals (Tims & Bakker, 2010). By reducing hindering demands, the unemployed may be able to attain their job search goals without excessive effort and loss of well-being. Reducing hindering demands may include behaviors such as trying to make the quest for work emotionally (e.g., trying to ruminate less) or mentally (e.g., not looking for vacancies online 24 hr a day, 7 days a week) less intense.

Seeking Challenging Demands

Scholars (e.g., Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007) have argued that when demands are positively interpreted, they may be perceived as challenges. Although challenges need the investment of time and energy (and therefore could be classified as demands) they do not deplete one's energy and are not associated with ill-health and dissatisfaction (Tims & Bakker, 2010). They are, however, related to goal achievement, motivation and engagement (Cavanaugh, Boswell, Roehling, & Boudreau, 2000; Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008). When unemployed, it may be difficult to stay motivated to continue one's job search, so seeking challenging demands may be an effective strategy to uphold one's motivation. Seeking challenging demands may include proactive behaviors such as learning how to network or how to make an online video résumé.

Study 1

The aims of the first study were threefold: (1) to examine whether the manner in which the unemployed craft their job search is similar to the way employees craft their job, (2) to explore how and when reemployment crafting is beneficial for job search performance, and (3) to examine whether this increases the chances of finding reemployment.

As there are similarities between having a job and having to find a job (e.g., both take a considerable amount of time [Amundson & Borgen, 1982] and both deal with uncertainties [Price et al., 1998; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970]), some researchers have stated that finding a job is a fulltime job itself (Amundson & Borgen, 1982). Therefore, strategies that help employees in their work, might also be relevant for the unemployed. That is, the unemployed may optimize their job search demands and resources by crafting their job search context using the same strategies as job crafters: seeking resources, seeking challenging demands and reducing hindering demands.

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Reemployment crafting will show a similar three-factor structure as job crafting with seeking resources, seeking challenging demands, and reducing hindering demands as factors.

How Reemployment Crafting May Benefit the Unemployed

Previous research has shown that job crafting is positively related to performance (e.g., Bakker et al., 2012; Demerouti et al., 2015; McClelland, Leach, Clegg, & McGowan, 2014). When crafting their job, employees align their working conditions with their needs and abilities to enhance P-E fit (Tims & Bakker, 2010), creating a challenging work environment that fosters enthusiasm and absorption (Bakker et al., 2012). This way, they are more

willing to focus their attention on the tasks at hand, thereby enhancing performance (Beal, Weiss, Barros, & Macdermid, 2005). In a similar vein, we expect reemployment crafting to be related to job search performance, to the extent that the unemployed enhance P-E fit by crafting a challenging job search environment that enhances engagement and increases the chances of finding a job. As networking behavior and environmental exploration are important aspects when trying to find a new job (Forret, 2014; Van Hooft, van Hooft, & Lievens, 2009; Wanberg, Kanfer, & Banas, 2000; Zikic & Klehe, 2006), they are the focus of the current study. Specifically, reemployment crafting is expected to be positively related to networking behavior and this relationship will be mediated by environmental exploration.

Most research on networking among the unemployed focuses on networking intensity (Blau, 1993; Lambert et al., 2006; Wanberg et al., 2000), which is described as the scope and frequency of networking behaviors displayed (Wanberg et al., 2000). However, networking intensity alone is not sufficient. As Lambert et al. (2006) mentioned, "people can engage in a great deal of networking but not obtain high-quality information because of the types of contacts that they have" (p. 352). Thus, not only the scope and frequency of networking behavior matter, its quality is also of influence on successfully finding a new job.

The precise nature of the construct of networking quality has received little research attention, although scholars have pointed out its relevance (e.g., Van Hooft, Wanberg, & Van Hooft, 2012; Wanberg et al., 2000). One exception is the work of Lambert et al. (2006), who focus on the diversity of one's network and the perceived value of the quality of the information obtained through networking. Although their work is promising, their scale does not (always) reflect behavioral actions undertaken by the unemployed (i.e., one can have a diverse network, but if one does not engage in networking this diversity will not be of any help). Building on the work of Lambert et al. (2006) we took a behavioral perspective distinguishing two dimensions of networking quality: network influence and network progression. *Network influence* refers to the knowledge and status of the persons with whom one networks (e.g., they are experts in their field and/or have an interesting network themselves; Widén-Wulff et al., 2008). *Network progression* refers to the extent to which networking helps one get ahead (e.g., being introduced to another person or a possible job lead; Widén-Wulff et al., 2008). In the current study we focus on both networking intensity and networking quality and expect reemployment crafting to be related to networking behavior via environmental exploration.

Environmental exploration is described as the process in which people proactively gather information about jobs, occupations and organizations, which allows them to make informed career decisions (Stumpf, Colarelli, & Hartman, 1983; Zikic & Klehe, 2006). It thus focuses on the behavioral actions a person undertakes to enrich his or her knowledge about potential new job leads. Examples of environmental exploration are obtaining information about specific areas of career interest, visiting a career orientation program and obtaining information about specific jobs and/or organizations. Environmental exploration, together with self-exploration, forms the construct of career exploration (Berlyne, 1960 and Jordaen, 1963 as cited in Stumpf et al., 1983): the goal-directed behaviors and cognitions aimed at gaining new information about job opportunities (Berlyne, 1960 and Jordaen,

1963 as cited in Stumpf et al., 1983). In the current study, we take a behavioral perspective focusing on behaviors the unemployed undertake to enhance their job search performance, and we solely focus on environmental exploration and not on self-exploration.

Soelberg (1967) argued that the job search process consists of two phases: the preparatory and the active job search phase. In the preparatory job search phase, people plan their intended job search actions and gather initial job alternatives to consider (Soelberg, 1967, as cited in Blau, 1994). In the active job search phase people formally activate their job search by actively applying for positions. Soelberg (1967 as cited in Blau, 1994) argued that logically, preparatory job search behavior precedes active job search behavior. As environmental exploration is a preparatory job search activity and networking behavior is an active job search activity, environmental exploration logically precedes networking behavior. Reemployment crafting enables the unemployed to shape the environmental conditions necessary to optimize their job search, enabling them to first plan and then execute their job search. Therefore, environmental exploration is expected to act as a mediator in the relationship between reemployment crafting and networking behavior (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Environmental exploration (Time 2 [T2]) mediates the positive relationship between Time 1 [T1]—(H2a) seeking resources, (H2b) seeking challenging demands, and (H2c) reducing hindering demands—and Time 3 (T3) networking intensity.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Environmental exploration (T2) mediates the positive relationship between T1—(H3a) seeking resources, (H3b) seeking challenging demands, and (H3c) reducing hindering demands—and T3 networking quality.

Finding Reemployment

Engaging in networking behavior is related to higher chances of finding reemployment (Lambert et al., 2006), as people who engage in networking behavior may gain additional information, affect (friendship), power and ingratiation (enhancing one's likability; Kaplan, 1984; Liden & Mitchell, 1988; Michael & Yukl, 1993). Therefore, they are assumed to gain more career-relevant information, advice, feedback, job interviews, and job offers compared with those who do not use their network (Forret, 2014; Van Hove et al., 2009).¹ Thus, the unemployed engaging in networking behavior gain additional means to enhance their chances of finding reemployment.

Hypothesis 4: People utilizing their network to a greater extent (high networking intensity and quality) are more likely to gain reemployment (a) 3 months, (b) 6 months, and (c) 9 months after the study was conducted.

Method

We conducted a longitudinal study among customers of a Dutch unemployment agency with three measurement points (6 weeks apart) over a 12-week period. This study, together with Study 2, was part of the project 'Let's go to work: The role of job crafting in the process of finding a job' and was approved by the Research Committee Industrial Engineering, protocol number 2015–011.

This article is the first publication of a larger dataset related to this project.

Participants were well educated (61.9% had at least a bachelor's degree), unemployed for at least 4 months, and between the ages of 28 and 65. Moreover, participants did not have any mental or physical disabilities that would impede with their chances of gaining reemployment. Participants were recruited through e-mail messages and personal letters that were sent to their home address by the unemployment agency. All questionnaires were administered online. When participants completed the whole study, they received a coupon (\$11) for a local bistro.

In total, 350 unemployed customers were invited to participate in the study, 278 responded (79.4% response rate). Of these people 46.4% were male, 53.6% were female. On average, people were 51.6 ($SD = 9.0$) years old, unemployed for 15.4 ($SD = 8.6$) months, and had 15.9 ($SD = 8.0$) months of unemployment benefits left. Between T1 and T2, 28 people (10.1%) found reemployment, leaving 250 possible responses for T2. Between T2 and T3, 13 people (4.7%) found reemployment, leaving 237 possible responses. At T2, 189 participants responded (dropout 24.4%), and at T3, 166 participants responded (dropout 30.0%). Dropout was completely random, $\chi^2(878) = 899.54, p = .30$. When exploring the mean differences on the study variables (reemployment crafting, environmental exploration and networking behavior) participants who dropped out had slightly higher scores (M difference = 0.19) on T1 seeking challenging demands ($t = 1.97, p = .05$). However, on all other study variables there were no differences.

Measures

All variables were measured at all three points in time, with the exception of the sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender) that were only assessed at T1. Unless indicated otherwise, participants were asked to reflect on their experiences in the last month. Moreover, all items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*does not apply to me*) to 5 (*totally applies to me*).

Reemployment crafting. Reemployment crafting was assessed using an adapted version of the 10 item job crafting scale developed by Petrou et al. (2012). For an overview of the items, see Table 1. Before developing this scale, 13 semistructured interviews were conducted with unemployed customers of the unemployment agency. In these interviews, the job search process, job search demands, and job search resources were extensively discussed, to make sure the items of our scale matched the context of being unemployed and looking for a job. The scale consisted of three subscales: Seeking Resources, Seeking Challenging Demands, and Reducing Hindering Demands. All items were modified.

¹ One could argue that seeking resources and networking behavior are the same as in cases in which one might seek feedback and advice. However, we would like to emphasize that seeking resources is a broader construct than networking behavior. It refers to gathering those aspects relevant for one's job search that help to achieve goals, help to stay motivated and stimulate personal development (Demerouti et al., 2001). These can be aimed at the social aspects of one's job search (e.g., asking for advice), but also at the more structural aspects of one's job search (e.g., time management). Networking behavior is targeted only at social aspects, as it refers to the building of a system of people that help to provide career relevant information and social support (Gould & Penley, 1984). Thus, although there is some overlap between the constructs, seeking resources is much broader than just networking behavior.

Figure 1. Proposed research model Study 1.

fied to match the context of unemployed. The Seeking Resources subscale comprises three items (e.g., “I have asked others for feedback on my job search performance”), Cronbach’s alphas ranged from 0.61 to 0.77 ($M \alpha = .68$). The Seeking Challenging Demands subscale comprises four items (e.g., “I have tried to make my quest for work more challenging”); Cronbach’s alphas ranged from 0.79 to 0.82 ($M \alpha = .81$). The Decreasing Hindering Demands subscale comprises three items (e.g., “I have tried to ensure that my quest for work is emotionally less

intense”); Cronbach’s alphas ranged from 0.82 to 0.86 ($M \alpha = .84$).

Environmental exploration. Environmental exploration was measured using the six-item Environment Exploration subscale of the Career Exploration Survey (Stumpf et al., 1983). An example item was “I obtained information on specific jobs or companies.” Cronbach’s alphas ranged from 0.77 to 0.81 ($M \alpha = .79$).

Networking intensity. Networking intensity was measured using a shortened version (six items) of the Network Intensity

Table 1

Overview of the Crafting Items, Transcribed to Match the Context for People Who Are Unemployed

Original item (Petrou, Demerouti, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Hetland, 2012)	Transcribed item
Seeking resources	
1. Today I have asked others for feedback on my job performance.	1. (Today) I have asked others for feedback on my job search performance.
2. Today I have asked colleagues for advice.	2. (Today) I have asked others for advice.
3. Today I have asked my supervisor for advice.	3. (Today) I have asked my advisor at the unemployment agency for advice. ^a
Seeking challenging demands	
1. Today I have tried to learn new things at work.	1. (Today) I have tried to learn new things when looking for a job.
2. Today I have asked for more tasks when I finished my work.	2. (Today) I undertook more activities to find a new job than I had planned.
3. Today I have asked for more responsibilities.	3. (Today) I have tried to raise the bar in my quest for work.
4. Today I have asked for more odd jobs.	4. (Today) I have tried to make my quest for work more challenging.
Reducing hindering demands	
1. Today I have tried to ensure that my work is emotionally less intense.	1. (Today) I have tried to ensure that my quest for work is emotionally less intense.
2. Today I have made sure that my work is mentally less intense.	2. (Today) I have made sure that my quest for work is mentally less intense.
3. Today I have tried to ensure that my work is physically less intense.	3. (Today) I have tried to ensure that my quest for work is physically less intense.

^a This item was excluded after conducting multilevel confirmatory factor analyses.

Scale by Wanberg et al. (2000). Example items were "I spoke with previous employers or business acquaintances about their knowing of potential job leads" and "I talked with friends or relatives about possible job leads." Cronbach's alphas ranged from 0.84 to 0.86 ($M \alpha = .85$).

Networking quality. Networking quality was assessed using four items based on the work of Lambert et al. (2006). Items were "In the past month, I had contact with someone". . . "who can help me get along in my area of expertise," "of influence in my area of expertise" (i.e., influence), "who can immediately do something for me," and "who will introduce me to a company/another interesting contact" (i.e., progression). Cronbach's alphas ranged from 0.87 to 0.90 ($M \alpha = .89$).

Reemployment status. Three, 6, and 9 months after the third measure was conducted, the unemployment agency provided an overview of participants who successfully gained reemployment. We examined whether networking behavior at T3 was related to reemployment status 3 and 6 months after the study was conducted. For those who found reemployment during the study period, the measure closest to the starting date of their new job (either the T1 or T2 measure) was used.

Strategy of Analysis

Overall, 153 participants provided data at all three measurement points. In our analyses we used these 153 cases, with the exception of our hypothesis regarding actual reemployment. To test this hypothesis, we used the data from all 278 respondents because the sample included participants who dropped out because of reemployment. Data were analyzed using a full cross-lagged panel design in AMOS, Version 22 (Arbuckle, 2013). Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted (Brown, 2014). All constructs were modeled using latent variables. The measurement model was inspected at each point in time. Moreover, longitudinal invariance analyses (Kang, Mcneish, & Hancock, 2016) were used to examine whether the scales were filled out consistently over time. In longitudinal invariance analyses, all different measurement occasions are included in one analysis. First, an unconstrained model is estimated, which serves as the comparison model. Second, a constrained model (constraining both factor loadings and factor variances) is estimated. When the fit of the constrained model is significantly worse than the fit of the unconstrained model, scales are not invariant (implying they were not filled in consistently over time). Furthermore, structural equation modeling was used to test the hypothesized model. A full cross-lagged panel design was used, meaning that all variables were measured and modeled at each point in time. This way, we controlled for earlier levels of the dependent variables. Model evaluation was based on the chi square, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Bollen's Incremental Fit Index (IFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). Last, a logistic regression analyses was conducted to examine the effects of networking behavior on reemployment status.

Results

Table 2 provides an overview of the means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables.

CFAs. Reemployment crafting was modeled as three latent factors with three items for seeking resources, four for seeking challenging demands, and three for reducing hindering demands. The latent factors were allowed to correlate. For seeking resources, the item "I asked my advisor of the unemployment agency for advice" did not show a good fit on the latent factor. Although model fit was adequate, model fit considerably improved when this item was removed. Therefore, it was excluded from further analyses. Probably the unemployed do not experience their advisor as a resource, as the advisor not only supports the unemployed, but is also allowed to sanction (Behncke, Frölich, & Lechner, 2010). At all points in time, modeling reemployment crafting this way showed a good fit to the data. CFIs, TLIs, and IFIs were all above 0.95, RMSEAs were below 0.09. Moreover, the three-factor model showed a better fit to the data than a one factor model (see Table 3). These results confirm the first hypothesis that reemployment crafting has the same three-factor structure as job crafting, with seeking resources, seeking challenging demands and reducing hindering demands as subscales. Networking quality was modeled as two latent factors, both including two items. The latent factors were allowed to correlate. Data showed a good fit; CFIs, TLIs, and IFIs were all above 0.99, and RMSEAs were below 0.01 (T1: $\chi^2[1] = 0.23$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.01, IFI = 1.00, RMSEA < 0.001; T2: $\chi^2[1] = 0.01$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.02, IFI = 1.00, RMSEA < 0.001; T3: $\chi^2[1] = 0.01$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.02, IFI = 1.00, RMSEA < 0.001). Moreover, we examined whether networking quality and networking intensity were different factors, by comparing a three-factor model (two factors for networking quality and one for networking intensity) with a one factor model. The three-factor model showed an adequate fit to the data. CFI, TLI, and IFIs were all above 0.92, RMSEAs were slightly too high (ranging from 0.09 to 0.11). However, the data fitted the two-factor model better than the one factor model (see Table 3).

Longitudinal invariances. On the basis of the measurement models mentioned in the preceding text, longitudinal invariance analyses were conducted to examine whether the same factors were examined over time (Kang et al., 2016). As is shown in Table 4, longitudinal invariance was achieved for each construct, as they were stable over the three measurement points.

Testing the full cross-lagged panel design.

Model fit. First, model fit of the full cross-lagged panel design, from reemployment crafting to networking behavior via environmental exploration, was assessed. The proposed model showed adequate fit: $\chi^2(80) = 163.61$, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.93, IFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.08, Akaike information criterion (AIC) = 381.61. However, as alternative models cannot be completely ruled out, several other models were examined as well. One might, for example, argue that people explore their environment to come up with new possibilities and then craft their job search in a way that enables them to use their network in an optimal manner. This model, suggesting lagged effects from environmental exploration to networking behavior via reemployment crafting, indeed showed a better fit ($\chi^2[72] = 135.44$, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.94, IFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.08, AIC = 369.44). In that same line of reasoning, one might argue that people craft their job search to strengthen their network behavior. Inspired by their networking conversations, people may see new options and explore their environment to a higher extent. This model, suggesting lagged effects from networking behavior to environmental exploration via

Table 2
Study 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1. Gender T1	1.48	.50	—																						
2. Age T1	54.53	7.85	-.21**	—																					
3. Unemployed (months) T1	17.67	8.47	-.03	.65**	—																				
4. Months left receiving unemployment benefits T1	17.33	8.05	-.06	.29**	-.13	—																			
5. Seeking resources T1	2.87	.73	.09	-.22**	-.19*	.14	—																		
6. Seeking resources T2	2.89	.79	.02	-.21**	-.18*	.04	.65**	—																	
7. Seeking resources T3	2.90	.81	.06	-.29**	-.17*	-.02	.71**	.69**	—																
8. Seeking challenging demands T1	3.04	.72	.05	-.34**	-.34**	.03	.60**	.50**	.47**	—															
9. Seeking challenging demands T2	3.03	.73	-.04	-.29**	-.22**	-.06	.57**	.62**	.63**	.81**	—														
10. Seeking challenging demands T3	3.09	.75	-.03	-.36**	-.29**	<.01	.57**	.56**	.57**	.79**	.85**	—													
11. Reducing hindering demands T1	2.92	.90	-.05	.19*	.19*	.06	-.07	-.12	-.11	-.16*	-.12	-.21**	—												
12. Reducing hindering demands T2	2.97	.88	.06	.12	.02	.03	-.05	-.01	.01	-.09	-.02	-.04	.52**	—											
13. Reducing hindering demands T3	2.99	.85	.07	.19*	.12	.03	-.10	-.04	-.01	-.19*	-.12	-.13	.49**	.71**	—										
14. Environmental exploration T1	2.85	.81	-.10	-.29**	-.32**	.08	.53**	.42**	.54**	.59**	.59**	.56**	-.16*	-.10	-.17*	—									
15. Environmental exploration T2	2.85	.87	-.01	-.43**	-.37**	-.02	.49**	.51**	.61**	.60**	.65**	.57**	-.14	-.08	-.19*	.72**	—								
16. Environmental exploration T3	2.80	.82	-.05	-.32**	-.32**	.01	.48**	.46**	.56**	.59**	.64**	.64**	-.16*	-.10	-.18*	.76**	.75**	—							
17. Networking intensity T1	3.34	.73	.09	-.17*	-.18*	.17*	.59**	.49**	.58**	.43**	.44*	.42**	-.13	<-.01	-.12	.49**	.46**	.45**	—						
18. Networking intensity T2	3.22	.75	.04	-.26**	-.21**	.01	.55**	.65**	.66**	.33**	.46**	.45**	-.11	.03	-.01	.44**	.52**	.49**	.74**	—					
19. Networking intensity T3	3.16	.75	.07	-.23**	-.18*	.05	.61**	.59**	.70**	.39**	.49**	.50**	-.15	-.04	-.09	.48**	.50**	.56**	.71**	.82**	—				
20. Networking quality T1	2.85	.83	-.14	-.08	-.17*	.15	.47**	.46**	.53**	.29**	.35**	.33**	-.02	.04	.05	.44**	.42**	.42**	.67**	.62**	.60**	—			
21. Networking quality T2	2.80	.82	-.06	-.15	-.18*	.11	.41**	.46**	.52**	.25**	.36**	.34**	.03	.11	.07	.41**	.47**	.45**	.57**	.66**	.62**	.79**	—		
22. Networking quality T3	2.82	.84	-.09	-.20*	-.21**	.10	.44**	.47**	.54**	.27**	.35**	.37**	.01	.01	.03	.46**	.46**	.52**	.55**	.62**	.70**	.78**	.79**	—	
23. Reemployment status ^a	.24	.43	.08	-.43**	-.32**	-.26**	.06	.20**	.10	.19**	.13	.11	-.05	-.04	-.09	.07	.12	.09	.06	.08	.11	.05	.07	.17*	—

Note. N = 153. Gender was coded as follows: 1 = male, 2 = female. T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; T3 = Time 3.

^a For reemployment status, we used all available data (N = 278 vs. N = 153) because people could drop out as a result of finding a new job.

* p < .05. ** p < .01.

Table 3
Study 1: Confirmatory Factor Analyses Reemployment Crafting and Networking Behavior

Time and model	χ^2	df	CFI	TLI	IFI	RMSEA
Reemployment crafting						
T1						
Three-factor model	34.29	24	.99	.98	.99	.05
One-factor model	367.45	27	.50	.33	.51	.29
T2	45.51	24	.97	.95	.97	.08
Three-factor model						
One-factor model	376.96	27	.48	.30	.48	.29
T3	25.52	24	1.00	1.00	1.00	.02
Three-factor model	354.20	27	.51	.34	.52	.28
One-factor model						
Networking intensity and quality						
T1						
Three-factor model	60.99	24	.95	.92	.95	.10
One-factor model	132.34	27	.86	.81	.86	.16
T2						
Three-factor model	56.40	24	.96	.93	.96	.09
One-factor model	136.29	27	.85	.80	.85	.16
T3						
Three-factor model	67.95	24	.95	.93	.95	.11
One-factor model	160.85	27	.85	.80	.85	.18

Note. CFI = confirmatory fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; IFI = Bollen's Incremental Fit Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

reemployment crafting, showed a worse fit to the data compared to the original model ($\chi^2[74] = 167.85$, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.91, IFI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.09, AIC = 397.85). In the end, the model showing the best fit was a model in which reemployment crafting and environmental exploration were reciprocally modeled ($\chi^2[70] = 117.56$, CFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.95, IFI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.07, AIC = 355.56; see Figures 2 and 3 and Table 5). The model showed a better fit than the originally proposed model and the direct-only model, $\chi^2(90) = 197.79$, CFI = 0.95, TLI = 0.92, IFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.09, AIC = 394.79 (Mathieu & Taylor, 2006).

Hypothesis testing. H2 and H3 predicted that environmental exploration (T2) mediated the positive relationship between T1 reemployment crafting and T3 networking intensity (H2) and T3 networking quality (H3). First, we examined whether T1 reem-

ployment crafting was related to T2 environmental exploration. While controlling for T1 environmental exploration, seeking challenging demands was positively related to T2 environmental exploration ($\gamma = 0.26$, $p < .001$). However, seeking resources ($\gamma = -0.03$, $p = .63$) and reducing hindering demands ($\gamma = -0.02$, $p = .64$) were unrelated to T2 environmental exploration. Second, we examined whether T2 environmental exploration was related to T3 networking intensity and T3 networking quality. While controlling for T1 and T2 networking intensity, the result showed a positive relationship between T2 environmental exploration and T3 networking intensity ($\gamma = 0.13$, $p = .02$) and T3 networking quality ($\gamma = 0.12$, $p = .05$) even when controlling for T1 and T2 networking quality. Lastly, we examined the mediation effects from T1 reemployment crafting to T3 networking behavior. A significant mediation effect was found for T1 seeking

Table 4
Study 1: Results of the Longitudinal Invariance Tests

Variable	χ^2	df	$\Delta\chi^2/\Delta df$	p	CFI	TLI	IFI	RMSEA
Reemployment crafting								
Unconstrained	101.21	72			.99	.98	.99	.03
FL and FV constrained	115.34	90	14.13/18	.72	.99	.99	.99	.03
Environmental exploration								
Unconstrained	33.13	27			.99	.99	.99	.02
FL and FV constrained	44.13	39	11.29/12	.50	.99	.99	.99	.02
Networking intensity								
Unconstrained	40.07	15			.97	.95	.97	.06
FL and FV constrained	43.65	25	3.58/10	.96	.98	.98	.98	.04
Networking quality								
Unconstrained	15.51	6			.99	.97	.99	.06
FL and FV constrained	24.85	14	9.24/8	.31	.99	.99	.99	.04

Note. $N = 153$. CFI = confirmatory fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; IFI = Bollen's Incremental Fit Index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; FL = factor loadings; FV = factor variances.

Figure 2. Final model based on the results using a full cross-lagged panel design in AMOS (Version 22; Arbuckle, 2013).

challenging demands to T3 networking intensity via T2 environmental exploration. The bootstrap estimate (2,000 repetitions) was 0.033 ($p = .01$), and the 95% bias-corrected confidence interval (CI) did not include zero [0.006, 0.076]. There was also a significant mediation effect from T1 seeking challenging demands to T3

networking quality via T2 environmental exploration. The bootstrap estimate (2,000 repetitions) was 0.032 ($p = .01$) and 95% bias-corrected CI did not include zero [0.006–0.070]. Overall, H2b and H3b are accepted. H2a, H2c, H3a, and H3c are rejected, as there was no significant effect of T1 seeking resources and reducing hindering demands on T2 environmental exploration, making it impossible to test for a mediation effect.

Although H2b and H3b are accepted, the model turned out to be more complex than expected. A reciprocal effect between reemployment crafting and environmental exploration (see Figure 3) was found, showing that seeking challenging demands not only influences environmental exploration, but environmental exploration also affects reemployment crafting behavior. More specifically, a positive relationship between T1 environmental exploration and seeking challenging demands ($\gamma = 0.20$, $p < .001$) and seeking resources ($\gamma = 0.17$, $p = .02$) was found. T2 environmental exploration positively affected T3 seeking resources ($\gamma = 0.30$, $p < .001$) and negatively affected T3 reducing hindering demands ($\gamma = -0.12$, $p = .04$). It thus seems that reemployment crafting can stimulate environmental exploration, whereas over time environmental exploration affects reemployment crafting.

H4 predicted that people using their network to a higher extent would be more likely to gain reemployment 3, 6, and 9 months after the study was conducted. A binary regression was used to examine the effects of both networking quality and networking intensity on reemployment status. H4a through H4c were rejected, as there were no significant effects of networking quality and networking intensity after 3 ($\beta_{\text{networking quality}} = 0.15$, $p = .41$; $\beta_{\text{networking intensity}} = 0.34$, $p = .10$), 6 ($\beta_{\text{networking quality}} = 0.21$, $p = .21$; $\beta_{\text{networking intensity}} = 0.34$, $p = .08$), and

Figure 3. Final model including a reciprocal relationship between reemployment crafting and environmental exploration.

Table 5

Study 1: Overview of the Pathways Modeled, Including Their Standardized Regression Weight and Significance Level

Direct path	<i>B</i> _{standardized}	Oblique path	<i>B</i> _{standardized}	Oblique path	<i>B</i> _{standardized}
SR T1–SR T2	.51***	SR T1–EE T2	–.03	SR T2–EE T3	–.06
SR T2–SR T3	.30***	SCD T1–EE T2	.26***	SCD T2–EE T3	.19**
SR T1–SR T3	.36***	RHD T1–EE T2	–.02	RHD T2–EE T3	–.03
SCD T1–SCD T2	.69***	EE T1–NWI T2	.15*	EE T2–NWI T3	.13*
SCD T2–SCD T3	.57***	EE T1–NWQ T2	.11*	EE T2–NWQ T3	.12*
SCD T1–SCD T3	.33***	EE T1–SR T2	.17*	EE T2–SR T3	.30***
RHD T1–RHD T2	.52***	EE T1–SCD T2	.20***	EE T2–SCD T3	.01
RHD T2–RHD T3	.62***	EE T1–RHD T2	–.02	EE T2–RHD T3	–.12*
RHD T1–RHD T3	.15*	NWI T1–EE T2	.04	NWI T2–EE T3	.02
EE T1–EE T2	.54***	NWQ T1–EE T2	.05	NWQ T2–EE T3	.05
EE T2–EE T3	.36***				
EE T1–EE T3	.36***				
NWI T1–NWI T2	.63***				
NWI T2–NWI T3	.54***				
NWI T1–NWI T3	.26***				
NWQ T1–NWQ T2	.72***				
NWQ T2–NWQ T3	.39***				
NWQ T1–NWQ T3	.41***				

Note. SR = seeking resources; T1 = Time 1; T2 = Time 2; EE = environmental exploration; T3 = Time 3; SCD = seeking challenging demands; RHD = reducing hindering demands; NWI = networking intensity; NWQ = networking quality.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

9 ($\beta_{\text{networking quality}} = 0.11, p = .48$; $\beta_{\text{networking intensity}} = 0.24, p = .18$) months after the study was conducted, although for networking intensity the p value was close to the threshold of 0.05 the first 6 months after the study.

Discussion

This study aimed to introduce the construct of reemployment crafting and to examine its effects on job search behavior over time. Results showed that the way in which the unemployed craft their job search is similar to the way employees craft their job. Moreover, reemployment crafting was positively related to job search performance: seeking challenging demands was positively related to networking intensity and quality over time, and this relationship was mediated by environmental exploration. Furthermore, reemployment crafting and environmental exploration affected each other reciprocally, as seeking challenging demands was positively related to environmental exploration, whereas environmental exploration was positively related to seeking resources (both time waves) and seeking challenging demands (only from T1 to T2) and negatively related to reducing hindering demands (from T2 to T3). Unexpectedly, seeking resources and reducing hindering demands had no effect on environmental exploration, implying that seeking challenging demands seems the most effective way to enhance job search behavior over time. Thus, to continue one's job search over a sustained period of time, the unemployed need to challenge themselves during the process. Last, some preliminary support was found for the effects of networking intensity on reemployment status, as the p values were close to the threshold of 0.05 within the first 6 months after the collection of questionnaire data. However, networking quality had no effect. This implies that the frequency with which the unemployed engage in networking behavior is probably of greater importance than with whom they network. These findings contradict earlier work of scholars who indicate the relevance of net-

working quality (e.g., Van Hooft et al., 2012; Wanberg et al., 2000).

Together, these results highlight the potential of crafting outside the work domain and show the importance of self-initiated, proactive behaviors that enable the unemployed to shape the environmental conditions of their job search. Moreover, they show that environmental exploration precedes networking behavior over time, which is in line with the suggestions of Soelberg (1967, as described in Blau, 1994) who argued that preparatory job search behaviors precede active job search behaviors.

Overall, Study 1 showed that reemployment crafting seems at least partially beneficial to the unemployed. However, many questions remain unanswered. For example, does the process uncovered in this study hold on a daily basis? As job crafting occurs not only over a sustained period of time, but also on a daily basis (Lyons, 2008; Petrou et al., 2012), the same may be the case for reemployment crafting. Can the unemployed reap the same benefits of reemployment crafting on a daily basis as over a sustained period of time? Are there contingency factors that affect the effectiveness of reemployment crafting on job search behavior? Moreover, as reemployment crafting is a new construct, how does it relate to other, comparable constructs? To get insight into these questions, we conducted to Study 2.

Study 2

The aims of the second study were fourfold: (1) gain insights into the short-term, daily dynamics of reemployment crafting on job search behavior; (2) examine contingency factors possibly affecting the effectiveness of reemployment crafting; (3) explore the effects of day-level networking on reemployment status over time; and (4) preliminarily establish the incremental validity of the reemployment crafting construct.

Previous research has shown that employees not only craft their job over sustained periods of time (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013),

but also on a daily basis (Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2014). In a similar way, we examine whether the unemployed craft their job search on a daily basis and explore the effects of day-level reemployment crafting on their job search activities. This way, we enhance our understanding of reemployment crafting by taking a within-person approach (comparing the effects of reemployment crafting on days that people report high vs. low levels of reemployment crafting) instead of a between-persons approach (see Study 1, which examines the differences between people high and low on reemployment crafting; Ohly, Sonnentag, Niessen, & Zapf, 2010). Day-level job crafting yielded similar results in terms of performance and engagement as job crafting over a more prolonged period of time (Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2014). Therefore, it is examined whether reemployment crafting, in line with the arguments of H2 and H3, is related to networking behavior via environmental exploration on a daily basis. We expect that on days that the unemployed craft their job search, they show higher levels of networking behavior (both quality and intensity) as reemployment crafting helps satisfying basic psychological needs (cf. Tims & Bakker, 2010), elevating enthusiasm and engagement (cf. Bakker et al., 2012), and resulting in more willingness to devote attention to networking behavior (cf. Beal et al., 2005). As Blau (1994) argued that preparatory job search activities precede active job search activities, the positive relationship between day-level reemployment crafting and networking behavior should be mediated by environmental exploration (see Figure 4).

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Day-level environmental exploration mediates the positive relation between day-level (H5a) seeking resources, (H5b) seeking challenging demands, and (H5c) reducing hindering demands and day-level networking intensity.

Hypothesis 6 (H6): Day-level environmental exploration mediates the positive relation between day-level (H6a) seeking resources, (H6b) seeking challenging demands, and (H6c) reducing hindering demands and day-level networking quality.

From Reemployment Crafting to Career-Exploration: Contingency Factors

Reemployment crafting may have a positive effect on environmental exploration, as through reemployment crafting the unemployed can shape their job search in a way that enhances P-E fit (cf. Bakker et al., 2012). This holds for all the unemployed. However, we propose that reemployment crafting may be especially beneficial when other motivational resources are (nearly) absent. People strive to prevent resource losses; that is, they will engage in behaviors that focus on obtaining, protecting and retaining additional resources if threatened by such losses (Hobfoll, 2001). On days that motivational resources are low (and people thus experience resource loss) reemployment crafting may be a behavioral strategy used to compensate for this loss. This way, reemployment crafting can enhance motivation and enables the unemployed to pursue their job search. In this study (the absence of) two motivational resources are examined: subjective goal attainment and social support.

Subjective goal attainment refers to the extent to which people make progression toward, reach or exceed their predefined goals (Grebner et al., 2010; Sonnentag, 2002). Subjective goal attainment is related to feelings of success, positive affect and motivation (Fredrickson, 2001; Grebner et al., 2010). When experiencing adequate levels of subjective goal attainment, this may help the unemployed to perform optimally and to pursue when facing difficulties (Sonnentag, 2002).

In a similar way to subjective goal attainment, social support is related to motivation. *Social support* refers to the perceived amount of available and received support from others (Vinokur & van Ryn, 1993). Social support is positively related to job search intention and motivation (Van Yperen & Hagedoorn, 2003; Vinokur & Caplan, 1987). Social support enables people to cope with the negative effects of job loss and facilitates continued job search efforts, as social support helps the unemployed to see their job search activities as meaningful and worthwhile (Kanfer et al., 2001). Thus, when receiving adequate levels of social support,

Figure 4. Proposed research model of Study 2.

people are able to cope with the situation and keep up their motivation when encountering setbacks.

Although we found preliminary evidence that reemployment crafting is related to environmental exploration in general, it is expected to be more beneficial on days that people experience low levels of subjective goal attainment or social support. During these days, people lack the motivational benefits coming from subjective goal attainment and social support. As people aim to prevent resource losses (Hobfoll, 2001), reemployment crafting may act as a compensating mechanism, allowing the unemployed to experience motivation coming from other sources than subjective goal attainment/social support, thereby enabling them to uphold their levels of environmental exploration (see Figure 4).

Hypothesis 7: Day-level goal attainment moderates the relationship between day-level reemployment crafting behavior (seeking resources [a], seeking challenging demands, [b] and reducing hindering demands [c]) and day-level environmental exploration, such that reemployment crafting is more beneficial on days that people experience low levels of goal attainment than on days that people experience high levels of goal attainment.

Hypothesis 8: Day-level social support moderates the relationship between day-level crafting behavior (seeking resources [a], seeking challenging demands [b], and reducing hindering demands [c]) and day-level environmental exploration, such that reemployment crafting is more beneficial on days that people experience low levels of social support than on days that people experience high levels of social support.

Finding Reemployment

Networking behavior is related to higher chances of finding reemployment (Forret, 2014; Lambert et al., 2006; Van Hove et al., 2009). However, little is known about the effects of daily networking behaviors on reemployment status over time. Daily behavior can provide insight into work habits that are predictive of performance over time (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). For example, previous research has shown that absorption (as a part of work engagement) in work was able to predict performance (i.e., the number of publications) up to three years later (Dubbelt, Rispen, & Demerouti, 2016). Thus, current behavior may not only predict short-term performance, but also have lagged effects. As networking behavior is an important predictor of reemployment status (e.g., Van Hove et al., 2009), it is examined whether both networking intensity and networking quality—as measured during a “regular” week—are positively related to reemployment status three months, six months and one year after the study was conducted (see Figure 4).

Hypothesis 9: People utilizing their daily network to a higher extent (i.e., having a high network intensity and networking with people of high quality) on average per week are more likely to regain reemployment (H9a) 3 months, (H9b) 6 months, and (H9c) 1 year after the study was conducted.

Method

Design and Participants

A daily diary study (Study 2) during which the unemployed people were followed for 4 consecutive days was conducted. The questionnaire was the same each day, aiming to capture within-person fluctuations in reemployment crafting, environmental exploration, networking behavior, social support, and goal attainment over time. Before the start of the diary study, participants filled out a general questionnaire capturing individual and sociodemographic characteristics. From this questionnaire, we used the proactive personality measure to assess incremental validity.

All participants were unemployed for at least 6 months, well educated (65.4% had at least a bachelor's degree) and were aged between 28 and 49 and did not have any mental or physical disabilities that would impede their chances of regaining reemployment. Participants were recruited through e-mail messages, letters and phone calls. All questionnaires were administered online. During the study participants received a daily invitation e-mail with a link to the diary questionnaire. When participants fully completed the study, they received a coupon (\$11) for a local bistro.

Overall, 264 participants were invited; 208 participants (78.8%) responded at least one day. Of these 208, 19 participants were excluded as they were not actively seeking a job, but were starting their own business, while maintaining part of their unemployment benefits, leaving us with a sample size of 189 (71.6%). Of these 189 participants, 136 completed the whole study (72.0%). In our analyses, we used all available data ($N = 189$). Participants were on average 41.8 ($SD = 4.7$) years old; 34.6% of the respondents were male, 65.4% were female. On average, they were unemployed for 12.4 ($SD = 6.0$) months.

Measures

Unless indicated otherwise, all items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*does not apply to me*) to 5 (*totally applies to me*). For reemployment crafting, environmental exploration, networking intensity and networking quality, we used the same scales as in Study 1. In line with other studies (e.g., Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Hetland, 2012), items were adjusted to refer to today. Cronbach's alphas were all above 0.70 for all constructs on all days.

Subjective goal attainment. Subjective goal attainment was assessed using the subscale Goal Attainment from the Subjective Occupational Success Scale (Grebner et al., 2010). The scale consisted of three items (Cronbach's α ranged from 0.79 to 0.86, $M \alpha = .82$). An example item is “Today I achieved good results in my quest for work.”

Social support. Social support was measured using the Social Support Scale by Vinokur & van Ryn (1993). The scale consisted of four items (Cronbach's α s ranged from 0.75 to 0.85, $M \alpha = .79$). An example item is “Today, people listened to me when I needed to talk.”

Reemployment status. Three months, 6 months, and 1 year after the diary study, the unemployment agency provided an overview of participants who successfully gained reemployment.

Proactive personality. Proactivity personality was assessed using the shortened proactivity scale developed by Seibert, Crant,

and Kraimer (1999). The scale consisted of 10 items ($\alpha = .88$). An example item is "I am constantly on the lookout for new ways to improve my life." Items were scored on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Analysis

As we followed participants for 4 consecutive days, observations were not independent from each other (Hox, 2002). To control for this, multilevel analyses were necessary. MLwiN 2.25 (Rasbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2012) was used to analyze our data. Multilevel CFAs were conducted using MPlus Version 7.3 (Muthén & Muthén, 2014). Mediation effects were tested using bootstrapping (Hayes, 2013). Using a logistic regression analysis, the aggregated mean score of networking intensity and networking quality during the diary period were used to examine whether it was related to reemployment status 3, 6, and 12 months later. Incremental validity of reemployment crafting was assessed using CFAs.

To examine whether a two-level model would explain the data better than a single-level model (Dierdorff & Ellington, 2008) the intraclass correlations (ρ) were calculated. The intraclass correlation illustrates the amount of variance that can be attributed to the different levels of analysis. For the outcome variables networking intensity ($\rho = 0.60$) and networking quality ($\rho = 0.60$), results showed that 40% of the variance can be attributed to within-person fluctuations. For the remaining factors in the model, the ρ indicated that 59% to 69% of the variance can be explained by within person fluctuations, emphasizing the importance of using a multilevel model to test our hypotheses. In our analyses we controlled for age, gender, unemployment duration, months left receiving unemployment benefits and proactive personality. As the first four variables had no significant relationship with the other variables in the model, they were left out of further analyses. Proactive personality did have a significant relationship with the other variables in the model and was therefore included as a control variable in all our analyses.

Results

Table 6 shows the mean, standard deviations, and (multilevel) correlations of the study variables. First, the three-factor structure of day-level reemployment was examined. As in Study 1, the item "Today I've asked my advisor at the unemployment agency for advice" did not load well on the factor seeking resources. Probably because the unemployed do not see their advisor as a resource, as (s)he is allowed to sanction as well (Behncke et al., 2010). Moreover, if they have contact with their advisor, this probably is not on a daily basis. Therefore, this item was excluded from further analyses. However, support was found for the suggested three-factor structure on the day-level of analysis as the data had a good fit: $\chi^2(48) = 106.25$, $p < .001$. RMSEA = 0.04, CFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.04/0.07. Furthermore, the factor structure of day-level networking quality was examined, as this scale was developed for the purpose of this study. The multilevel CFA (using two factors: "network influence" (Items 1 and 2) and "network progression" (Item 3 and 4) showed a good fit to the data: $\chi^2(2) = 3.44$, $p = .18$, RMSEA = 0.03, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 0.99, SRMR = 0.003/0.02. Results showed the following factor loadings: influence = 0.77–0.81 (within-person), 0.96–0.97 (between-persons), progression 0.75–0.86 (within-person), 0.82–0.97 (between-persons).

Preliminary Analyses to Determine Incremental Validity of Reemployment Crafting

In Study 1, the validity of the new measure, capturing reemployment crafting, was not assessed. To overcome this shortcoming, we conducted some preliminary analysis to establish the validity of the reemployment crafting scale. First, in both studies model fit was best, when modeling reemployment crafting, environmental exploration, networking intensity and quality as separate constructs. Therefore, reemployment crafting is distinctive from these other constructs, providing some preliminary support for its validity. Second, in the general questionnaire (Study 2)

Table 6
Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations ($N = 189$, Days = 627)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Gender	1.66	.47	—													
2. Age	41.78	4.69	.04	—												
3. Unemployed (months)	12.39	5.98	.05	.27**	—											
4. Months left receiving unemployment benefits	10.78	6.90	.05	.36**	-.18**	—										
5. Proactive personality	3.59	.56	-.12	.12	.04	.13	—									
6. SR	2.34	.90	.04	-.04	-.06	-.03	.23**	—								
7. SCD	2.34	.71	<.001	.03	<.01	-.01	.24**	.44**	—							
8. RHD	2.13	.73	.02	-.01	-.02	-.04	.13	.29**	.48***	—						
9. Networking intensity	2.29	.73	.04	.04	-.05	.06	.26**	.17***	.28***	.16***	—					
10. Networking quality	2.32	.86	-.03	≤.01	-.02	-.03	.26**	.16***	.26***	.15***	.56***	—				
11. Environmental exploration	2.32	.69	-.04	.03	-.08	.01	.30**	.34***	.57***	.32***	.49***	.45***	—			
12. Subjective goal attainment	2.67	.94	-.03	.01	≤.01	-.05	.31**	.36***	.59***	.33***	.29***	.27***	.59***	—		
13. Social support	2.70	.87	.10**	-.12**	-.05	-.09*	.23**	.43***	.38***	.27***	.13***	.12***	.26***	.33***	—	
14. Reemployment status	.29	.45	-.08*	-.05	≤.01	-.09*	.04	.04	-.01	.07	.03	.08*	.04	.08*	.01	—

Note. Gender was coded as follows: 1 = male, 2 = female. Correlations in italic type are multilevel correlations. SR = seeking resources; SCD = seeking challenging demands; RHD = reducing hindering demands.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

preceding the diary study, a general measure of proactive personality was included. As previous research has shown that job crafting is distinctive from proactive personality (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2012), we compared the reemployment crafting scale with proactive personality as well. To be able to compare the within-level measure of reemployment crafting with the general measure of proactive personality, aggregated mean scores over the days were computed for reemployment crafting. Correlations between proactive personality and the subdimensions of reemployment crafting were seeking resources (0.23), seeking challenging demands (0.24), and reducing hindering demands (0.13). Moreover, CFAs showed that the two-factor model (reemployment crafting as a second order construct with three sub dimensions, and proactive personality) had a better fit, $\chi^2(149) = 341.79$, CFI = 0.88, TLI = 0.85, IFI = 0.89, RMSEA = 0.08, AIC = 461.79, than the one-factor model, $\chi^2(152) = 1061.37$, CFI = 0.45, TLI = 0.31, IFI = 0.46, RMSEA = 0.18, AIC = 1175.37. In the two-factor model, the CFI, TLI, and IFI are below the cut-off of 0.90. This is probably due to the aggregation of reemployment crafting from a daily level to an overall average, losing substantial amounts of variance. The results however do provide the first evidence that reemployment crafting is different from job search behavior (i.e., environmental exploration and networking behavior) and proactive personality.

Hypotheses Testing

H5 and H6 predicted day-level environmental exploration to mediate the positive relationship between day-level (a) seeking resources; (b) seeking challenging demands; and (c) reducing hindering demands with day-level networking intensity, respectively networking quality. As can be seen from Table 7, environmental exploration mediated the relationship between seeking resources and networking intensity ($\gamma_{\text{seeking resources}} = 0.20, p < .001$ and $\gamma_{\text{environmental exploration}} = 0.41, p < .001$) and seeking resources and networking quality ($\gamma_{\text{seeking resources}} = 0.24, p < .001$ and $\gamma_{\text{environmental exploration}} = 0.46, p < .001$). Moreover, environmental exploration mediated the relationship between seeking challenging demands and networking intensity ($\gamma_{\text{seeking challenging demands}} = 0.18, p < .001$ and $\gamma_{\text{environmental exploration}} = 0.41, p < .001$) and seeking challenging demands and

networking quality ($\gamma_{\text{seeking challenging demands}} = 0.18, p < .001$ and $\gamma_{\text{environmental exploration}} = 0.46, p < .001$). As there was no significant relationship between reducing hindering demands and networking intensity ($\gamma_{\text{reducing demands}} = 0.04, p = .42$) and between reducing hindering demands and networking quality ($\gamma_{\text{reducing hindering demands}} = 0.06, p = .32$), environmental exploration could not be a mediator in these relationships. All mediations were significant as shown by the Sobel tests and bootstrapping results in Table 8 (networking intensity: $T_{\text{seeking resources}} = 6.22, p < .001$, CI [0.08, 0.15]; $T_{\text{seeking challenging demands}} = 7.54, p < .001$, CI [0.18, 0.30], networking quality: $T_{\text{seeking resources}} = 5.98, p < .001$, CI [0.09, 0.17]; $T_{\text{seeking challenging demands}} = 7.09, p < .001$, CI [0.20, 0.34]). Overall H5a and H5b and H6a and H6b were accepted because day-level environmental exploration mediated the relationship between day-level seeking resources and day-level networking behavior (both intensity and quality) and between day-level seeking challenging demands and day-level networking behavior (both intensity and quality). H5c and H6c were rejected as the relationship between day-level reducing hindering demands and day-level networking behavior (both intensity and quality) was nonsignificant, excluding day-level environmental exploration as a mediator.

H7 predicted day-level subjective goal attainment to moderate the positive relationship of day-level (a) seeking resources, (b) seeking challenging demands, and (c) reducing hindering demands with day-level environmental exploration. Table 9 shows that seeking resources ($\gamma = 0.08, p = .05$) and seeking challenging demands ($\gamma = 0.47, p < .001$) are both positively related to environmental exploration, whereas reducing hindering demands shows no relationship ($\gamma = 0.05, p = .21$) with environmental exploration. As can be seen in Model 3 (see Table 9) subjective goal attainment is a significant moderator of the relationship between seeking resources and environmental exploration ($\gamma = -0.15, p < .001$). The moderation is represented in Figure 5 and shows that seeking resources is more beneficial on days that the unemployed experience low ($\beta = 0.15, Z = 3.68, p < .001$) versus high ($\beta = -0.04, Z = 1.14, p = .25$) levels of subjective goal attainment.

Model 4 (see Table 9) describes the moderation effect of subjective goal attainment in the relationship between seeking chal-

Table 7
Study 2: Model Results for Networking Intensity and Networking Quality

Variable	Networking intensity			Networking quality		
	Model 1 B (SE)	Model 2 B (SE)	Model 3 B (SE)	Model 1 B (SE)	Model 2 B (SE)	Model 3 B (SE)
Individual level						
Proactive personality	.18 (.08)**	.18 (.08)**	.18 (.08)**	.28 (.09)***	.28 (.09)***	.28 (.09)***
Day level						
Seeking resources		.23 (.03)***	.20 (.03)***		.27 (.04)***	.24 (.04)***
Seeking challenging demands		.37 (.05)***	.18 (.05)***		.39 (.06)***	.18 (.06)**
Reducing hindering demands		-.04 (.05)	-.06 (.04)		-.06 (.06)	-.09 (.05)
Environmental exploration			.41 (.05)***			.46 (.06)***
Variance components						
Individual level	.21 (.03)	.24 (.03)	.25 (.03)	.27 (.04)	.30 (.04)	.31 (.04)
Day level	.33 (.02)	.23 (.02)	.20 (.01)	.45 (.03)	.33 (.02)	.29 (.02)
Model fit (-2 log likelihood)	1268.19	1100.67	1034.99	1460.11	1313.37	1257.67

Note. B = unstandardized parameter estimate; SE = standard error.

** $p \leq .01$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 8

Study 2: Mediation Effects of Environmental Exploration on the Relationship Between Reemployment Crafting and Networking Intensity and Networking Quality

$x \rightarrow$	$m \rightarrow$	y	Sobel t	Bootstrap 95% CI	
				Lower level	Upper level
Seeking resources	Environmental exploration	Networking intensity	6.22***	.08	.15
Seeking challenging demands	Environmental exploration	Networking intensity	7.54***	.18	.30
Reducing hindering demands	Environmental exploration	Networking intensity			
Seeking resources	Environmental exploration	Networking quality	5.98***	.09	.17
Seeking challenging demands	Environmental exploration	Networking quality	7.09***	.20	.34
Reducing hindering demands	Environmental exploration	Networking quality			

Note. Bootstrapping was performed with 2,000 repetitions.

*** $p \leq .001$.

lenging demands and environmental exploration. This moderation effect is significant ($\gamma = -0.16$, $p < .001$) and can be found in Figure 6. In line with the previous moderation, results show that seeking challenging demands is more beneficial on days that the unemployed experience low ($\beta = 0.40$, $Z = 7.26$, $p < .001$) versus high ($\beta = 0.20$, $Z = 3.60$, $p < .001$) levels of subjective goal attainment.

The moderation effect of subjective goal attainment on the relationship between reducing hindering demands and environmental exploration (Model 5, Table 9) is not significant ($\gamma = -0.05$, $p = .32$). Reducing hindering demands is not (more) effective on days that the unemployed experience low (vs. high) levels of subjective goal attainment. Therefore, H7a and H7b are accepted, and H7c is rejected.

H8 predicted day-level social support to act as a moderator on the positive relationship between day-level (a) seeking resources, (b) seeking challenging demands, and (c) reducing hindering demands and day-level environmental exploration. Results (see Table 10, Model 3) show that social support indeed moderates the relationship between seeking resources and environmental exploration ($\gamma = -0.21$, $p < .001$). Figure 7 shows that seeking

resources is more beneficial on days that the unemployed experience low ($\beta = 0.20$, $Z = 4.91$, $p < .001$) versus high ($\beta = -0.03$, $Z = 0.79$, $p = .43$) levels of social support, thereby supporting H8a.

We also found a moderation effect (see Table 10, Model 4) for social support on the relationship between seeking challenging demands and environmental exploration ($\gamma = -0.24$, $p < .001$). As can be seen from Figure 8, results are in line with our hypothesis as seeking challenging demands is especially beneficial on days that the unemployed experience low ($\beta = 0.61$, $Z = 11.70$, $p < .001$) versus high ($\beta = 0.35$, $Z = 6.60$, $p < .001$) levels of social support, thereby supporting H8B.

Last, there was a significant moderation effect (see Table 10, Model 5) for social support on the relationship between reducing hindering demands and environmental exploration ($\gamma = -0.21$, $p < .001$). As shown in Figure 9, reducing hindering demands seems especially beneficial on days that the unemployed experience low ($\beta = 0.17$, $Z = 3.49$, $p = .001$) versus high ($\beta = -0.07$, $Z = 1.38$, $p = .17$) levels of social support, thereby supporting H8C. The moderation effects described above only hold on a daily basis (within days) and not over time (between-persons). However,

Table 9

Study 2: Moderator Effects of Goal Attainment on the Relationship Between Reemployment Crafting and Environmental Exploration

Variable	Model 1 B (SE)	Model 2 B (SE)	Environmental exploration		
			Model 3 (SR) B (SE)	Model 4 (SCD) B (SE)	Model 5 (RHD) B (SE)
Individual level					
Proactive personality	.27 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***
Day level					
Seeking resources (SR)		.08 (.03)*	.05 (.03)	.04 (.03)	.05 (.03)
Seeking challenging demands (SCD)		.47 (.04)***	.28 (.05)***	.30 (.05)***	.29 (.05)***
Reducing hindering demands (RHD)		.05 (.04)	.03 (.04)	.03 (.04)	.03 (.04)
Subjective goal attainment			.24 (.03)***	.25 (.03)***	.26 (.03)***
Moderation (Reemployment Crafting $\times$ Subjective Goal Attainment)			-.15 (.04)***	-.16 (.05)***	-.05 (.05)
Variance components					
Individual level	.17 (.03)	.20 (.03)	.20 (.03)	.22 (.03)	.21 (.03)
Day level	.28 (.02)	.19 (.01)	.16 (.01)	.16 (.01)	.16 (.01)
Model fit (-2 log likelihood)	1170.42	979.80	906.34	907.65	918.05

Note. The term *reemployment crafting* (as described in the moderator in Models 3 through 5) represent seeking resource,s (SR) seeking challenging demands (SCD), and reducing hindering demands (RHD).

* $p \leq .05$. *** $p \leq .001$.

Figure 5. Moderation effect of subjective goal attainment on the relationship between seeking resources and environmental exploration.

they do emphasize the importance of reemployment crafting as a means to uphold environmental exploration on days that other resources (i.e., goal attainment and social support) are low.

Reciprocal Effects

Since in Study 1, an unexpected reciprocal effect between reemployment crafting and environmental exploration was found, we assessed the possibility of a reciprocal effect on a daily basis as well by examining the lagged effects of day-level environmental exploration on reemployment crafting behavior. For seeking resources ($\gamma = 0.05$, $SE = 0.08$, $p = .27$) and seeking challenging demands ($\gamma = 0.001$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .49$) no lagged effects were found. For reducing hindering demands a negative lagged effect ($\gamma = -0.13$, $SE = 0.06$, $p = .01$) was found. This is in line with the findings in Study 1, where a negative effect from T2 environmental exploration to T3 reducing hindering demands was found. However, as reducing hindering demands was unrelated to environmental exploration, no reciprocal effects between reemployment crafting and environmental exploration seem to occur on a day-to-day basis.

Reemployment Chances

H9 predicted day-level networking intensity and networking quality to be related to reemployment status (a) 3 months, (b) 6 months, and (c) 1 year after the diary study was conducted. Day-level networking intensity was not significantly related to reemployment status (a) 3 months ($\beta = -0.99$, $p = .11$), (b) 6 months ($\beta = -0.94$, $p = .08$), and 1 year ($\beta = -0.13$, $p = .77$) after the diary study. However, day-level networking quality was positively related to reemployment status (a) 3 months after the diary study: ($\beta = 1.33$, $p = .02$). Looking at EXP(β), results showed that people who reported high networking quality during our diary study were 3.78 (95% CI [1.43, 9.97]) times more likely to gain reemployment within 3 months after the study. This effect was still visible six months after the study: ($\beta = 0.99$, $p = .03$) with an EXP(β) of 2.68 (95% CI [1.11, 6.45]) indicating that people who reported higher levels of day-level networking quality were 2.68 times more likely to gain reemployment within the six months after our study. The effects of day-level networking quality on reemployment status faded out one year after the study ($\beta = 0.60$, $p = .14$) as results became nonsignificant. Overall, H9a

Figure 6. Moderation effect of subjective goal attainment on the relationship between seeking challenging demands and environmental exploration.

Table 10

Study 2: Moderator Effects of Social Support on the Relationship Between Reemployment Crafting and Environmental Exploration

Variable	Model 1 <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 2 <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Environmental exploration		
			Model 3 (SR) <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 4 (SCD) <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)	Model 5 (RHD) <i>B</i> (<i>SE</i>)
Individual level					
Proactive personality	.27 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***	.28 (.07)***	.27 (.07)***	.27 (.07)***
Day level					
Seeking resources (SR)		.08 (.03)*	.08 (.03)*	.08 (.03)*	.08 (.03)*
Seeking challenging demands (SCD)		.47 (.04)***	.48 (.04)***	.48 (.04)***	.48 (.04)***
Reducing hindering demands (RHD)		.05 (.04)	.06 (.04)	.07 (.04)	.05 (.04)
Subjective goal attainment			<.01 (.04)	.01 (.04)	.02 (.04)
Moderation (Reemployment Crafting × Subjective Goal Attainment)			-.21 (.04)***	-.24 (.05)***	-.21 (.05)***
Variance components					
Individual level	.17 (.03)	.20 (.03)	.19 (.03)	.20 (.03)	.20 (.03)
Day level	.28 (.02)	.19 (.01)	.18 (.01)	.18 (.01)	.18 (.01)
Model fit (-2 log likelihood)	1170.42	979.80	958.68	958.23	959.96

Note. The term *reemployment crafting* (as described in the moderator in Models 3 through 5) represent seeking resource,s (SR) seeking challenging demands (SCD), and reducing hindering demands (RHD).

* $p \leq .05$. *** $p \leq .001$.

through H9c were rejected for networking intensity. For networking quality, H9a and H9b were accepted, and H9c was rejected.

General Discussion

Based on the JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007, 2017; Demerouti, 2014) and subsequent job crafting literature (Tims & Bakker, 2010), this article introduced the concept of reemployment crafting: the proactive, self-initiated behaviors undertaken by the unemployed to shape the environmental conditions of their job search in a way that enhances P-E fit. Study 2 replicated and extended the findings of Study 1, by again showing that the unemployed use the same crafting strategies as job crafters do; that is, the unemployed make small adjustments to their job search demand and job search resources to enhance P-E fit using seeking resources, seeking challenging demands, and reducing hindering

demands. In both, studies the three-factor structure of reemployment crafting was confirmed (Petrou et al., 2012). Results in Study 2 showed that day-level seeking resources and seeking challenging demands were positively related to day-level networking behavior (both in intensity and quality), whereas day-level reducing hindering demands was not. Combining these insights with the results of Study 1, seeking challenging demands seems the most promising crafting strategy (both over time and within days), followed by seeking resources (within days). Reducing hindering demands was the least favorable strategy, as it was only effective as a means to uphold environmental exploration on days when social support was low. However, there were no direct effects of reducing hindering demands on job search performance. These results add to the literature by showing that the JD-R model and the subsequent job crafting literature can be generalized to the context of unem-

Figure 7. Moderation effect of social support on the relationship between seeking resources and environmental exploration.

Figure 8. Moderation effect of social support on the relationship between seeking challenging demands and environmental exploration.

ployment. Moreover, both studies provide the first (preliminary) evidence for the validity of the reemployment crafting scale, as the CFAs demonstrated that reemployment crafting differs from environmental exploration, networking behavior and proactive personality.

In a similar way as with job crafting (Demerouti et al., 2015; McClland et al., 2014), reemployment crafting is related to performance. That is, it enables the unemployed to enhance their levels of networking behavior via enhanced levels of environmental exploration both over time (seeking challenging demands) and within days (seeking challenging demands and seeking resources). This mediation effect is in line with earlier work on job search behavior, as Soelberg (1967, as cited in Blau, 1994) argued that preparatory job search behavior (i.e., environmental exploration) logically precedes active job search behavior (i.e., networking behavior). Interestingly, in Study 1 a reciprocal effect of reem-

ployment crafting and environmental exploration was found. That is, reemployment crafting stimulates environmental exploration, which in turn enhances reemployment crafting behavior. This reciprocal effect helps the unemployed to continue their job search by exploring options, while at the same time, exploring options enables the unemployed to further enhance the P-E fit by crafting their job search process. However, on a daily basis, no such effect was found, as we found a mediating effect only for environmental exploration. This probably has to do with the time frame used (i.e., 6 weeks vs. 1 day; Roe, 2014). Overall, these findings highlight the importance of reemployment crafting during one's job search and strengthen the generalizability of the JD-R model and job crafting literature in the context of being unemployed.

Furthermore, Study 2 showed there were contingency factors affecting the effectiveness of reemployment crafting. On days when goal attainment and social support were low, reemployment

Figure 9. Moderation effect of social support on the relationship between reducing hindering demands and environmental exploration.

crafting enabled the unemployed to uphold their levels of environmental exploration. Both subjective goal attainment and social support are resources generally thought of as fueling motivation (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). On days that these resources are absent, it may be harder for the unemployed to uphold their motivation. As people strive to prevent resource losses (Hobfoll, 2001), reemployment crafting may be used as a behavioral strategy enabling the unemployed to deal with the absence of other resources. Our results indeed indicate that reemployment crafting helps the unemployed to uphold their levels of environmental exploration, even on days when subjective goal attainment and social support were lacking. Reemployment crafting thus acts as a compensating mechanism to uphold job search performance. These results contribute to the literature by not only showing *why* the unemployed craft their job search process, but also advance our understanding of potential moderators (when) affecting the effectiveness of reemployment crafting.

Last, these results add to the literature by differentiating between networking intensity and networking quality. Although scholars have highlighted the importance of networking quality for reemployment (e.g., Van Hoof et al., 2012; Wanberg et al., 2000), the concept has received little research attention (with the exception of the work of Lambert et al. (2006)). Taking a behavioral perspective on networking quality, we build on the work of Lambert et al. (2006) to further operationalize the construct. Results in Study 2 showed that day-level networking quality was able to predict reemployment chances over time. These findings contradict the findings in Study 1, where networking intensity seemed most promising. They are, however, in line with the work of Lambert et al. (2006) who mention that one can engage in a great deal of networking behavior, but it is the quality of the networking that makes a difference. Overall, our results suggest that networking quality and networking intensity both seem promising in their own way. However, as the *p* values for networking intensity in Study 1 were only close to the threshold of 0.05 and not below, these results must be interpreted with caution.

Most results were in line with our expectations, although there were some unexpected findings. Reducing hindering demands was unrelated to networking behavior both in Study 1 and Study 2. Reducing hindering demands may help the unemployed reach their job search goals without excessive effort and loss of well-being (Tims & Bakker, 2010). This could make the job search easier and it could enhance the experience of meaning and motivation (Bakker et al., 2012; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). However, people may reduce demands for other reasons, for example to prevent exhaustion (Demerouti, 2014). Therefore, it may be that reducing hindering demands does not relate to a motivational process, but it is more related to a health-impairment process (Petrou et al., 2012).

Although seeking resources was related to environmental exploration within days, it was unrelated to environmental exploration over time. A possible explanation for these findings may be found in the timeframe used (Roe, 2014). When seeking resources, the unemployed for example ask advice on how to best apply to a specific organization. The advice may be helpful in that situation and therefore be positively related to environmental exploration in the short run. However, it may be that the advice given at T1 (for that specific situation) is of no help at T2 when the circumstances differ. When seeking challenging demands, people proactively

invest time and effort to challenge themselves to use additional skills (Tims & Bakker, 2010). Mastering skills may be more widely applicable than the advice sought in a specific situation, explaining why seeking challenging demands is related to environmental exploration both within days and over time, while seeking resources is only related to environmental exploration within days.

The time frame used may also explain why a reciprocal effect of reemployment crafting and environmental exploration was found over a prolonged period of time, but not within days. If people find new information allowing them to make informed career decisions, it may take some time for people to act upon that information. Apparently, a 3-month period is enough for people to act upon the information gathered to enhance P-E fit, while this process does not occur over one night. Additional research is needed to determine the period of time people need to benefit from the reversed effect of environmental exploration on reemployment crafting.

Practical Implications

The results of this study hold some important practical implications. First, the results are of relevance for caseworkers and policymakers in the unemployment agencies. Caseworkers could emphasize the importance of seeking resources and seeking challenging demands when advising their clients on how to pursue their job search, especially when their clients experience low progress (i.e., low goal attainment) or experience low levels of social support. Policymakers could develop training programs for the unemployed that focus on crafting one's job search, deliberately teaching people how to optimize their job search resources and demands. Moreover, as networking intensity and quality are both useful in their own way, these training programs should focus both on the importance of the networking quantity and quality.

Second, the research shows that the unemployed may benefit from crafting their job search themselves. Seeking resources and seeking challenging demands stimulate the unemployed to explore options and use their network. Undertaking activities such as learning new skills and seeking feedback, advice and support may thus be advisable for the unemployed, as it will help them to pursue their job search. The results also show the importance of social support and subjective goal attainment in continuing one's job search. People need to receive adequate support from family and friends and benefit from setting small goals and experiencing feelings of progression. However, if these resources are lacking, reemployment crafting may be used as a compensation mechanism to uphold motivation.

Last, this study emphasizes the importance of networking behavior. It seems wise to have frequent networking interactions (intensity) to enhance the chances of finding a job. However, frequent networking interactions alone are not sufficient. People should also focus on the quality of these interactions, as networking with people who are influential and can truly help, heightens the chances of finding reemployment.

Limitations and Future Research

This research is not without limitations. First, it mainly used self-ratings to capture job search performance. These are sensitive

to common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) and therefore not the most superior method to use (Conway & Lance, 2010). Although our ultimate performance measure (reemployment status) was objective, future research should try to incorporate more objective measures of environmental exploration and networking behavior as well.

Second, in Study 2 no causal inferences about the proposed models can be made. Although the models were chronologically and theoretically correct, and lagged effects were only limitedly found, the definite order of the models proposed cannot be determined. To overcome this limitation, future research is encouraged to focus on (quasi-) experimental research designs that may contribute to establishing causality.

Third, although in Study 2 some preliminary results support the construct validity of reemployment crafting, additional research is required. Results show that reemployment crafting differs from proactive personality, environmental exploration and networking behavior. However, we lack information on the validity of our scale compared to, for example, a general job search behavior measure (including a broader range of job search behaviors). Future research is encouraged to further determine the validity of the reemployment crafting scale. The same holds for the networking quality scale. Although results show that networking quality is different from networking intensity, we lack information of the validity of the scale compared to a general job search behavior measure.

Fourth, in line with the job crafting literature, reemployment crafting was expected to have a positive effect on meaning and motivation (Bakker et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2016). However, these constructs were not included in our studies as we focused on behavioral aspects. Therefore, future research should try to incorporate these constructs to examine whether reemployment crafting is indeed related to environmental exploration via meaning and motivation.

Last, future research could also focus on the trainability of reemployment crafting. As job crafting is trainable (e.g., Dubbelt, 2016; Van den Heuvel, Demerouti, & Peeters, 2012; Van Wingarden et al., 2016), it may be that reemployment crafting is trainable as well. It would be interesting to examine the effects of a reemployment crafting training on job search performance, motivation and well-being to see if it has similar (positive) effects as a job crafting intervention.

Conclusions

Unemployment has detrimental effects on both the affected individual and society. Therefore, examining ways to help people deal with their unemployment is valuable. Reemployment crafting is a promising proactive technique as the unemployed can optimize their job search performance by focusing on seeking resources and seeking challenging demands. Via environmental exploration, reemployment crafting helps the unemployed to use their network (both quality and intensity) to a higher extent and ultimately heighten their chances of finding reemployment.

References

Amundson, N. E., & Borgen, W. A. (1982). The dynamics of unemployment: Job loss and job search. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60, 562–564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2164-4918.1982.tb00723.x>

Arbuckle, J. L. (2013). *Amos* (Version 22.0). Chicago, IL: IBM SPSS.

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 265–269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411414534>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309–328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22, 273–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations*, 65, 1359–1378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0018726712453471>

Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S. M. (2005). An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1054–1068. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1054>

Behncke, S., Frölich, M., & Lechner, M. (2010). Unemployed and their caseworkers: Should they be friends or foes? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A, Statistics in Society*, 173, 67–92. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2009.00600.x>

Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal and curiosity*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Blau, G. (1993). Further exploring the relationship between job search and voluntary individual turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 313–330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00876.x>

Blau, G. (1994). Testing a two-dimensional measure of job search behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 59, 288–312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1994.1061>

Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 579–616. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030>

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Hetland, J. (2012). The measurement of state work engagement: A multilevel factor analytic study. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 28, 305–312. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000111>

Brown, T. A. (2014). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Brown, D. J., Cober, R. T., Kane, K., Levy, P. E., & Shalhoop, J. (2006). Proactive personality and the successful job search: A field investigation with college graduates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 717–726. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.717>

Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 65–74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.1.65>

Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 325–334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6>

Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your own job through job crafting. *European Psychologist*, 19, 237–247. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000188>

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Gevers, J. M. P. (2015). Job crafting and extra-role behavior: The role of work engagement and flourishing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 91, 87–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.09.001>

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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>

Dierdorff, E. C., & Ellington, J. K. (2008). It's the nature of the work: Examining behavior-based sources of work–family conflict across occupations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 883–892. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.883>

- Dubbelt, L. (2016). *Women to the top: Discovering facilitating factors for women's functioning in minority positions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands.
- Dubbelt, L., Rispens, S., & Demerouti, E. (2016). Work engagement and research output among female and male scientists. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 15*, 55–65. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000150>
- Forret, M. (2014). Networking as a job-search behavior and career management strategy. In U.-C. Klehe & E. A. J. Van Hooft (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of job loss and job search* (pp. 1–19). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*, 218–226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
- Gould, S., & Penley, L. E. (1984). Career strategies and salary progression: A study of their relationships in a municipal bureaucracy. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*, 244–265. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(84\)90006-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(84)90006-0)
- Grebner, S., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N. K. (2010). New developments in theoretical and conceptual approaches to job stress. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being, 8*, 61–108. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555\(2010\)000008005](http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3555(2010)000008005)
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250–279. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The Influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology, 50*, 337–421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resources theory: Its implication for stress, health, and resilience. In S. Folkman (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of stress, health, and coping* (pp. 127–147). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. (2008). Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 6*, 53–60.
- Hox, J. (2002). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781410604118>
- Jahoda, M. (1981). Work, employment and unemployment values, theories and approaches in social research. *American Psychologist, 36*, 184–191. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.36.2.184>
- Jahoda, M. (1982). *Employment and unemployment: A social-psychological analysis*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Jordaan, J. P. (1963). Exploratory behavior: The formation of self and occupational concepts. In D. E. Super, R. Statishersky, N. Mattin, & J. P. Jordaan (Eds.), *Career development: Self-concept theory*. New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Kanfer, R., Wanberg, C. R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2001). Job search and employment: A personality-motivational analysis and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 837–855. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.837>
- Kang, Y., McNeish, D. M., & Hancock, G. R. (2016). The role of measurement quality on practical guidelines for assessing measurement and structural invariance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 76*, 533–561. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164415603764>
- Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. *Organizational Dynamics, 12*, 37–52. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(84\)90010-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(84)90010-X)
- Lambert, T. A., Eby, L. T., & Reeves, M. P. (2006). Predictors of networking intensity and network quality among white-collar job seekers. *Journal of Career Development, 32*, 351–365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894845305282767>
- Lee, F. (1997). When the going gets tough, do the tough ask for help? Help seeking and power motivation in organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 72*, 336–363. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2746>
- Liden, R. C., & Mitchell, T. R. (1988). Ingratiation behaviors in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review, 13*, 572–587. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.1988.4307430>
- Lu, C., Wang, H., Lu, J., Du, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Does work engagement increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 84*, 142–152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.12.004>
- Lyons, P. (2008). The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 23*, 25–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-008-9080-2>
- Mathieu, J. E., & Taylor, S. R. (2006). Clarifying conditions and decision points for mediational type inferences in Organizational Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27*, 1031–1056. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.406>
- McClelland, G. P., Leach, D. J., Clegg, C. W., & McGowan, I. (2014). Collaborative crafting in call centre teams. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 87*, 464–486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/joop.12058>
- Michael, J., & Yukl, G. (1993). Managerial level and subunit function as determinants of networking behavior in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 18*, 328–351. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601193183005>
- Muthén, K. L., & Muthén, L. (2014). *Mplus*. Los Angeles, CA: Author.
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., Niessen, C., & Zapf, D. (2010). Diary studies in organizational research. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 9*, 79–93. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000009>
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C. W., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 1120–1141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1783>
- Pissarides, C. A. (1992). Loss of skill during unemployment and the persistence of employment shocks. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 107*, 1371–1391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2118392>
- Podsakoff, N. P., LePine, J. A., & LePine, M. A. (2007). Differential challenge stressor-hindrance stressor relationships with job attitudes, turnover intentions, turnover, and withdrawal behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 438–454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.438>
- 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*, 879–903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Price, R. H., Friedland, D. S., & Vinokur, A. D. (1998). Job loss: Hard times and eroded identity. In J. H. Harvey (Ed.), *Perspectives on loss: A sourcebook* (pp. 303–316). Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2012). *MLwiN version 2.25*. Bristol, England: Centre for Multilevel Modelling, University of Bristol.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15*, 150–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2391486>
- Roe, R. A. (2014). Test validity from a temporal perspective: Incorporating time in validation research. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 23*, 1–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2013.804177>
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 416–427. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416>

- Soelberg, P. (1967). *A study of decision making: Job choice*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Sonnentag, S. (2002). Performance, well-being, and self-regulation. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological management of individual performance* (pp. 405–423). Chichester, England: Wiley. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/0470013419>
- Stumpf, S. A., Colarelli, S. M., & Hartman, K. (1983). Development of the Career Exploration Survey (CES). *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 22, 191–226. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(83\)90028-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(83)90028-3)
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, Article 841. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 173–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18, 230–240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032141>
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2014). Daily job crafting and the self-efficacy - performance relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29, 490–507. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2012-0148>
- Tims, M., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2016). Job crafting and its relationships with person—Job fit and meaningfulness: A three-wave study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 92, 44–53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.11.007>
- UWV. (2017). *Januarinota 2017: Ontwikkeling wetten en fondsen UWV 2016–2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.uwv.nl/overuwv/Images/UWV-Januarinota-2017.pdf>
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte, H., & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout, and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work and Stress*, 22, 277–294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393672>
- Van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2012). Succesvol job craften door middel van een groepstraining. In J. De Jonge, M. C. W. Peeters, S. Sjollem, & H. De Zeeuw (Eds.), *Scherp in werk: 5 routes naar optimale inzetbaarheid* (pp. 27–49). Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Van Hooft, E. A. J., Wanberg, C. R., & van Hooft, G. (2012). Moving beyond job search quantity: Towards a conceptualization and self-regulatory framework of job search quality. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 3, 3–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2041386612456033>
- Van Hooft, G., van Hooft, E. A. J., & Lievens, F. (2009). Networking as a job search behaviour: A social network perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 661–682. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317908X360675>
- Van Wingerden, J., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2016). The longitudinal impact of a job crafting intervention. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26, 1–13.
- Van Yperen, N. W., & Hagedoorn, M. (2003). Do high job demands increase intrinsic motivation or fatigue or both? The role of job control and job social support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 339–348.
- Vinokur, A., & Caplan, R. D. (1987). Attitudes and social support: Determinants of job-seeking behavior and well-being among the unemployed. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 1007–1024. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1987.tb02345.x>
- Vinokur, A. D., & van Ryn, M. (1993). Social support and undermining in close relationships: Their independent effects on the mental health of unemployed persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 350–359. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.350>
- Wanberg, C. R. (2012). The individual experience of unemployment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 369–396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100500>
- Wanberg, C. R., Kanfer, R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of networking intensity among unemployed job seekers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 491–503. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.491>
- Widén-Wulff, G., Ek, S., Ginman, M., Perttilä, R., Södergård, P., & Tötterman, A.-K. (2008). Information behaviour meets social capital: A conceptual model. *Journal of Information Science*, 34, 346–355. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/01655551507084679>
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179–201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>
- Zacher, H. (2013). Older job seekers' job search intensity: The interplay of proactive personality, age and occupational future time perspective. *Ageing and Society*, 33, 1139–1166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X12000451>
- Zikic, J., & Klehe, U. C. (2006). Job loss as a blessing in disguise: The role of career exploration and career planning in predicting reemployment quality. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 391–409. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.05.007>

Received December 7, 2017

Revision received April 5, 2019

Accepted April 8, 2019 ■