

human relations**Playful Work Design: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Validity**

Journal:	<i>Human Relations</i>
Manuscript ID	HR-2020-0530.R3
Manuscript Type:	Standard Manuscript
Keywords:	Playful Work Design, Proactive Work Behavior, Scale development, Playfulness, play at work, Job and work design, Engagement, Competitiveness

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Playful Work Design: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Validity**Yuri S. Scharp**¹ (contact); **Arnold B. Bakker**^{1,2}; **Kimberley Breevaart**¹; **Kaspar Kruup**³;**Andero Uusberg**³¹Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam, Center of Excellence for Positive Organizational
Psychology²University of Johannesburg, Industrial Psychology and People Management³University of Tartu, Institute of Psychology**Abstract**

In three different studies, we challenge the traditional view that work and play are mutually exclusive phenomena. We introduce the concept of playful work design – the proactive cognitive-behavioral orientation that employees engage in to incorporate play into their work activities to promote fun and challenge. In Study 1, we utilized expert-ratings and iterative exploratory factor analyses to develop an instrument that measures (1) designing fun and (2) designing competition. Additionally, Study 1 evidences the divergent and convergent validity of the subscales as well as their distinctiveness. Specifically, playful work design was indicative of proactivity as well as play, and designing fun especially correlated with ludic traits (i.e., traits focused on deriving fun; e.g., humor), whereas designing competition particularly correlated with agonistic traits (i.e., traits focused on deriving challenge; e.g., competitiveness). Study 2 cross-validated the two-factor structure, further investigated the nomological net of playful work design, and revealed that playful work design is distinct from job crafting. Finally, Study 3 examined the predictive and incremental validity of the playful work design instrument with self- and colleague-ratings two weeks apart. Taken

1
2
3 together, the results suggest that the instrument may advance our understanding of play
4
5 initiated by employees during work.
6

7
8 *Keywords:* playful work design, proactive work behavior, scale development,
9
10 playfulness, play at work, job and work design, work engagement, competitiveness
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Peer Review Version

1
2
3 Playful Work Design: Conceptualization, Measurement, and Validity
4

5 “Any action can be practiced as an art, as a craft.”
6

7
8 —Stephen Nachmanovitch, *Free play: Improvisation in Life and Art*, 1990
9

10 Play represents a universally enjoyable phenomenon, which is why virtually everyone
11 engages in some form of play from time to time (Huizinga, 1949; Sutton-Smith, 2009).
12

13 Hence, Huizinga contended that humans are not best described as *Homo Sapiens*, mankind
14 who knows; but rather as *Homo Ludens*, mankind who plays. Indeed, play permeates our
15 lives in a myriad of forms; playfully teasing a friend, joking around, a game of chess, or a
16 soccer match. Individuals pursue play for the sake of fun and challenge. For the same
17 purpose, individuals may want to integrate play with work. Contemporary research has
18 diverged from the traditional paradigm that considered work and play as mutually exclusive
19 phenomena (Butler et al., 2011; Dandridge, 1986; Glynn & Webster, 1992; Kavanagh, 2011).
20 Instead, research has started to focus on their integration (e.g., Celestine & Yeo, 2021;
21 Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006; Petelczyc et al., 2018). Research on play initiatives by
22 organizations and other parties is flourishing. Findings thus far suggest that organizational
23 initiatives such as fun activities, productivity competitions (Tews et al., 2014; Tsaur et al.,
24 2019), providing playful cues during meetings (West et al., 2016), and gamifying work by
25 adding points, badges, and leaderboards (Deterding et al., 2011; Gerdenitsch et al., 2020)
26 cultivate employees’ motivation and performance. In the current research, we expand the
27 existing literature on play at work by positioning the employee at the core of the process of
28 integrating play with work.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Although play concerns a widespread phenomenon – with a surging interest from the
52 occupational domain – scant research studied self-initiated play during work (Celestine &
53 Yeo, 2021; Petelczyc et al., 2018; cf. Bakker, Scharp et al., 2020; Bakker, Hetland et al.,
54 2020; Scharp et al., 2019). In this paper, we develop new insights about self-initiated play at
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 work by synthesizing the literatures on play and work design. We build on recurrent, and
4
5 often convergent themes in the literatures on play and self-initiated work design strategies
6
7 (e.g., personality traits as antecedents; promotion-focus; energy management; performance
8
9 behaviors). We complement research on play at work that builds on a top-down and activity-
10
11 based perspective by advancing a bottom-up and approach-based perspective. The core
12
13 premise of this article is that *employees* may themselves initiate play *during* work activities to
14
15 transform their experience of work, which resonates with recent advances on individual work
16
17 design strategies such as job crafting (Tims et al., 2012). Contrasting top-down initiatives that
18
19 utilize a ‘one size fits all’ approach, self-initiated play may cater more to individual needs.
20
21
22
23

24 Second, we answer calls for the development of a generic instrument to measure play
25
26 during work (Petelczyc et al., 2018; Van Vleet & Feeney, 2015). We conceptualize and
27
28 advance a two-dimensional instrument with sound psychometric qualities that measures play
29
30 during work to systematically test and refine theories regarding play at work. Moreover,
31
32 while play theorists often characterize play along two different dimensions, attention is
33
34 usually devoted to only one of the manifestations of play. The two-dimensional
35
36 conceptualization of PWD answers calls for the differentiation between types of play
37
38 (Petelczyc et al., 2018). Furthermore, a two-dimensional approach distinguishing between
39
40 ‘designing fun’ and ‘designing competition’ offers an enhanced understanding of the nuanced
41
42 differences between these forms of play compared to a one-dimensional approach. That is,
43
44 the idiosyncratic nature and differential focus of these play forms suggests they may cater to
45
46 different personal needs as well as benefit distinct work conditions (e.g., Bakker, Hetland et
47
48 al. 2020; Petelczyc et al., 2018; Scharp et al., 2019; Scharp et al., 2021).
49
50
51
52
53

54 Finally, we extend contemporary theorizing and empirical research on PWD in
55
56 several ways. First, we highlight the theoretical similarities and differences with other play
57
58 initiatives and self-initiated work design strategies to position PWD in the literature as a
59
60

1
2
3 related, but unique concept. In consideration of the novelty of PWD, the purpose of this
4
5 article was to build on the theoretical narratives that are dominant in research on play (e.g.,
6
7 personality, energies) and self-initiated work design (e.g., promotion- vs. prevention-focus,
8
9 energies, performance behaviors). Second, we aim to extend previous research on PWD that
10
11 has mainly revealed how intraindividual differences in PWD, motivational states, and
12
13 performance behaviors are interrelated (Scharp et al. 2019; Scharp et al., 2021). In contrast,
14
15 the present study aims to reveal how individuals who design work to be more playful differ
16
17 from their less playful counterparts in terms of traits, enduring motivational states, and
18
19 performance. Third, while previous research has mainly relied on self-ratings of work
20
21 engagement and performance behaviors (Bakker & van Wingerden, 2021; Scharp et al. 2019;
22
23 Scharp et al., 2021), the present study also investigates how PWD relates to colleague ratings
24
25 of their engagement and performance (e.g., creative performance, effort). Furthermore, we
26
27 test the often-formulated propositions regarding the antecedents as well as consequences of
28
29 play during work. That is, play is often conceptualized as a manifestation of certain
30
31 personality traits, promotion-focused, an energy-management strategy stimulating positive
32
33 affect, and promoting performance behaviors such as creativity and effort (Barnett, 2007;
34
35 Celestine & Yeo, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi, 1981; Huizinga, 1949; Lieberman, 2014;
36
37 Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006; Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Proyer, 2012).

The Foundation for Playful Work Design

Play Paradigms

46
47
48 Play has been a topic of debate across a multitude of disciplines ranging from
49
50 anthropology, sociology, history, biology, to psychology (Sutton-Smith, 2009). Overall, we
51
52 can roughly discern three major themes or ‘paradigms’ in the research on play where (1) play
53
54 is approached as a set of activities or behaviors, (2) play is considered an individual
55
56 characteristic, or (3) play is defined as a behavioral approach to an activity. First, the stream
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of research that approaches ‘play-as-activities’ situates play as a consequence and/or
4
5 characteristic of certain activities and behaviors (e.g., Caillois, 2001; Huizinga, 1949). For
6
7 instance, utilizing a multidimensional scaling method, Day (1981) positioned activities on a
8
9 continuum ranging from ‘workfulness’ (e.g., algebra, dishes, taking out the garbage) to
10
11 playfulness (e.g., dances, parties, being with friends). Similarly, Van Vleet and Feeney
12
13 (2015) defined play as activities or behaviors carried out for fun with a high amount of
14
15 enthusiasm and interactivity (e.g., dancing together, Nerf gun shoot-outs, mock wrestling).
16
17 Second, the play-as-personality stream of research approaches play as a manifestation of
18
19 individual differences in specific tendencies or capacities (e.g., Barnett, 2007; Lieberman,
20
21 2014; Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Helmreich & Spence, 1978; Thorson & Powell, 1993). For
22
23 instance, Proyer (2012; 2017) described playfulness as an individual characteristic that
24
25 enables individuals to (re)frame situations for the purpose of entertainment and stimulation,
26
27 which builds on the tendencies to be other-directed, lighthearted, intellectual, and whimsical.
28
29 Finally, the play-as-approach stream of research defines play as a specific way of structuring
30
31 cognition and behavior in relation to an activity (e.g., Abramis, 1990; Apter, 1991; Andersen
32
33 & Roepstorff, 2021; Csikszentmihalyi, 1981; Miller, 1973). In other words, play is not
34
35 considered as a “set of activities but rather a behavioral approach to performing any activity”
36
37 (Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006, p. 84). For example, Hamilton et al. (1984) described how
38
39 individuals play during activities such as mowing the lawn by “discovering game-like
40
41 qualities in the task itself and by creating rules about what one is doing and how to do it:
42
43 pretending one is ‘mowing down’ something besides grass, inscribing circular or zig-zag
44
45 patterns” (p. 184). The paradigms provide complementary and unique insights into what
46
47 may constitute play during work and its nomological net.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Play Communalities**

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While the play paradigms differ in their approach of researching play, their findings
4 converge in their description of the core features: (1) cognitive recategorization of behaviors
5 or activities as ‘play’, (2) a process-orientation described by a momentary focus on the
6 behavior or activity, (3) a sense of freedom and volition, (4) interactive involvement in terms
7 of seeking, finding, and resolving surprises and complexities, and (5) the autotelic nature, i.e.,
8 performed for the sake of the associated positive affective states (Andersen & Roepstorff,
9 2021; Bateson, 1972; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Proyer, 2017; Van Vleet & Feeney, 2015). In
10 support of their unity, the constellation of the core features of play appears to synchronize in
11 harmony. The presence or absence of features stimulates or inhibits the prevalence of other
12 features. For instance, experiments reveal that framing tasks as ‘play’ transforms their
13 experiential qualities; it suspends the instrumental, efficiency-oriented qualities of a task, and
14 promotes an intrinsic, process-oriented mindset and positive affective states (Cellar &
15 Barrett, 1987; Glynn, 1994; 1988; Heimann & Roepstorff, 2018; Sandelands, 1988; Webster
16 et al., 1990). Similarly, a game of monopoly or a soccer match becomes dull and
17 performative after the outcome becomes unequivocal (e.g., who will win) and more focused
18 on the outcome (e.g., to finish the game) as opposed to the process (Andersen & Roepstorff,
19 2021). Likewise, forcing an individual to participate in play may create cynicism and
20 minimize the autotelic nature and cognitive recategorization (Fleming, 2005). Finally, when
21 individuals do not ‘get’ a joke or are unable to solve a puzzle; they are unable to resolve
22 surprises and complexities, which may yield confusion or frustration instead of fun and
23 challenge (Suls, 1983). Taken together, the research on play suggests individuals play (1)
24 when they possess specific traits or capacities, (2) when the situation signals the freedom to
25 play, and (3) due to the autotelic nature, i.e., to optimize personal energetic and psychological
26 resources (Celestine & Yeo, 2021; Petelczyc et al., 2018).

The Duality of Play

Another recurrent theme across the play literatures is the duality of play. Play is often characterized along two dimensions. Huizinga (1949) concluded that this duality is best described by the ancient Greek terms *παιδιά* (*paidiā*), which means *ludic*, childish, and fun, and *ἀγών* (*agōn*), meaning *agonistic*, contest, and competition. The play literature often appreciates this duality with different labels. Scholars may describe play in terms of open or closed, irrational or rational, playful or serious, imaginary or real, as well as arbitrary or rule-bound (Kolb & Kolb, 2010; Suits, 1978). Ludic play tends to be focused on deriving lighthearted pleasure and is characterized by “open” goals (the goal is to continue playing), non-seriousness, fantasy, and arbitrary rules. In contrast, agonistic play tends to be focused on creating pleasure from stretching one’s skill and involves relatively structured behaviors such as competing and striving for achievements characterized by “closed” goals (i.e., goals whose achievement ends the play episode), seriousness, reality, and explicit rules. Naturally, these forms of play do not represent dichotomous manifestations. Instead, they may covary in harmony. Moreover, the duality of play applies to the play-as-activity, play-as-personality, and play-as-approach perspectives. For instance, ludic play activities may refer to dancing and jesting, whereas rock-climbing and basketball represent agonistic play activities. Similarly, humorous and lighthearted personalities represent ludic personalities, whereas the trait of competitiveness reflects an agonistic personality. Finally, in terms of play as a behavioral approach, individuals may restructure their cognition and behavior during activities in a ludic fashion with, for instance, using humor and imagination to derive fun while cooking; or in an agonistic fashion by, for example, creating objectives and rules to create pleasure from stretching one’s skill while mowing the lawn.

Play as Work Design

The literature on play shares striking similarities with the literature on work design. Parker (2014) advanced a conceptualization of “work design” that not only includes the top-down organization of work (job design; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), but also employees’ emergent and self-initiated organization of tasks and activities (individual work design). Similar to research on play as activities, the literature on top-down work design reveals how creating situational conditions such as autonomy and variety can elicit motivation and behavior (Celestine & Yeo, 2021; Humphrey et al., 2007). Recently, research emerged on organizational initiatives that integrate play with top-down work design. For instance, fun activities at work and gamification represent top-down initiatives that aim to harness the autotelic nature of play. Fun activities include playful and humorous endeavors organized and sponsored by the organization to promote amusement, enjoyment, or pleasure such as theme days, public celebrations, productivity contests, and teambuilding events (Tews et al., 2014; Michel et al., 2019). Gamification aims to integrate game elements with non-game contexts (Deterding et al., 2011) such as introducing playful instructions and props during meetings (West et al., 2016), or developing a digital environment with leaderboards, badges, and awards (Silic et al., 2020). Indeed, such top-down initiatives appear to foster employee engagement and performance (Becker & Tews, 2014; Silic et al., 2020; Tews et al., 2014; West et al., 2016). However, as proposed by Parker (2014), individuals may also organize their tasks and activities themselves, which connects with the literature that defines play as a specific way of organizing one’s cognition and behavior in relation to an activity.

Individual work design strategies represent a form of proactive behavior; self-started behavior focused on promoting change as opposed to passively accepting the status quo (Crant, 2000; Frese et al., 1997; Parker et al., 2006). While proactive behaviors share a common core of being action-oriented and goal-directed, their form, intended target of

1
2
3 impact, and temporal orientation may vary extensively (Grant & Ashford, 2008). For
4
5 instance, the form and target of impact of proactive behaviors may include taking personal
6
7 initiative, preventing the reoccurrence of work problems, identifying new technologies for
8
9 innovation, strategic scanning for potential issues to ensure organization-environment fit, and
10
11 engaging in non-work activities to mobilize personal psychological resources (Parker &
12
13 Collins, 2010; Van der Kamp et al., 2018). These behaviors illustrate how proactive
14
15 behaviors may differ in their intended target of impact in terms of the organization or the self,
16
17 and short- or long-term results (Grant & Ashford, 2008). For instance, personal initiative,
18
19 identifying new technologies, and strategic scanning reflect proactive behaviors focused on
20
21 creating changes that align with the organization's mission with a long-term orientation,
22
23 whereas mobilizing personal psychological resources targets the individual's experience and
24
25 has a short-term orientation. Finally, in a similar vein as the autotelic nature of play, work
26
27 design strategies often focus on attaining positively valenced end-states (e.g., promotion-
28
29 focus job crafting; Bindl et al., 2019; Laurence, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Zhang
30
31 & Parker, 2019). Contextualized to work, play as a cognitive-behavioral approach represents
32
33 a specific individual work design strategy that (1) utilizes cognitive and behavioral
34
35 restructuring to create change, (2) is short-term oriented (but can be enacted over longer
36
37 periods of time), and (3) focuses on the self. This strategy contrasts fun activities and
38
39 gamification in terms of agency and locus of enactment. Fun activities and gamification
40
41 represent top-down initiatives, whereas play as an individual work design strategy is a
42
43 bottom-up initiative. Furthermore, employees mainly engage with fun activities outside of
44
45 their tasks (play as diversion from work), whereas play as an individual work design strategy
46
47 is embedded in work (play as engagement with work; Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006).
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Playful Work Design

The conceptualization of playful work design (PWD) synthesizes the literatures on play and individual work design. PWD represents a specific individual work design strategy that builds on play as a cognitive-behavioral orientation and the duality of play. Specifically, we define PWD as the proactive cognitive-behavioral orientation aimed at fostering fun and challenge during work activities through creating, seeking, and resolving surprises and complexities. PWD entails approaching work activities as ludic or agonistic play opportunities (i.e., cognitive recategorization) and performing them in a ludic or agonistic fashion (e.g., with humor and imagination or competitively, industriously) to attain positively valenced end-states (e.g., fun, challenge; i.e., promotion-focus). Thus, PWD represents a two-dimensional construct comprised of (1) ludic play, which we label as “designing fun”, and (2) agonistic play, which we label as “designing competition”.

Designing Fun

When employees design fun, they approach and perform work with a ludic mindset using humor and imagination to foster amusement, entertainment, and fun during work activities. The conceptualization of designing fun builds upon research that describes how individuals utilize personal capacities such as humor and imagination to provide themselves (and possibly others) with lighthearted positive affect (Abramis, 1990; Barnett, 2007; Lieberman, 2014; Proyer et al., 2012; Robert & Wilbanks, 2012; Roy, 1959). When employees design fun, they may utilize several ludic play strategies such as ludic framing, using oneself as entertainment, imagining amusing narratives or interactions, and using humor (Logan, 1985; Robert & Wilbanks, 2012; Seligman & Peterson, 2004). By using fantasy and humor, individuals may temporarily suspend or expand features of the self or the situation; attributing “their own meanings to objects and behaviors” (Tegano, 1990, p. 1049). Thus, by constructing a playful narrative, perceiving amusing incongruities, or engaging in

1
2
3 role-play, individuals may design fun in their work activities. To illustrate, Terkel (1974)
4 interviewed a cashier who described ringing groceries as “playin’ a piano” (p. 376) and a
5 server who compared work to performing as a ballerina on stage (p. 393). Another example
6 concerns a flight attendant who went viral after using humor to make flight safety fun for
7 everyone involved by communicating the safety procedure as a rap (CBS, 2009).
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Designing Competition**

15
16
17 Designing competition refers to when employees approach and perform work with an
18 agonistic mindset characterized by formulating objectives and rules to foster diligence,
19 challenge, and competition during activities. The conceptualization of designing competition
20 builds on the literatures that describe how individuals cognitively and behaviorally
21 restructure activities to derive pleasure from stretching their skills (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975;
22 Hamilton et al., 1984; Howe, 2008; Miller, 1973). When employees design competition, they
23 use play strategies such as agonistic framing, self-competition, and segmentation. By
24 voluntarily elaborating tasks in a patterned way, individuals may design challenge in
25 activities (Miller, 1973). Elaboration of tasks may involve setting small goals within tasks
26 and segmenting tasks into meaningful parts (Fisher, 1993; Hill, 1975; Roy, 1959). For
27 instance, self-competition involves competing with personal performance standards; aiming
28 to stretch personal skills and pushing beyond personal limits (Howe, 2008). Thus, designing
29 competition entails creating and finding opportunities to balance skill and challenge through
30 agonistic play. For instance, Csikszentmihalyi (1975) describes an assembly line employee
31 who exemplifies ‘designing competition’. The employee maintained engagement with work
32 throughout years of tenure by approaching and performing every task in a competitive
33 fashion: “How do I beat my record?” (p. 39). Likewise, an engaged bus driver described a
34 game during rides; challenging oneself to drive as smoothly as possible with the least amount
35 of sudden decelerations (Schaufeli et al., 2001).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Validation Studies

Taken together, we expect that individuals (1) especially enact PWD when they possess playful and proactive traits, (2) particularly use PWD when the situation affords the freedom to use PWD, and (3) who use PWD enjoy more personal psychological resources and perform better than their non-playful counterparts. We further build on the differentiation between tendencies indicative of approaching desired end-states and avoiding undesired end-states, which reflect the two independent promotion and prevention motivational systems, respectively (Higgins, 2014). PWD is expected to correlate with tendencies associated with the promotion motivational system focused on “gains”, whereas we hypothesize PWD will generally diverge from indicators of the prevention-motivational system focused on avoiding “losses”. Figure 1 illustrates the overall conceptual model of PWD that guides our hypotheses.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Study 1: Scale Construction and Preliminary Validity

Playful Work Design as Proactivity and Play

In Study 1, we develop an instrument that captures PWD in terms of ludic play (designing fun) and agonistic play (designing competition). In addition, we provide preliminary evidence for the scale’s validity. First, PWD and personal initiative converge in their self-starting nature but diverge in their goal content (self vs. organizational) and time-orientation (i.e., short-term vs. long-term; Frese et al., 1997). Hence, we expect that designing fun (Hypothesis 1a) and designing competition (Hypothesis 1b) are distinct from, but correlate positively with, personal initiative. Building on the research that conceptualizes play as a manifestation of specific tendencies and capacities, we hypothesize that PWD correlates

1
2
3 positively with general tendencies associated with play such as trait curiosity and trait
4
5 openness. Curiosity describes the pursuit, recognition, and desire to explore novel, uncertain,
6
7 complex, and ambiguous events (Kashdan et al., 2009). Likewise, individuals high in trait
8
9 openness have the “recurrent need to enlarge and examine experiences” (McCrae & Costa,
10
11 1997, p. 826). Research suggests that individuals who possess these traits will strive to
12
13 expand their experiences through play (Baumann et al., 2016; Berlyne, 1960; Guitard et al.,
14
15 2005; Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2014; Proyer, 2012). Hence, we expect that designing
16
17 fun correlates positively with trait curiosity (Hypothesis 2a) and trait openness (Hypothesis
18
19 2b). Similarly, we predict that designing competition relates positively to trait curiosity
20
21 (Hypothesis 3a) and trait openness (Hypothesis 3b).
22
23
24
25

26 **Designing Fun as Ludic Play**

27
28 Since designing fun and designing competition reflect ludic and agonistic play,
29
30 respectively, we anticipate that designing fun and designing competition will correlate
31
32 positively with ludic and agonistic traits (convergent validity); however, we further predict
33
34 that designing fun correlates more strongly with ludic traits than designing competition and
35
36 that designing competition correlates more strongly with agonistic traits than designing fun
37
38 (divergent validity). While trait playfulness, trait humor, and creative personality represent
39
40 ludic characteristics, competitiveness and achievement striving reflect agonistic
41
42 characteristics. The conceptualization of trait playfulness builds on the ludic play literature
43
44 and refers to “the predisposition to frame (or reframe) a situation in such a way to provide
45
46 oneself (and possibly others) with amusement, humor, and/ or entertainment (Barnett, 2007,
47
48 p. 955; Proyer, 2012). In a similar vein, humor is a character strength that refers to the
49
50 capacity to make oneself and others laugh (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Finally, trait
51
52 creativity is considered to be a fundamental component of ludic play, reflective of the
53
54 capacity for divergent thinking, which enables individuals to creatively approach and perform
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 activities (Glynn & Webster, 1992; Guitard et al., 2005; Lieberman, 2014; see, for a review,
4
5 Proyer et al., 2019). Taken together, we predict that designing fun correlates positively and
6
7 more strongly than designing competition with trait playfulness (Hypothesis 4a), sense of
8
9 humor (Hypothesis 4b), and trait creativity (Hypothesis 4c).

12 **Designing Competition as Agonistic Play**

14
15 Since competitiveness and achievement striving represent agonistic traits they should
16
17 especially correlate with designing competition. Trait competitiveness refers to having a
18
19 strong desire to outperform others and frame situations as competitions (Houston et al., 2002;
20
21 Hibbard et al., 2010). The achievement striving facet of conscientiousness refers to the will to
22
23 achieve and strive for excellence (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Competitiveness and achievement
24
25 striving are closely related; however, competitiveness also focuses on others, whereas
26
27 achievement striving is mainly self-centered (Moon, 2001). Hence, we expect that designing
28
29 competition correlates positively, and more strongly than designing fun, with competitiveness
30
31 (Hypothesis 5a) and achievement striving (Hypothesis 5b).

35 **Divergent Behavioral Tendencies**

37
38 Finally, we expect PWD to diverge from constructs reflective of the prevention-
39
40 motivational system focused on avoiding losses such as procrastination and cynicism. The
41
42 tendency to procrastinate refers to the propensity to put off work and avoid an activity under
43
44 one's control (Tuckman, 1991), which reflects avoidance of negative emotions (Sirois &
45
46 Pychyl, 2013). Cynicism refers to a negative, callous, and cynical attitude towards one's job
47
48 characterized by distancing oneself from work (Leiter & Schaufeli, 1996). Typically,
49
50 individuals develop cynical attitudes towards their work to avoid incurring further energetic
51
52 losses (Maslach et al., 2001). We expect that the enactment of PWD operates independently
53
54 from procrastination and cynicism. To illustrate, individuals who score low on
55
56 procrastination may utilize PWD to 'kick-start' their focal task, whereas procrastinators may
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 employ PWD to avoid their focal task by playfully designing other work activities. Similarly,
4
5 while individuals low in cynicism may initiate PWD to further expand their motivation,
6
7 cynical individuals may also initiate PWD to protect their energies or as a strategy to further
8
9 distance themselves from work and as a form of resistance (Rodrigues & Collinson, 1995).
10
11 These opposing associations suggest that designing fun and designing competition diverge
12
13 from procrastination and cynicism.
14
15

16 17 **Method**

18 19 **Content Validity, Item Generation, and Reduction**

20
21 Four experts (one professor in organizational psychology and three work design
22
23 consultants) generated 75 items utilizing an inductive approach based on their knowledge of
24
25 the subject matter and experiences with clients (DeVellis, 2016). All items were positively
26
27 keyed since reverse-scored items reduce validity, introduce systematic error, and may cause
28
29 an artifactual response factor consisting of all negatively worded items (Hinkin, 1995).
30
31 Experiences with clients comprised workshop exercises and interviews on the use of play
32
33 during work to make tasks more fun and challenging. During the next round, we selected and
34
35 reformulated 39 items to ensure that the final item pool consisted of statements that indicated
36
37 to what extent employees proactively integrated play with work with commonly described
38
39 play elements (e.g., humor, fantasy, narrative, competition, challenges, rules; Lieberman,
40
41 2014; Caillois, 2001; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Huizinga, 1949). A panel of six Work and
42
43 Organizational psychologists was provided with the following description of PWD: “Playful
44
45 work design is a proactive employee strategy of using imagination and behavior to make
46
47 work more challenging and fun”. The panel evaluated and scrutinized the item pool based on
48
49 clarity and construct validity. Specifically, they were instructed to rate items in terms of
50
51 clarity, unambiguity, and conciseness on a 5-point scale (1 = *bad quality*, 5 = *good quality*).
52
53 We retained items with a high degree of consensus and minor comments ($n = 26$; $M = 4.33$).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, we formulated several new items based on the feedback ($n = 6$), which resulted in a
4
5 total set of 32 items for the exploratory factor analyses.
6
7

8 **Procedure and Participants**

9

10 Participants were recruited through social media and the personal network of the
11 authors. We informed participants of the general purpose of the study, that they could
12 withdraw at any time, and that their responses were completely confidential. To incentivize
13 participants, they could win a wireless headset worth 50 euros. In total, 428 Dutch employees
14 participated. The sample consisted of 262 men (61.2%) and 166 women (38.8%). On average,
15 participants were 40.42 years of age ($SD = 12.62$), worked 46.33 hours a week ($SD = 16.20$),
16 and worked 12.97 years in their current job ($SD = 11.75$). Most of our sample received
17 vocational training (40.2%) or finished high school (25.2%). Participants worked in a variety
18 of sectors such as trade (41.8%), healthcare (15.4%), education (9.8%), industry (7.9%), and
19 business services (7.2%). The participants rated the 32 items on a five-point scale (1 = *never*,
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
5 = very often).

35 **Measures**

36
37
38 In addition to the 32 newly developed items to measure PWD, we included various
39 scales to establish preliminary evidence of construct validity. Statements were rated on a 5-
40 point scale unless stated otherwise (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*).
41
42
43

44 **Proactivity.** We measured proactivity with the seven-item Self-reported Initiative
45 Questionnaire (Frese et al., 1997). An example item is: “I actively attack problems”.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
General Play Traits. We measured trait curiosity and trait openness. Curiosity was
measured with the ten-item Curiosity and Exploration Inventory-II (Kashdan et al., 2009).
Respondents rated statements such as “I am the kind of person who embraces unfamiliar
people, events, and places” (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *extremely*). The ten-item Openness to

1
2
3 Experience scale of the Big Five Inventory was used to measure openness (John et al., 2008).

4
5 One example item is: “I see myself as someone who is ingenious”.

6
7
8 **Ludic Traits.** We used instruments that measure trait playfulness, humor, and
9
10 creative personality. We measured trait playfulness with the five-item Short Measure of
11
12 Playfulness (Proyer et al., 2012). Example items are “I am a playful person” and “Good
13
14 friends would describe me as a playful person” (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).
15
16 Humor was measured with the nine-item humor scale of the Values in Action Inventory of
17
18 Strengths (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). An example item is “I use laughter to brighten the
19
20 days of others” (1 = *very uncharacteristic*, 5 = *very characteristic*). We used the four-item
21
22 Creative Personality Scale to measure creative personality (Gough, 1979; Zhou, 2003).
23
24 Respondents rated items such as “I am inventive”.

25
26
27
28 **Agonistic Traits.** Competitiveness was measured with the five-item competition
29
30 subscale of the Work and Family Orientation questionnaire (Helmreich & Spence, 1978). An
31
32 example item is: “feel that winning is important in both work and games”. We measured the
33
34 achievement striving facet of conscientiousness with the ten-item achievement striving
35
36 subscale from the NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). An example item is:
37
38 “I plunge into tasks with all my heart”.

39
40
41
42 **Divergent Behavioral Tendencies.** We used measures of procrastination and
43
44 cynicism to assess divergent validity. We measured procrastination with eight of the highest
45
46 loading items of the Procrastination Scale (Tuckman, 1991), such as “I am an incurable time
47
48 waster”. We used the four-item cynicism subscale from the Maslach Burnout Inventory to
49
50 measure cynicism (Maslach et al., 1986). An example item is: “I doubt the significance of my
51
52 work” (1 = *never*, 7 = *always*).

53 54 55 56 **Results**

57 58 **Exploratory Factor Analyses**

1
2
3 The 32 items were used in iterative exploratory factor analyses (EFA) using principal
4 component analysis and oblique rotation (promax). Oblique rotation was chosen because the
5 hypothesized factors, designing fun and designing competition, represent correlated facets of
6 the higher-order latent PWD construct. To ensure content validity and avoid redundancy, we
7 removed items that did not distinctly load on their intended dimension, showed substantial
8 overlap with other items, or created aberrant deviations from the two-factor structure. In
9 addition, to ensure a concise and parsimonious instrument, we utilized an iterative approach
10 where we inspected Eigenvalues (> 1), cross-loadings ($< .35$), overlap, and content validity of
11 the statements to add and remove items (Osborne et al., 2008). An iterative approach to the
12 factor analysis was deemed most appropriate in consideration of the novelty of the construct,
13 need for a parsimonious meaningful instrument, and lack of empirical studies to draw items
14 from.

15
16
17 In total, the iterative procedure identified 12 items that loaded distinctively on their
18 expected factor and mirrored the proposed two-dimensional nature of PWD (see Table 1).
19 The factor loadings ranged from .43 to .80 and none of the cross-loadings exceeded .27. The
20 first factor described ludic play during work, which we refer to as *designing fun*, and
21 explained 34.39% of the variance (Eigenvalue = 4.13; alpha reliability coefficient = .75). The
22 second factor consisted of items that measure agonistic play during work, which we label as
23 *designing competition*, and explained an additional 10.20% of the variance (Eigenvalue =
24 1.22). In addition to the alpha reliability coefficients (α), we calculated the omega reliability
25 coefficients (ω) for each PWD subdimension based on maximum likelihood estimation of
26 factor loadings and error variances (Hayes & Coutts, 2020). The reliabilities of the designing
27 fun ($\alpha = .75$, $\omega = .75$) and designing competition scale were acceptable ($\alpha = .73$, $\omega = .74$).
28 The item means vary between 2.61 and 3.97 ($\bar{x} = 3.18$), which suggests most individuals
29 occasionally engage in PWD. The absolute values of the skewness and kurtosis indices did
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

not exceed 1.1, which indicates the items are normally distributed (Kline, 1998). The designing fun and designing competition subscales were intercorrelated ($r = .56, p < .01$; see Table 1).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Validity Evidence

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of the variables. We predicted that designing fun (Hypothesis 1a) and designing competition (Hypothesis 1b) would correlate positively with personal initiative. In support of Hypothesis 1, personal initiative associated positively with designing fun ($r = .36, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = .36, p < .01$). Hypothesis 2 states that designing fun (a) and designing competition (b) correlate positively with the trait of curiosity. Indeed, trait curiosity was positively correlated with designing fun ($r = .42, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = .46, p < .01$). Finally, we hypothesized that designing fun (Hypothesis 3a) and designing competition (Hypothesis 3b) would relate positively to trait openness. As expected, designing fun ($r = .40, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = .31, p < .01$) correlated positively with trait openness. Taken together, the results indicate that individuals with proactive and playful tendencies tend to design fun and design competition.

Hypothesis 4 states that designing fun would correlate positively, and more strongly than designing competition, with trait playfulness (a), humor (b), and creative personality (c). To compare the strength of the correlations, we calculated two-tailed 95% confidence intervals of the differences (Zou, 2007). The strength of the correlations significantly differs in size when the confidence interval excludes zero. Indeed, the positive correlations between designing fun and playfulness ($r = .45, p < .01$; LL: 0.19, UL: 0.35), humor ($r = .41, p < .01$;

1
2
3 LL: .20, UL: .36), and creative personality ($r = .36, p < .01$; LL: .04, UL: .20) were stronger
4
5 than the associations between designing competition and the respective ludic traits (Table 2).
6
7 In contrast, we predicted that designing competition would correlate positively, and more
8
9 strongly than designing fun, with trait competitiveness (Hypothesis 5a) and achievement
10
11 striving (Hypothesis 5b). Indeed, the correlations of designing competition with
12
13 competitiveness ($r = .44, p < .01$; LL: .18 UL: .34) and achievement striving ($r = .34, p < .01$;
14
15 LL: .04, UL: .20) were stronger than the associations between designing fun and the agonistic
16
17 traits (Table 2). These findings support the conceptualization of designing fun and designing
18
19 competition as ludic and agonistic play, respectively.
20
21
22

23
24 We expected that PWD diverged from procrastination and cynicism. Designing fun
25
26 neither correlated with procrastination ($r = -.01, p = .963$) nor cynicism ($r = -.08, p = .088$).
27
28 Likewise, designing competition did not relate to procrastination ($r = -.01, p = .859$);
29
30 however, designing competition did show a small negative correlation with cynicism ($r = -$
31
32 $.13, p < .05$).
33
34
35

36
37
38 -----
39 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE
40
41 -----
42

43 Discussion

44
45 The two-dimensional factor structure that emerged from iterative exploratory factor
46
47 analyses mirrored the duality of play, which we labeled designing fun and designing
48
49 competition. Further supporting this distinction, designing fun especially correlated with
50
51 ludic traits (i.e., playfulness, humor, creative personality), whereas designing competition
52
53 was especially related to agonistic traits (i.e., competitiveness, achievement striving). As
54
55 hypothesized, both dimensions converged similarly with personal initiative and general traits
56
57 associated with play (i.e., curiosity, openness), which supports the conceptualization of PWD
58
59
60

1
2
3 as an integration of play and proactivity during work. Finally, PWD diverged from constructs
4
5 reflective of withdrawal and avoidance – suggesting PWD is indicative of a different
6
7 motivational system. Taken together, the findings support the two-dimensional
8
9 conceptualization of PWD as behavior reflective of proactive ludic play and proactive
10
11 agonistic play during work.
12
13

14 **Study 2: Cross-Validation and Additional Validity Evidence**

15 **Playful Work Design vs. Job Crafting**

16
17
18
19 Study 2 aims to cross-validate the two-dimensional factor structure of the PWD
20
21 instrument (Hypothesis 6) and provide further construct validity. Job crafting is an important
22
23 construct to consider in relation to PWD. Job crafting can be defined as self-initiated changes
24
25 in job demands and job resources (Tims et al., 2012; Petrou et al., 2012). Such proactive
26
27 efforts can also be conceptualized as contraction (prevention/avoidance-oriented) and
28
29 expansion (promotion/approach-oriented) of the task, cognitive, skill, and relational
30
31 boundaries of the job (Bindl et al., 2019; Laurence, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001;
32
33 Zhang & Parker, 2019). In contrast, PWD does not involve changing job resources or job
34
35 demands. PWD also does not promote change through expansion or contraction of the scope
36
37 of the job. PWD creates change by proactively restructuring cognition and behavior *during*
38
39 *existing* work activities. To illustrate, a cashier who crafts their job may seek out or drop
40
41 certain tasks by asking to be responsible for the bookkeeping or by exchanging their cleaning
42
43 task with a colleague; try to get to know or avoid certain colleagues; and, focus on how the
44
45 supermarket ensures that individuals in society have easy access to food or channel attention
46
47 away from tasks that involve wasting food. These behaviors exemplify self-initiated changes
48
49 in job demands and job resources as well as expansion and contraction of the boundaries of
50
51 the job (Bindl et al., 2019; Tims et al., 2012). In contrast, a cashier who designs work to be
52
53 more playful may imagine an amusing narrative for the item list of each customer (to create
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fun) and try to scan articles as fast as possible (to create challenge). The cashier does not aim
4
5 to modify the boundaries of their obligations, relations, and meaning of the job; the aim is to
6
7 redesign the experience to be more fun and challenging by integrating play with work within
8
9 the boundaries of the activities. Hence, we argue PWD is distinct from job crafting due to the
10
11 differences in content and how the behaviors realize change (discriminant validity;
12
13 Hypothesis 7). However, PWD and job crafting overlap in terms of self-started changes to
14
15 optimize work conditions (convergent validity). Hence, we argue that designing fun
16
17 correlates positively with increasing structural resources (Hypothesis 8a), increasing social
18
19 resources (Hypothesis 8b), and increasing challenge job demands (Hypothesis 8c). Likewise,
20
21 Hypothesis 9 states that designing competition is positively associated with increasing
22
23 structural resources (Hypothesis 9a), increasing social resources (Hypothesis 9b), and
24
25 increasing challenge job demands (Hypothesis 9c).

31 **Convergent Behavioral Tendencies**

32
33 We expect that when individuals design fun and design competition, they frame and
34
35 perform activities with a ludic and agonistic orientation, which builds on an individual's
36
37 mental capacities and flexibility (Lieberman, 2014; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). Imagination
38
39 refers to the mental capacity to simulate certain activities and experiences (Taylor et al.,
40
41 1998). When individuals design fun or competition, they may utilize their imagination to
42
43 frame and approach activities in a ludic (e.g., as a theatrical performance) or agonistic (e.g.,
44
45 as a challenging puzzle) fashion. Hence, we expect that imagination correlates positively with
46
47 designing fun (Hypothesis 10a) and designing competition (Hypothesis 10b). Behavioral
48
49 rigidity refers to the tendency to maintain the status quo and avoid unknown activities
50
51 (Lynam, 2012). This tendency stands in stark contrast with PWD, which revolves around
52
53 self-initiating changes to create surprises, uncertainties, and complexities. Hence, Hypothesis
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 11 states that behavioral rigidity correlates negatively with designing fun (H11a) and
4
5 designing competition (H11b).
6
7

8 **Convergent Job Characteristics**

9
10 Finally, as mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, PWD is embedded in activities.
11
12 The characteristics of these activities may promote or limit the opportunities to playfully
13
14 design work (Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006; Celestine & Yeo, 2021). Autonomy and
15
16 supervision support for play provide employees with the latitude to playfully design work.
17
18 Job autonomy refers to the degree of freedom, independence, and discretion (Morgeson &
19
20 Humphrey, 2006). Since higher levels of autonomy afford individuals with more play
21
22 opportunities, we anticipate that designing fun (Hypothesis 12a) and designing competition
23
24 (Hypothesis 12b) correlate positively with autonomy. Likewise, supportive supervision may
25
26 stimulate PWD by signaling that play is permissible (Celestine & Yeo, 2021; Petelczyc et al.,
27
28 2018). Hence, we predict experience support for fun will correlate positively with (H13a)
29
30 designing fun and (H13b) designing competition.
31
32
33
34

35 **Divergent Behavioral Tendencies**

36
37 We expect PWD to manifest independently from constructs that reflect avoidance
38
39 such as laziness. Similar to procrastination, laziness reflects an unwillingness to engage in
40
41 and an avoidance of work (Costa & McCrae, 1985). Hence, we expect laziness to diverge
42
43 from designing fun and designing competition.
44
45
46

47 **Playful Work Design and Energy Management**

48
49 Play theory suggests that individuals initiate play to expand and recuperate their
50
51 energetic resources (Berlyne, 1960; Celestine & Yeo, 2021; Ellis, 1973; Giddens, 1964;
52
53 Magnuson & Barnett, 2013; Spencer, 1870). The affective-energetic states of employees can
54
55 be described by work engagement, exhaustion, and job boredom (Schaufeli & Salanova,
56
57 2014). Work engagement is a positive, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor,
58
59
60

1
2
3 dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). In contrast, exhaustion refers to a
4 feeling of fatigue due to excessive demands (Maslach et al., 1986). Finally, job boredom
5 reflects a lack of energetic resources and passiveness due to an unstimulating environment
6 (Reijseger et al., 2013). In other words, engagement, exhaustion, and boredom reflect the
7 employees' energetic reservoir. Therefore, we anticipate that designing fun (H14a) and
8 designing competition (H14b) correlate positively with work engagement. In contrast, we
9 expect that employees who design fun (H15a) and design competition (H15b) are generally
10 less exhausted. Similarly, we expect that employees who design fun (H16a) and design
11 competition (H16b) are less bored with their work.

22 23 24 **Method**

25 26 **Procedure and Participants**

27
28 We recruited Dutch employees by posting (digital) flyers on social media channels
29 (e.g., LinkedIn, Facebook). Participants were first informed of the general purpose of the
30 study, the confidentiality of their responses, and that participation was voluntary. As an
31 incentive, respondents could win a wireless headset worth 60 euros. We recruited 302
32 participants, which consisted of 164 women (54.3%) and 138 men (45.7%). Respondents had
33 a mean age of 43.46 years old ($SD = 11.70$), workweek of 42.07 hours ($SD = 15.00$), and job
34 tenure of 14.45 years ($SD = 11.95$). Most participants received vocational training (32.5%) or
35 higher professional education (32.1%). Participants worked in a variety of sectors, including
36 transport (33.1%), healthcare (29.1%), education (16.2%), and business services (7.9%).

37 38 39 **Material**

40
41 All statements were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly*
42 *agree*), unless stated otherwise.

43
44 **Playful Work Design.** PWD was measured with the newly developed twelve-item
45 PWD questionnaire from Study 1 (see Table 1).

1
2
3 **Job Crafting.** We measured three job crafting behaviors with the Job Crafting
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Job Crafting. We measured three job crafting behaviors with the Job Crafting
Questionnaire (Tims et al., 2012). Each scale consists of five items. Example items are: “I try
to develop myself professionally” (increasing structural job resources), “I ask colleagues for
advice” (increasing social job resources), and “When an interesting project comes along, I
offer myself proactively as project co-worker” (increasing challenging job demands). Items
were rated on a five-point scale (1 = *never*, 5 = *very often*).

Convergent Measures. We measured imagination, rigidity, support for fun, and
autonomy as general antecedents of play. We used a six-item scale to measure imagination
(Costa & McCrae, 1992). Respondents rated items such as: “I feel like my imagination can
run wild”. Rigidity was measured with the seven-item behavioral rigidity scale (Lynam et al.,
2012). An example statement is: “I am very predictable”. We measured manager support for
fun with the five-item Manager Support for Fun scale (Tews et al., 2014). An example item
is: “My managers try to make my work fun”. We used three items to measure job autonomy
(Bakker et al., 2003), including, “I can decide myself how I execute my work” (1 = *totally*
disagree, 7 = *totally agree*).

Divergent Measures. Laziness was measured with the five-item laziness scale (Costa
& McCrae, 1992). An example item is: “I tend to be lazy”.

Criterion Measures. We measured work engagement, job boredom, and exhaustion
(1 = *never*, 7 = *always*). The nine-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale was used to measure
work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006). An example item is: “At my work, I feel bursting
with energy”. Job boredom was measured with the eight-item Boredom Scale (Reijseger et
al., 2013). Participants rated how frequent statements such as “I feel bored at my job” applied
to them. We measured exhaustion with the five-item exhaustion subscale from the Utrecht
Burnout Scale (Schaufeli et al., 1996). An example item is: “I feel mentally exhausted by my
work”.

Results

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

To cross-validate the two-factor structure from Study 1 (Hypothesis 6), we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis with maximum likelihood estimation using Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017). Model fit was assessed with the chi-square/df ratio (χ^2/df), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). These fit indices indicate acceptable fit when the χ^2/df ratio is lower than three (Kline, 1998), TLI and CFI values exceed .90, and RMSEA and SRMR values are lower than .08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). In support of Hypothesis 8, the findings indicate that two-factor model sufficient fits the data ($\chi^2 = 129.41$, $df = 53$, CFI = .923, TLI = .905, RMSEA = .069, SRMR = .048), whereas the one-factor model fitted less adequately to the data ($\chi^2 = 195.95$, $df = 54$; $\Delta \chi^2 = 66.54$, $\Delta df = 1$, $p < .01$, CFI = .858, TLI = .826, RMSEA = .093, SRMR = .061). The standardized factor loadings of the two-factor model were statistically significant and ranged from .39 to .75 ($p < .01$). Similar to Study 1, designing fun ($\alpha = .80$, $\omega = .80$) and designing competition ($\alpha = .75$, $\omega = .76$) were intercorrelated ($r = .59$, $p < .01$) and sufficiently reliable (See Table 2).

To assess whether we can distinguish PWD from job crafting (Hypothesis 7), we performed a series of confirmatory factor analyses (see Table 3). The hypothesized measurement model consisted of five latent factors: designing fun, designing competition, increasing structural job resources, increasing job social resources, and increasing job challenges. The PWD dimensions consisted of 6 items each, whereas the three job crafting dimensions consisted of 5 items each. The hypothesized 5-factor model showed an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 645.09$, $df = 314$, CFI = .903, TLI = .891, RMSEA = .059, SRMR = .052). In addition, we compared the five-factor model with various alternative models such as a model assuming that items indicating designing competition and increasing challenge job

1
2
3 demands refer to one underlying “increasing challenges” dimension (Model 11). However,
4
5 none of the alternative models improved model fit beyond the original, five-factor model.
6
7 Hence, we conclude that designing fun and designing competition are distinct and discernable
8
9 from the dimensions of job crafting.
10
11

12
13 -----
14
15 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE
16
17 -----
18

19 20 **Convergent Validity**

21
22 Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of the variables. It is important to note the
23
24 low reliability of the behavioral rigidity and laziness scales, which may have limited the
25
26 validity of the associations. We hypothesized that PWD would relate positively to job
27
28 crafting (Hypothesis 8 and 9). Indeed, designing fun and designing competition, respectively,
29
30 correlated positively with increasing social job resources ($r = .41, p < .01$ and $r = .43, p <$
31
32 $.01$), increasing challenge job demands ($r = .49, p < .01$ and $r = .52, p < .01$), and increasing
33
34 structural job resources ($r = .43, p < .01$ and $r = .44, p < .01$). We further predicted PWD to
35
36 relate positively to imagination (H10) and negatively to behavioral rigidity (H11). As
37
38 expected, imagination correlated positively with designing fun ($r = .22, p < .01$) and
39
40 designing competition ($r = .23, p < .01$); and behavioral rigidity correlated negatively with
41
42 designing fun ($r = -.23, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = -.22, p < .01$). In other words,
43
44 employees who use PWD tend to be proactive and somewhat more imaginative and less rigid
45
46 in their behavior. Finally, we expected PWD to be more prevalent in settings characterized by
47
48 autonomy (H12) and support for fun (H13). Indeed, autonomy correlated positively with
49
50 designing fun ($r = .17, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = .23, p < .01$); likewise, support
51
52 for fun related positively to designing fun ($r = .23, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r =$
53
54 $.21, p < .01$).
55
56
57
58
59
60

Divergent Validity

We anticipated designing fun and designing competition to diverge from trait laziness. Neither designing fun ($r = -.01, p = .845$) nor designing competition ($r = -.11, p = .054$) correlated with laziness. These findings provide further evidence that PWD operates largely independently of the prevention-motivational system.

Criterion Validity

We hypothesized PWD would correlate positively with work engagement (H14), and negatively with exhaustion (H15) and boredom (H16). As hypothesized, designing fun ($r = .30, p < .01$) and designing competition ($r = .36, p < .01$) correlated positively with work engagement. However, designing fun ($r = .01, p = .931$) and competition ($r = -.07, p = .244$) were not associated with exhaustion. Similarly, designing fun ($r = .02, p = .791$) and designing competition ($r = .04, p = .523$) were not associated with job boredom. Thus, while employees who use PWD generally feel more engaged, they do not experience less or more boredom and exhaustion than less playful counterparts.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

Study 2 replicated the two-dimensional factor structure found in Study 1. In addition, the confirmatory factor analyses revealed that PWD is distinguishable from job crafting. The correlations support the conceptualization of PWD as a form of proactive behavior and play, and suggest situational latitude promotes PWD. As expected, employees who design fun and design competition generally feel more engaged. However, contrary to our expectations, PWD did not correlate with exhaustion and job boredom. The energy management perspective of play may explain these findings (Celestine & Yeo, 2021). That is, on opposing

ends of the continuum of exhaustion and boredom, employees may initiate PWD. Individuals who generally do not feel exhausted or bored may initiate PWD to expand their resources, whereas individuals who lack energetic resources may initiate PWD to recuperate.

Study 3: Longitudinal Invariance and Predictive Validity

PWD and Behavioral Motivational Systems

Study 3 further tests the psychometric robustness of the PWD instrument and provides additional validity evidence. Moreover, we examine the predictive power of the PWD scales by temporally separating designing fun and designing competition from the outcome measures (i.e., self- and colleague-ratings). In addition, we will evaluate their incremental predictive power beyond job crafting, personal initiative, and fun activities. In the preceding paragraphs, we argued that PWD resonates with the promotion-motivational system but operates largely independent of the prevention-motivational system. These systems closely relate to the behavioral activation system (BAS) and behavioral inhibition system (BIS; Gray, 1990; Strauman et al., 2012). Carver and White (1994) argued that drive, reward responsiveness, and fun seeking characterize BAS, whereas concerns regarding potentially punishing events reflect BIS. Hence, Hypothesis 17 states that (a) drive, (b) reward responsiveness, and (c) fun seeking correlate positively with designing fun. However, we expect that BIS is not associated with designing fun. Hypothesis 18 specifies that (a) drive, (b) reward responsiveness, and (c) fun seeking relate positively to designing competition. In contrast, we expect that designing competition diverges from BIS.

PWD, Energies, and Performance Behaviors

The energy management perspective of play proposes that play may enable employees to “build” energies that fuel work engagement, relational energy, and job effort (Celestine & Yeo, 2021). Relational energy encompasses energy derived from relational experiences (Owens et al., 2016). A colleague who restructures activities in a fun and

1
2
3 challenging fashion may act as an energizer to colleagues (Neumann & Strack, 2000).
4
5 Similarly, job effort is defined by time commitment and work intensity (Brown & Leigh,
6
7 1996). Since PWD involves actively restructuring activities to make them more engaging, we
8
9 expect that colleagues will perceive employees who playfully design work activities to exert
10
11 more effort. Thus, Hypothesis 19 describes a positive association between designing fun and
12
13 (a) self-ratings of work engagement as well as colleague-ratings of (b) work engagement, (c)
14
15 relational energy, and (d) job effort. Similarly, Hypothesis 20 states that designing
16
17 competition positively relates to (a) self-ratings of work engagement as well as colleague-
18
19 ratings of (b) work engagement, (c) relational energy, and (d) job effort.
20
21
22
23

24
25 Various disciplines endorse the idea that play fosters development through creating
26
27 and resolving novelties and complexities (Clark, 2017; Piaget, 1962; White, 1959), which
28
29 resonates with informal learning and creativity. Informal learning refers to self-initiated
30
31 learning during work activities (Marsick et al., 1999; Noe et al., 2013). For instance, by
32
33 cognitively and behaviorally restructuring work activities in a ludic and agonistic fashion,
34
35 employees may learn the intricacies of tasks. Hence, PWD may offer employees unique
36
37 insights that can be used to solve problems innovatively. Creative performance refers to the
38
39 production of novel and appropriate responses, products, or solutions (Amabile & Mueller,
40
41 2008). Therefore, we expect that designing fun positively relates to colleague-ratings of
42
43 informal learning (Hypothesis 21a) and creative performance (Hypothesis 21b). Likewise, we
44
45 hypothesize that designing competition relates positively to colleague-ratings of informal
46
47 learning (Hypothesis 22a) and creative performance (Hypothesis 22b).
48
49
50

51 **The Dark Side of Playful Work Design**

52
53 Play initiatives have been criticized for incentivizing individuals to work excessively
54
55 (Goggin, 2011) and as subversive to work according to values such as the Protestant work
56
57 ethic (Dandridge, 1986). We differentiate between behavioral overcommitment and
58
59
60

1
2
3 psychological overcommitment. The former is operationalized by subtracting actual worked
4
5 hours from contractual work hours, whereas the latter concerns a pattern of excessive
6
7 dedication of resources to work and a high need for approval (Siegrist et al., 2004). Finally,
8
9 when PWD behaviors are considered subversive, they might be perceived as idling behaviors.
10
11 Idling behaviors (bored behaviors) refer to withdrawal behaviors during work to alleviate the
12
13 adverse consequences of boring tasks such as working slower or spending time on non-work
14
15 related activities (Hooff & Hooff, 2014). Hence, Hypothesis 23 states that designing fun is
16
17 positively associated with (a) psychological overcommitment, (b) behavioral
18
19 overcommitment, and (c) colleague-ratings of idling behavior. Finally, Hypothesis 24
20
21 specifies that designing competition will positively relate to (a) psychological
22
23 overcommitment, (b) behavioral overcommitment, and (c) colleague-ratings of idling
24
25 behavior.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Method

32 Procedure and Participants

33
34
35 Dutch employees were recruited through social media and (company) newsletters. We
36
37 informed participants of the study purpose, research design, confidentiality of their responses,
38
39 and that participation was voluntary. Respondents were eligible to participate if their
40
41 colleagues were willing to participate and able to provide accurate observations. As an
42
43 incentive, respondents received a 10 euro voucher or were enrolled in a raffle for a 20 euro
44
45 voucher when they and their colleagues filled out the surveys. Participants answered a survey
46
47 at Time 1 ($N = 276$) and roughly two weeks later at Time 2 ($N = 257$; 93.11%), whereas their
48
49 colleagues filled out a single survey about the participants at Time 2 ($N = 227$; 82.24%). The
50
51 panel group included 206 women (74.6%) and 70 men (25.4%). The mean age of the sample
52
53 was 34.94 ($SD = 10.59$). On average, employees' contracts specified 32.73 hours a week (SD
54
55 = 8.52), they worked an actual 37.30 hours a week ($SD = 9.23$), and organizational tenure
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 was 6.06 ($SD = 7.14$). The majority of the sample received a degree from an academic
4
5 (55.4%) or applied sciences university (33.0%). The sample worked in a diverse set of
6
7 occupational fields including education (29.7%), healthcare (22.1%), business services
8
9 (17.4%), and governance (8.0%).
10
11

12 **Measures**

13
14 Statements were rated on a five-point scale unless stated otherwise (1 = *never*, 5 =
15
16 *very often*).
17
18

19 **Self-ratings**

20
21 **Playful Work Design.** We assessed playful work design with the 12-item scale
22
23 developed in Study 1 and Study 2 at T1 and T2.
24
25

26 **Proactivity.** We measured two proactive behaviors at T1. We assessed Approach
27
28 Crafting (Zhang & Parker, 2019) with the three job crafting behaviors described in Study 2
29
30 (Tims et al., 2012) and with the five-item scale optimizing demands crafting developed by
31
32 Demerouti and Peeters (2018). An example statement of optimizing demands crafting is “I
33
34 improve work processes or procedures to make my job easier”. Finally, personal initiative
35
36 was measured with the 5-item scale described in Study 1 (Frese et al., 1997).
37
38
39

40 **Fun activities.** We used the five-item fun activities scale at T1 to assess play at work
41
42 (Tews et al., 2014). A sample item is “My employer organizes public celebrations of work
43
44 achievements”.
45
46

47 **Behavioral Approach and Inhibition System.** The behavioral approach (BAS) and
48
49 inhibition System (BIS) were measured with the BIS/BAS scales at T2 (Carver & White,
50
51 1994). The scale includes five items to measure four items to assess drive (i.e., BAS; e.g.,
52
53 “When I want something, I usually go all-out to get it”), reward responsiveness (i.e., BAS;
54
55 e.g., “It would excite me to win a contest”), four items to measure fun seeking (i.e., BAS;
56
57 e.g., I will often do things for no other reason than they might be fun), and seven items to
58
59
60

1
2
3 appraise behavioral inhibition (BIS; e.g., “I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at
4 something”). All statements were rated on a seven-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 =
5
6
7
8 *strongly agree*).

9
10 **Work Engagement.** We measured work engagement at T2 with the nine-item Utrecht
11
12 Work Engagement described in Study 2 (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

13
14 **Dark Side Outcomes.** We determined behavioral overcommitment by subtracting
15
16 contractual work hours per week from actual work hours a week at T1. Second, we appraised
17
18 psychological overcommitment with five items of the six-item overcommitment scale at T2
19
20 (Siegrist et al., 2004). Namely, we removed one item “When I get home, I can easily relax
21
22 and ‘switch off’ work” due to the lockdown measures. Respondents rated items such as
23
24
25
26
27 “People close to me say I sacrifice myself too much for my job”.

28 *Colleague-ratings*

29
30 **Energetic Outcomes.** We measured work engagement at T2 with the nine-item
31
32 Utrecht Work Engagement scale (Schaufeli et al., 2006). An example statement is “My
33
34 colleague is bursting with energy at work”. We assessed relational energy with the five-item
35
36 relational energy scale (Owens et al., 2016). The scale includes the item “After an exchange
37
38 with this person I feel more stamina to do my work”. We measured colleague-rated job effort
39
40 with the (Brown & Leigh, 1996). An example statement is “My colleague works at full
41
42
43
44
45
46 capacity in all of their job duties”.

47
48 **Developmental Outcomes.** Informal learning behaviors were measured with the
49
50 three-item Informal Learning Scale (Noe et al., 2013), including the following item: “My
51
52 colleague uses trial and error strategies to learn and better perform”. We used the four-item
53
54 innovation subscale of the individual performance instrument to appraise creative
55
56 performance (Miron et al., 2004). Respondents rated items such as: “My colleague is
57
58
59
60 innovative”.

1
2
3 **Dark Side Outcomes.** We measured idling behavior with the five-item bored
4 behavior scale (Hooff & Hooff, 2014). An example statement is “My colleague is busy with
5 activities to kill the time”.
6
7
8

10 Results

12 Longitudinal Psychometric Properties

14 We examined the longitudinal measurement invariance of the PWD instrument across
15 the two measurement occasions by comparing several consecutive models that gradually
16 increase model constraints (Table 5; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). First, we tested the
17 equivalence of the factor structures and freely estimated all parameters across measurement
18 occasions, which evidenced configural invariance for the PWD scales (Model 1). Next, we
19 constrained the factor loadings to be equal across measurement occasions (Model 2).
20 Indicative of metric invariance, Model 1 and Model 2 did not significantly differ ($p = .551$).
21 Finally, we compared Model 2 with a measurement model that constrained indicator
22 intercepts to be equal across time (Model 3). Model 3 did significantly differ from Model 2 (p
23 $< .01$). However, it is important to note that the decrease in CFI (.009), TLI (.004), RMSEA
24 (.001), and SRMR (.003) between Model 3 and Model 2 was negligible. The chi-square test
25 may erroneously reject a model based on trivial differences due to its sensitivity. Chen (2007)
26 argued that differences in CFI $< .010$, supplemented by changes in RMSEA $< .015$ or SRMR
27 < 0.030 indicate invariance for samples larger than 300, whereas for samples smaller than
28 300, differences in CFI $< .005$ supplemented by a change in RMSEA $< .010$ or in SRMR $<$
29 $.005$ indicate invariance. The results based on our sample meet the criteria regarding the
30 RMSEA and SRMR fit measures, but the CFI slightly deviates from the recommended cut-
31 off score. However, in light of the other fit measures and given that our sample size is close
32 to 300, we argue that this slight deviation does not warrant concern. The reliability
33 coefficients for designing fun ($\alpha_{T1} = .80$, $\omega_{T1} = .81$; $\alpha_{T2} = .83$, $\omega_{T2} = .83$) and designing
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 competition ($\alpha_{T1} = .69$, $\omega_{T1} = .68$; $\alpha_{T2} = .72$, $\omega_{T2} = .71$) were acceptable at Time 1 and Time 2.
4
5 Finally, the test-retest reliability of the designing fun ($r_{ij} = .78$) and designing competition (r_{ij}
6
7 = .69) scales was acceptable. Taken together, the results indicate that the scales represent a
8
9 psychometrically sound and reliable instrument.
10
11

12
13 -----
14
15 INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE
16
17 -----
18

19 20 **Predictive Validity**

21
22 Table 6 lists the descriptive statistics of the variables. We expected that drive
23
24 (Hypothesis 17a), reward responsiveness (Hypothesis 17b), and fun seeking (Hypothesis 17c)
25
26 are positively associated with designing fun, whereas BIS will diverge from designing fun.
27
28 As predicted, designing fun correlated positively with reward responsiveness ($r = .23$, $p <$
29
30 $.01$) and fun seeking ($r = .31$, $p < .01$). However, designing fun did not correlate with drive (r
31
32 = $.10$, $p = .114$) and BIS ($r = -.09$, $p = .131$). Hence, Hypothesis 17 is partially supported.
33
34 Hypothesis 18 states that (a) drive, (b) reward responsiveness, and (c) fun seeking correlate
35
36 positively with designing competition, whereas BIS is expected to diverge from designing
37
38 fun. Indeed, drive ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), reward responsiveness ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and fun seeking
39
40 ($r = .25$, $p < .01$) were positively associated with designing competition, whereas BIS did not
41
42 correlate with designing competition ($r = -.01$, $p = .913$). Taken together, the findings
43
44 indicate that PWD converges with the behavioral activation system, but diverges from the
45
46 behavioral inhibition system.
47
48
49
50

51
52 Hypothesis 19 proposes that designing fun would relate positively to (a) self-ratings
53
54 of work engagement as well as to colleague-ratings of (b) work engagement, (c) relational
55
56 energy, and (d) job effort. In partial support of our hypothesis, designing fun positively
57
58 related to self-ratings of work engagement ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) and colleague-ratings of work
59
60

1
2
3 engagement ($r = .28, p < .01$), but did not relate to colleague-ratings of relational energy ($r =$
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
engagement ($r = .28, p < .01$), but did not relate to colleague-ratings of relational energy ($r =$
.11, $p = .088$) and job effort ($r = .08, p = .222$). Hypothesis 20 states that designing
competition is positively associated with (a) self-ratings of work engagement as well as
colleague-ratings of (b) work engagement, (c) relational energy, and (d) job effort. Designing
competition correlated positively with self-ratings of work engagement ($r = .46, p < .01$) as
well as with ratings by colleagues of work engagement ($r = .31, p < .01$) and job effort ($r =$
.24, $p < .01$), but did not promote relational energy ($r = .04, p = .581$).

We further hypothesized that designing fun would correlate positively with colleague-
ratings of informal learning (Hypothesis 21a) and creative performance (Hypothesis 21b).
Indeed, designing fun was positively associated with informal learning ($r = .18, p < .01$) and
creative performance ($r = .28, p < .01$). Likewise, we hypothesized that designing
competition would relate positively to informal learning (Hypothesis 22a) and creative
performance (Hypothesis 22b). Designing competition was positively related to informal
learning ($r = .21, p < .01$) and creative performance ($r = .17, p < .05$).

Hypothesis 23 proposes that designing fun positively relates to (a) psychological
overcommitment, (b) behavioral overcommitment, and (c) colleague-ratings of idling
behavior. Likewise, we hypothesized that designing competition would be positively
associated with (Hypothesis 24a) psychological overcommitment, (Hypothesis 24b)
behavioral overcommitment, and (Hypothesis 24c) colleague-ratings of idling behavior.
Contrary to our expectations, designing fun did not relate to psychological overcommitment
($r = -.02, p = .774$), behavioral overcommitment ($r = .06, p = .336$), and idling behavior ($r = -$
.01, $p = .937$). Similarly, designing competition was not associated with psychological
overcommitment ($r = .09, p = .169$), behavioral overcommitment ($r = .06, p = .336$), and
idling behavior ($r = -.01, p = .878$).

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Incremental Predictive Validity

We assessed the incremental predictive validity of both PWD dimensions while controlling for the other PWD dimension as well as by accounting for fun activities, personal initiative, and job crafting. PWD, fun activities, personal initiative, and job crafting were measured at Time 1, whereas the outcome variables were measured at Time 2 (Table 7; behavioral overcommitment was measured at Time 1). First, most associations were robust when controlling for the opposing PWD dimension. The incremental validity of PWD beyond fun activities was substantial as none of the associations changed when we included fun activities. Similarly, designing fun and designing competition explained additional variance beyond personal initiative and job crafting in self-rated work engagement as well as colleague-ratings of work engagement, job effort, and creative performance. Moreover, replicating the findings, the pattern of significance at Time 2 mostly replicated the correlation matrix at Time 1 (91.11% of the correlations). However, the associations of (a) designing fun with reward responsiveness and informal learning, and (b) designing competition with creative performance became nonsignificant. When we controlled for personal initiative, the associations of designing competition with drive and fun seeking became non-significant. In addition, when we accounted for personal initiative and job crafting, two consistent changes emerged. First, designing competition was no longer related to creative performance. Second, the associations between PWD and informal learning were no longer significant.

INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

1
2
3 We conducted dominance analyses to further assess the incremental predictive
4 validity of the PWD scales. Dominance analysis is warranted when predictors are
5
6 intercorrelated, since determining relative importance based on regression analyses may lead
7
8 to faulty conclusions (Azen & Budescu, 2003). This analysis determines the relative
9
10 importance of predictors in terms of complete, conditional, and general dominance (Luo &
11
12 Azen, 2013). Complete dominance is established when a predictor always shows higher
13
14 incremental validity than another predictor across all possible submodels of predictors. When
15
16 the average incremental variance within each submodel is greater than that of another
17
18 predictor, this signifies conditional dominance. Finally, general dominance implies that the
19
20 average conditional contribution is greater than that of the other predictor. We performed
21
22 dominance analyses for the outcome variables that significantly related to the competing
23
24 predictors in addition to PWD (i.e., proactive behaviors and fun activities). While Table 8
25
26 presents the metrics for all three forms of dominance, we mainly limit our discussion to the
27
28 general dominance of the focal variables.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 For self-rated work engagement, the most important predictor was designing
36
37 competition (56.4%) followed by personal initiative (20.7%), designing fun (16.6%), job
38
39 crafting (5.81%), and fun activities (.41%). The PWD dimensions also dominated the other
40
41 predictors in explaining additional variance in colleague-rated work engagement. That is,
42
43 designing competition (38.5%) and designing fun (32.3%) contributed more additional
44
45 variance on average than personal initiative (16.9%), job crafting (9.2%), and fun activities
46
47 (3.08%). The most important predictor of colleague-rated effort was personal initiative
48
49 (44.8%) followed by designing competition (33.3%), job crafting (18.4%), designing fun
50
51 (3.4%), and fun activities (0.0%). In terms of colleague-rated learning, job crafting (37.0%)
52
53 explained more additional variance on average than personal initiative (23.5%), designing
54
55 competition (19.8%), designing fun (17.3%), and fun activities (2.5%). Finally, personal
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 initiative (41.5%) was closely followed by designing fun (40.0%) in explaining additional
4
5 variance in colleague-rated creative performance; job crafting (10.8%), designing
6
7 competition (6.9%), and fun activities (.8%) explained less additional variance on average.

8
9
10 Taken together, PWD shows strong incremental validity in terms of work engagement,
11
12 whereas designing fun and designing competition especially explain additional variance in
13
14 outcomes that match their ludic content (i.e., creative performance) and agonistic nature (i.e.,
15
16 effort), respectively. While job crafting was the most important predictor of informal
17
18 learning, the average incremental predictive power of PWD in relation to informal learning
19
20 was greater than fun activities but not greater than personal initiative.
21
22

23
24 -----
25
26 INSERT TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE
27
28 -----
29

30 31 **Discussion**

32
33 Study 3 further evidenced the psychometric robustness and validity of the PWD
34
35 instrument. The findings indicate that the PWD scales represent a reliable and invariant
36
37 assessment tool across measurement occasions. In addition, the findings further substantiate
38
39 the positioning of PWD as a proactive strategy to attain “gains” (promotion-motivational) but
40
41 as divergent from behavior that avoids “losses” (prevention-motivational; Higgins, 2014).
42
43 The analyses established the predictive and incremental explanatory power of the PWD
44
45 instrument. Employees who playfully designed work were rated as more engaged, learning
46
47 informally, and creative by their colleagues. However, only employees who designed
48
49 competition were perceived as exerting more job effort, whereas designing fun did not relate
50
51 to job effort. Possibly, this absent association is qualified by the occupational industry. For
52
53 instance, the use of humor may only be perceived as job effort in the sales, hospitality,
54
55 tourism, and retail industry (Cheng et al., 2021; Gilliam et al., 2014; Tsaur et al., 2019).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, endorsing the distinctiveness and robustness of PWD, most associations at Time 1
4 replicated at Time 2 and remained significant when controlling for the opposing PWD
5 dimension, fun activities, personal initiative, or job crafting. Moreover, dominance analyses
6 revealed that designing fun and designing competition were relatively important predictors
7 for self-rated work engagement, colleague-rated work engagement, effort, creative
8 performance. Unexpectedly, PWD was not associated with relational energy and the “dark-
9 side” criteria. First, the timing of the data collection might explain the absent association
10 between PWD and relational energy. The majority of the sample faced strict lockdown
11 measures and therefore worked remotely. Conceivably, the lack of face-to-face interactions
12 due to the COVID-19 lockdown limited the energizing potential of PWD behaviors (Howell
13 & Hall-Merenda, 1999). While the null findings regarding PWD and overcommitment and
14 idling behaviors are encouraging, other factors may moderate these associations. For
15 instance, PWD might only promote overcommitment for individuals with workaholic
16 tendencies. Likewise, the values and beliefs of colleagues such as endorsing a Protestant
17 work ethic might determine whether colleagues consider PWD behaviors as subversive
18 (Petelczyc et al., 2018; Sanchez-Burks, 2002; Tang & Baumeister, 1984).

40 **General Discussion**

41
42 The purpose of this study was to conceptualize play as an individual work design
43 strategy – playful work design (PWD) – as well as to develop and validate a measurement
44 tool. We conducted a series of studies that demonstrated the psychometric properties and
45 validity of the PWD instrument. Taken together, the present study makes three core
46 contributions. First, we integrated the play and work design literatures to conceptualize PWD.
47 The integration expands research on play and individual work design by explicating the two-
48 dimensional and self-started nature of play in organizations. Second, we developed a
49 psychometric sound and valid instrument, which revealed that PWD is distinguishable from
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 other proactive behaviors as well as incrementally explains variance beyond related concepts.
4
5 The instrument enables systematic research to test and refine theories regarding play during
6
7 work. The findings demonstrate that PWD is a unique and worthwhile concept. Finally, we
8
9 validate current theorizing regarding the interrelations between play in organizations,
10
11 individual differences, well-being, and performance behaviors.
12
13

14 **Theoretical Contributions**

15
16 First, the topic of play during work has received relatively little attention in the
17
18 organizational sciences (Mainemelis & Ronson, 2006). We expand the literatures on play and
19
20 work design by conceptualizing PWD as an individual work design strategy that utilizes play
21
22 as a mechanism for change. Specifically, based on our literature review, we defined PWD as
23
24 the proactive cognitive-behavioral orientation to work activities to foster fun and challenge.
25
26 Furthermore, the two-dimensional conceptualization adheres to the duality of play (Kolb &
27
28 Kolb, 2010) and answers calls for the differentiation between types of play (Petelczyc et al.,
29
30 2018). We argued employees may playfully designing work activities in a ludic fashion
31
32 (designing fun) and agonistic fashion (designing competition). The conceptualization
33
34 delineates how PWD differs from other play initiatives and proactive behaviors in terms of
35
36 the agent (employee vs. organization), mechanism for change (play vs. role contraction and
37
38 expansion), orientation in time (short-term vs. long-term), and intended target of impact (self
39
40 vs. organization).
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Second, we developed and validated a psychometrically sound instrument, which
48
49 answers calls for scales that measure play (e.g., Petelczyc et al., 2018; Van Vleet & Feeney,
50
51 2015). Across three studies, the findings indicate that the instrument provides a reliable and
52
53 invariant method for assessing PWD. In addition, the results validate the two-dimensional
54
55 measurement of PWD as a unique synthesis of (ludic and agonistic) play and proactivity. The
56
57 dimensions of PWD correlated similarly with general playful traits, proactive behaviors, and
58
59
60

1
2
3 situational conditions. However, ludic traits especially correlated with designing fun and
4
5 agonistic traits particularly related to designing competition. The distinctiveness of PWD and
6
7 its measurement was further substantiated by confirmatory factor analyses and incremental
8
9 validity evidence. The findings revealed that designing fun and designing competition are
10
11 discernable from job crafting behaviors and explain incremental variance in a variety of
12
13 constructs beyond each other and related concepts. Taken together, the findings emphasize
14
15 the usefulness of the PWD instrument for research on the antecedents, consequences, and
16
17 boundary conditions of play during work.
18
19
20

21
22 Third, contemporary research on play has proposed that play is instrumental for
23
24 employees as well as organizations. We extend current theorizing regarding play by
25
26 empirically demonstrating that PWD may represent a valuable strategy for optimizing well-
27
28 being as well as performance behaviors (Celestine & Yeo, 2021; Mainemelis & Ronson,
29
30 2006). The present study provides more insight into how and why play during work activities
31
32 may contribute to employees' energies and facilitate performance behaviors. Indeed, we
33
34 found that employees who designed fun and designed competition during work were more
35
36 engaged with work. These findings were validated by colleague-ratings of work engagement
37
38 as well as observations of job effort and creative performance. Moreover, the results revealed
39
40 that designing fun and designing competition appear to explain more additional variance on
41
42 average than job crafting or personal initiative in outcomes such as work engagement, effort,
43
44 and creative performance. For instance, designing fun and designing competition generally
45
46 dominated fun activities, personal initiative, and job crafting in explaining variance in
47
48 colleague-rated work engagement. In contrast, we did not find evidence for the dark side of
49
50 PWD. That is, the findings appear to indicate that PWD does not represent overcommitting or
51
52 subversive behavior. These findings extend and expand previous research that utilized self-
53
54 ratings and intraindividual methodologies (Scharp et al., 2019; Scharp et al., 2021). That is,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 these studies revealed that on days when individuals play during work, they have a *relatively*
4
5 ‘good’ day in terms of work engagement and performance in comparison to their other
6
7 workdays (within-person); however, the present findings reveal that individuals who play are
8
9 generally rated as more energetic and better performing than their less playful counterparts
10
11 (between-person). In other words, the use of PWD appears to not only relate to relative
12
13 intraindividual advantages – also interindividual differences are apparent. Moreover, the
14
15 findings reveal that the association between PWD and various performance behaviors is
16
17 readily observed across various occupations (Bakker, Hetland et al., 2020). Taken together,
18
19 the findings suggest that PWD is worthwhile for employees and organizations.
20
21
22

23 **Limitations and Future Research**

24
25 While the present findings are promising, several limitations require future
26
27 consideration. First, the longitudinal invariance and temporal ordering of the constructs
28
29 warrant further scrutiny for two reasons. Namely, PWD was measured on two occasions,
30
31 which may have influenced our findings. Future research may bolster claims regarding
32
33 longitudinal invariance by increasing the number of measurement occasions. Additionally,
34
35 we did not correct for stability paths, which implies we can only make claims regarding
36
37 temporal precedence but not causality. For this purpose, future research may employ a cross-
38
39 lagged panel or experimental research designs. Second, the associations between PWD,
40
41 boredom, and exhaustion were unclear and require further investigation. Possibly, by taking
42
43 an inter- and intraindividual approach, future research may distinguish how the interrelations
44
45 differ across levels of analysis. Future research may further disentangle these associations by
46
47 utilizing a (quasi) affect experimental design such as daily nudging (e.g., Weintraub et al.,
48
49 2021) or a dynamic observational approach such as episodic experience sampling
50
51 (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987). Third, although the findings showed that the scales for
52
53 assessing PWD were largely invariant, future studies may further test the measurement
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 invariance of the PWD instrument using different organizational and national contexts.

4
5 Finally, in consideration of Study 1, the observation that PWD correlates more strongly with
6
7 personality warrants future research. Possibly, due to the short-term focus, PWD depends less
8
9 on *general* job characteristics and more on dispositional tendencies and *daily* job
10
11 characteristics. Future research may investigate to what extent these findings generalize
12
13 across levels by utilizing daily diary methodology. Additionally, future research may utilize
14
15 the PWD instrument to further investigate play during work (see Bakker, Scharp et al., 2020)
16
17 to explain (1) *why* PWD especially fosters work engagement under certain circumstances and
18
19 for certain individuals (Scharp et al., 2019; Scharp et al., 2021) as well as (2) when and why
20
21 PWD manifests.
22
23
24
25

26 **Practical Implications**

27
28 The findings suggest that promoting PWD represents a valuable strategy for
29
30 employees and organizations. PWD may represent a cost-effective tool to foster well-being as
31
32 well as performance behaviors. Employees may strive to infuse work with play to optimize
33
34 their well-being and performance. For organizations, the playful work design (PWD)
35
36 instrument may also act as a developmental tool in several ways (Bakker, Scharp et al.,
37
38 2020). First, the measurement tool offers insight to organizations regarding the prevalence of
39
40 PWD and whether the situation warrants an intervention. Second, during interventions,
41
42 participants may utilize the instrument to examine and reflect on their PWD levels.
43
44
45 Furthermore, based on the scores, certain participants may share important insights in how
46
47 they playfully design specific work activities. Sharing personal PWD experiences may foster
48
49 and inspire PWD behaviors in other participants. Finally, the instrument can be used to
50
51 evaluate the efficacy of PWD interventions by comparing a pre- and post-measurement. It
52
53 should be noted that, since intrinsic motivation constitutes a core quality of play,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interventions necessitate voluntary participation because mandated attendance will likely
4
5 diminish their benefits (Fleming, 2005).
6
7

8 **Conclusion**

9
10 Research on individual work design strategies has flourished in recent years (Parker et
11
12 al., 2006; Parker, 2014). However, we know little about how employees use play to
13
14 proactively organize their work activities. The present study expands the literatures on play
15
16 and work design by conceptualizing playful work design (PWD) and validating its
17
18 measurement. PWD represents a two-dimensional proactive cognitive-behavioral orientation
19
20 that constitutes cognitively and behaviorally restructuring work activities in a ludic
21
22 (designing fun) and agonistic fashion (designing competition). To conclude, play permeates
23
24 our lives, and the domain of work is no exception. Hence, many opportunities exist for future
25
26 research on play during work activities. This fruitful avenue for research may benefit from a
27
28 reliable and valid scale such as the PWD instrument.
29
30
31

32 **Acknowledgements**

33
34
35 NONE
36

37 **Funding**

38
39
40 There are no funders to report for this submission
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abramis, D. J. (1990). Play in work: Childish hedonism or adult enthusiasm? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33, 353–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764290033003010>
- Amabile, T. M., & Mueller, J. S. (2008). Studying creativity, its processes, and its antecedents: An exploration of the componential theory of creativity. In J. Zhou & C. Shalley (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational creativity* (pp. 31–62). Erlbaum.
- Andersen, M. M., & Roepstorff, A. (2021). Play in Predictive Minds: A Cognitive Theory of Play. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/u86qy>
- Apter, M. J. (1991). *A structural phenomenology of play*. In J. H. Kerr and M. J. Apter (Eds.), *Adult play: A reversal theory approach* (pp. 13–29). Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Azen, R., & Budescu, D. V. (2003). The dominance analysis approach for comparing predictors in multiple regression. *Psychological Methods*, 8, 129–148. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.8.2.129>
- Bakker, A. B., & van Wingerden, J. (2021). Rumination about COVID-19 and employee well-being: The role of playful work design. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*, 62, 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000262>
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., De Boer, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2003). Job demands and job resources as predictors of absence duration and frequency. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 341–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00030-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00030-1)
- Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., Espevik, R., & De Vries, J. D. (2020). Job crafting and playful work design: Links with performance during busy and quiet days. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 122, 103478. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103478>
- Bakker, A. B., Scharp, Y. S., Breevaart, K., & De Vries, J. D. (2020). Playful work design: Introduction of a new concept. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SJP.2020.20>

- 1
2
3 Barnett, L. A. (2007). The nature of playfulness in young adults. *Personality and Individual*
4
5 *Differences, 43*, 949–958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.02.018>
6
7
8 Bateson, G. (1972). *A theory of play and fantasy*. In G. Bateson (Ed.), *Steps to an ecology of*
9
10 *mind* (pp. 177-193). Chandler.
11
12
13 Baumann, N., Lürig, C., & Engeser, S. (2016). Flow and enjoyment beyond skill-demand
14
15 balance: The role of game pacing curves and personality. *Motivation and Emotion,*
16
17 *40*, 507–519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9549-7>
18
19
20 Becker, F. W., & Tews, M. J. (2016). Fun activities at work: do they matter to hospitality
21
22 employees?. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 15*(3), 279–296.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2016.1147938>
25
26
27 Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. McGraw-Hill.
28
29
30 Bindl, U. K., Unsworth, K. L., Gibson, C. B., & Stride, C. B. (2019). Job crafting revisited:
31
32 Implications of an extended framework for active changes at work. *Journal of Applied*
33
34 *Psychology, 104*, 605–628.
35
36
37 Brown, S. P., & Leigh, T. W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its
38
39 relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied*
40
41 *Psychology, 81*, 358–368. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.358>
42
43
44 Butler, N., Olaison, L., Sliwa, M., & Spoelstra, S. (2011). Work, play and
45
46 boredom. *Ephemera, Theory & Politics in Organization, 11*, 329–335.
47
48
49 Caillois, R. (2001). *Man, play, and games*. University of Illinois Press.
50
51
52 Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and
53
54 affective responses to impending reward and punishment: the BIS/BAS scales.
55
56 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 319–333.
57
58
59 CBS (2009, April 13). *Rapping flight attendant* [Video File]. Retrieved from:
60
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rhMOnr0GxU8>

- 1
2
3 Celestine, N. A., & Yeo, G. (2020). Having some fun with it: A theoretical review and
4
5 typology of activity-based play-at-work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1–17.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2444>
8
9
10 Cellar, D. F., & Barrett, G. V. (1987). Script processing and intrinsic motivation: The
11
12 cognitive sets underlying cognitive labels. *Organizational Behavior and Human*
13
14 *Decision Processes*, 40, 115–135. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(87\)90008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(87)90008-2)
15
16
17 Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement
18
19 invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14, 464–504.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701301834>
22
23
24 Cheng, T. M., Chen, M. T., & Wu, C. H. (2021). Tour Conductor Playfulness:
25
26 Conceptualizing and Scale Development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60, 197–207.
27
28 <https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0047287519888284>
29
30
31 Clark, A. (2018). A nice surprise? Predictive processing and the active pursuit of
32
33 novelty. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 17, 521–534.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-017-9525-z>
36
37
38 Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding
39
40 common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*,
41
42 25, 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6>
43
44
45 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO personality inventory manual*. Psychological
46
47 assessment resources.
48
49 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The
50
51 NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 5–13.
52
53
54 Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26, 435–
55
56 462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety: Experiencing flow in work and*
4
5 *play* (2nd ed.). Jossey Bass.
6
7
8 Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1981). Some paradoxes in the definition of play. *Play as Context, 1,*
9
10 14–26.
11
12 Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1987). Validity and reliability of the experience-
13
14 sampling method. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 175*(9), 526–
15
16 536. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005053-198709000-00004>
17
18
19 Dandridge, T. C. (1986). Ceremony as an integration of work and play. *Organization*
20
21 *Studies, 7,* 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084068600700205>
22
23
24 Day, H. I. (1981). *A Ludic Behavior*. In H. I. Day (Ed.), *Advances in intrinsic motivation and*
25
26 *aesthetics* (pp. 225–250). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3195-7_10
27
28
29 Deterding, S., Dixon, D., Khaled, R., & Nacke, L., (2011). From game design elements to
30
31 gamefulness: Defining “gamification”. In *Proceedings of the 15th International*
32
33 *Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*. ACM,
34
35 Tampere, Finland, pp. 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2181037.2181040>
36
37
38 DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage Publications.
39
40 Ellis, M. J. (1973). *Why people play*. Prentice Hall.
41
42 Fisher, C. D. (1993). Boredom at work: A neglected concept. *Human Relations, 46,* 395–417.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600305>
45
46
47 Fleming, P. (2005). Workers’ playtime? Boundaries and cynicism in a “culture of fun”
48
49 program. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 41,* 285–303.
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886305277033>
52
53
54 Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal
55
56 initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70, 139–161.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00639.x>

Gerdenitsch, C., Sellitsch, D., Besser, M., Burger, S., Stegmann, C., Tscheligi, M., &

Kriglstein, S. (2020). Work gamification: Effects on enjoyment, productivity and the role of leadership. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 43, 100994.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2020.100994>

Giddens, A. (1964). Notes on the concepts of play and leisure. *The Sociological Review*, 12,

73–89. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1964.tb01247.x>

Gilliam, D. A., Flaherty, K. E., & Rayburn, S. W. (2014). The dimensions of storytelling by

retail salespeople. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer*

Research, 24, 231–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2013.849611>

Glynn, M. A. (1994). Effects of work task cues and play task cues on information processing,

judgment, and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 34–45.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.1.34>

Glynn, M. A., & Webster, J. (1992). The adult playfulness scale: An initial assessment.

Psychological Reports, 71, 83–103. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1992.71.1.83>

Goggin, J. (2011). Playbour, farming and leisure. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in*

Organization, 11, 357–368.

Gough, H. G. (1979). A creative personality scale for the Adjective Check List. *Journal of*

Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1398–1405.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3514.37.8.1398>

Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in*

Organizational Behavior, 28, 3–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.002>

Gray, J. A. (1990). Brain systems that mediate both emotion and cognition. *Cognition &*

Emotion, 4, 269–288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939008410799>

1
2
3 Guitard, P., Ferland, F., & Dutil, E. (2005). Toward a better understanding of playfulness in
4
5 adults. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 25, 9–22.

6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1177/153944920502500103>

8
9
10 Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a
11
12 theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250–279.

13
14 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)

15
16
17 Hamilton, J. A., Haier, R. J., & Buchsbaum, M. S. (1984). Intrinsic enjoyment and boredom
18
19 coping scales: Validation with personality, evoked potential and attention measures.

20
21 *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5, 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/0191->

22
23 [8869\(84\)90050-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(84)90050-3)

24
25
26 Hayes, A. F., & Coutts, J. J. (2020). Use omega rather than Cronbach's alpha for estimating
27
28 reliability. But.... *Communication Methods and Measures*, 14, 1–24.

29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2020.1718629>

31
32
33 Heimann, K. S., & Roepstorff, A. (2018). How playfulness motivates—Putative looping
34
35 effects of autonomy and surprise revealed by micro-phenomenological
36
37 investigations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1704.

38
39
40 Helmreich, R. C., & Spence, J. T. 1978. *The work and family orientation questionnaire: An*
41
42 *objective instrument to assess components of achievement motivation and attitude*
43
44 *toward family and career*. American Psychology Association.

45
46
47 Hibbard, D. R., & Buhrmester, D. (2010). Competitiveness, gender, and adjustment among
48
49 adolescents. *Sex Roles*, 63, 412–424. <https://doi.org/0.1007/s11199-010-9809-z>

50
51
52 Higgins, E. T. (2014). Promotion and prevention: How “0” can create dual motivational
53
54 forces. In J. W. Sherman, B. Gawronski, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories of*
55
56 *the social mind* (pp. 423–435), Guilford Press.

- Hill, E. D. (1975). The Trinitarian Allegory of the Moral Play of "Wisdom". *Modern Philology*, 73, 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1086/390630>
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21, 967–988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100509>
- Houston, J. M., McIntire, S. A., Kinnie, J., & Terry, C. (2002). A factorial analysis of scales measuring competitiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62, 284–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164402062002006>
- Howe, L. A. (2008). On competing against oneself, Or 'I need to get a different voice in my head'. *Sports Ethics and Philosophy*, 2, 353–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17511320802475762>
- Howell, J. M., & Hall-Merenda, K. E. (1999). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 680–694. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.5.680>
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6, 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Huizinga, J. (1949). *Homo ludens: A study of the play-element in culture*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: a meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1332–1356. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1332>

- 1
2
3 John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five
4 trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O.P. John, R.W.
5 Robins, & L.A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp.
6 114–158). New York, NY: Guilford.
- 7
8
9
10
11
12 Kashdan, T. B., Gallagher, M. W., Silvia, P. J., Winterstein, B. P., Breen, W. E., Terhar, D.,
13 & Steger, M. F. (2009). The curiosity and exploration inventory-II: Development,
14 factor structure, and psychometrics. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 987–998.
15
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.04.011>
- 18
19
20
21 Kavanagh, D. (2011). Work and play in management studies: A Kleinian analysis. *Ephemera*,
22
23 *Theory & Politics in Organization*, 11, 336–356.
- 24
25
26 Kline, R. B. (1998). *Structural equation modeling*. The Guilford Press.
- 27
28
29 Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2010). Learning to play, playing to learn: A case study of a ludic
30 learning space. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23, 26–50.
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811011017199>
- 34
35
36 Laurence, G. A. (2010). *Workaholism and expansion and contraction oriented job crafting:*
37
38 *The moderating effects of individual and contextual factors*. Unpublished doctoral
39 dissertation. Syracuse University.
- 40
41
42
43 Leiter, M. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1996). Consistency of the burnout construct across
44 occupations. *Anxiety, stress, and coping*, 9, 229–243.
45
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615809608249404>
- 48
49 Lieberman, J. N. (2014). *Playfulness: Its relationship to imagination and creativity*.
50
51 Academic Press.
- 52
53
54 Logan, R. D. (1985). The flow experience in solitary ordeals. *Journal of Humanistic*
55
56 *Psychology*, 25, 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167885254010>
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Luo, W., & Azen, R. (2013). Determining predictor importance in hierarchical linear models
4 using dominance analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 38, 3–31.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998612458319>
7
8
9
10 Lynam, D. R., Loehr, A., Miller, J. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2012). A five-factor measure of
11 avoidant personality: The FFAvA. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94, 466–474.
12
13 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.677886>
14
15
16
17 Magnuson, C. D., & Barnett, L. A. (2013). The playful advantage: How playfulness enhances
18 coping with stress. *Leisure Sciences*, 35, 129–144.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2013.761905>
21
22
23
24 Mainemelis, C., & Ronson, S. (2006). Ideas are born in fields of play: Towards a theory of
25 play and creativity in organizational settings. *Research in Organizational*
26 *Behavior*, 27, 81–131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(06\)27003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(06)27003-5)
27
28
29
30
31 Marsick, V. J., & O’Neil, J. (1999). The many faces of action learning. *Management*
32 *Learning*, 30, 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507699302004>
33
34
35
36 Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., Leiter, M. P., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schwab, R. L.
37 (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory* (Vol. 21, pp. 3463–3464). Consulting
38 Psychologists.
39
40
41
42 McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Conceptions and correlates of openness to
43 experience. In *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 825–847). Academic Press.
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012134645-4/50032-9>
46
47
48
49 Michel, J. W., Tews, M. J., & Allen, D. G. (2019). Fun in the workplace: A review and
50 expanded theoretical perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 29, 98–110.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.03.001>
53
54
55
56 Miller, S. (1973). Ends, Means, and Galumphing: Some Leitmotifs of Play 1. *American*
57 *Anthropologist*, 75, 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1973.75.1.02a00050>
58
59
60

1
2
3 Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that
4
5 promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other?
6

7
8 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 175-199. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.237>
9

10 Moon, H. (2001). The two faces of conscientiousness: Duty and achievement striving in
11
12 escalation of commitment dilemmas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 533–540.
13

14
15 <https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.535>
16

17 Morgeson, F. P., & Humphrey, S. E. (2006). The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ):
18

19 developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the
20
21 nature of work. *Journal of applied psychology*, 91, 1321–1339.
22

23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.6.1321>
25

26 Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2017). *Mplus User's guide (6th edition)*. Los Angeles,
27
28 CA: Muthén & Muthén.
29

30 Nachmanovitch, S. (1990). *Free play: Improvisation in life and art*. Putnam.
31

32 Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2002). The concept of flow. In *Handbook of positive*
33
34 *psychology* (pp. 89–105). Oxford University Press.
35

36
37 Neumann, R., & Strack, F. (2000). "Mood contagion": The automatic transfer of mood
38
39 between persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(2), 211–223.
40

41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.2.211>
43

44 Noe, R. A., Tews, M. J., & Marand, A. D. (2013). Individual differences and informal
45
46 learning in the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 327–335.
47

48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.06.009>
50

51 Op den Kamp, E. M., Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Proactive vitality
52
53 management in the work context: Development and validation of a new
54

55
56 instrument. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27, 493–505.
57

58
59 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1483915>
60

- 1
2
3 Osborne, J., Costello, A. & Kellow, J. (2008). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis. In
4
5 Osborne, J. (Ed.), *Best practices in quantitative methods* (pp. 86–99). SAGE
6
7 Publications. <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781412995627>
8
9
10 Owens, B. P., Baker, W. E., Sumpter, D. M., & Cameron, K. S. (2016). Relational energy at
11
12 work: Implications for job engagement and job performance. *Journal of Applied*
13
14 *Psychology, 101*(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000032>
15
16
17 Parker, S. K. (2014). Beyond motivation: Job and work design for development, health,
18
19 ambidexterity, and more. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 661–691.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115208>
22
23
24 Parker, S. K., & Collins, C. G. (2010). Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple
25
26 proactive behaviors. *Journal of Management, 36*, 633–662.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308321554>
29
30
31 Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive
32
33 behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 636–652.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.636>
36
37
38 Petelczyc, C. A., Capezio, A., Wang, L., Restubog, S. L. D., & Aquino, K. (2018). Play at
39
40 work: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of*
41
42 *Management, 44*, 161–190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317731519>
43
44
45 Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and*
46
47 *classification* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
48
49 Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a
50
51 job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal*
52
53 *of Organizational Behavior, 33*, 1120–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1783>
54
55
56 Piaget, J. (1962). *Play, dreams and imitation in childhood*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Proyer, R. T. (2012). Development and initial assessment of a short measure for adult
4
5 playfulness: The SMAP. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 989–994.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.018>
8
9
- 10 Proyer, R. T. (2017). A new structural model for the study of adult playfulness: Assessment
11
12 and exploration of an understudied individual differences variable. *Personality and*
13
14 *Individual Differences*, *108*, 113–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.12.011>
15
16
- 17 Proyer, R. T., Tandler, N., & Brauer, K. (2019). Playfulness and creativity: a selective
18
19 review. *Creativity and humor*, 43–60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813802-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813802-1.00002-8)
20
21 [1.00002-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-813802-1.00002-8)
22
23
- 24 Reijseger, G., Schaufeli, W. B., Peeters, M. C., Taris, T. W., Van Beek, I., & Ouweneel, E.
25
26 (2013). Watching the paint dry at work: Psychometric examination of the Dutch
27
28 Boredom Scale. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *26*, 508–525.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2012.720676>
31
32
- 33 Robert, C., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2012). The wheel model of humor: Humor events and affect in
34
35 organizations. *Human Relations*, *65*, 1071–1099.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726711433133>
38
39
- 40 Rodrigues, S. B., & Collinson, D. L. (1995). 'Having fun'?: Humour as resistance in
41
42 Brazil. *Organization studies*, *16*, 739–768.
43
44 <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069501600501>
45
46
- 47 Roy, D. F. (1959). Banana time job-satisfaction and informal interaction. *Human*
48
49 *Organization*, *18*, 158–168.
50
51
- 52 Sanchez-Burks, J. (2002). Protestant relational ideology and (in) attention to relational cues
53
54 in work settings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 919–929.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sandelands, L. E. (1988). Effects of Work and Play Signals on Task Evaluation. *Journal of*
4
5 *Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 1032–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559->
6
7 [1816.1988.tb01191.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1988.tb01191.x)
8
9
- 10 Scharp, Y. S., Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2021). Using playful work design to deal with
11
12 hindrance job demands: A quantitative diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health*
13
14 *Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000277
15
16*
- 17 Scharp, Y. S., Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., & van der Linden, D. (2019). Daily playful work
18
19 design: A trait activation perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality, 82*, 103850.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2019.103850>
22
23
- 24 Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). The Maslach Burnout
25
26 Inventory—General Survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Ed.), *MBI*
27
28 *manual* (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.
29
30
- 31 Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T., Le Blanc, P. M., Peeters, M. C., Bakker, A. B., & de Jonge, J.
32
33 (2001). Maakt arbeid gezond? Op zoek naar de bevlogen werknemer [Work and
34
35 health: The quest for the engaged worker]. *Psycholoog, 36*, 422–428.
36
37
- 38 Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2014). Burnout, boredom and engagement at the workplace.
39
40 In M.C.W. Peeters, J. de Jonge, T.W. Taris (Eds.), *An introduction to contemporary*
41
42 *work psychology* (pp. 293-320). John Willey & Sons.
43
44
- 45 Siegrist, J., Starke, D., Chandola, T., Godin, I., Marmot, M., Niedhammer, I., & Peter, R.
46
47 (2004). The measurement of effort–reward imbalance at work: European
48
49 comparisons. *Social Science & Medicine, 58*, 1483–1499.
50
51 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00351-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00351-4)
52
53
- 54 Silic, M., Marzi, G., Caputo, A., & Bal, P. M. (2020). The effects of a gamified human
55
56 resource management system on job satisfaction and engagement. *Human Resource*
57
58 *Management Journal, 30*, 260–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12272>
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sirois, F., & Pychyl, T. (2013). Procrastination and the priority of short-term mood
4
5 regulation: Consequences for future self. *Social and Personality Psychology*
6
7 *Compass*, 7, 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12011>
8
9
10 Spencer, H. (1870). *The principles of psychology* (2nd ed.). Appleton.
11
12 Strauman, T. J., Detloff, A. M., Sestokas, R., Smith, D. V., Goetz, E. L., Rivera, C., &
13
14 Kwapil, L. (2013). What shall I be, what must I be: neural correlates of personal goal
15
16 activation. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 6, 1–4.
17
18 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2012.00123>
19
20
21 Suits, B. (1978). *The grasshopper: Games, life and utopia*. Harvard University Press.
22
23
24 Suls, J. (1983). Cognitive processes in humor appreciation. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Handbook*
25
26 *of humor research* (pp. 39–57). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5572-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5572-7_3)
27
28 [7_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5572-7_3)
29
30
31 Sutton-Smith, B. (2009). *The ambiguity of play*. Harvard University Press.
32
33
34 Tang, T. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Effects of personal values, perceived surveillance,
35
36 and task labels on task preference: The ideology of turning play into work. *Journal of*
37
38 *Applied Psychology*, 69, 99–105. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.1.99>
39
40
41 Taylor, S. E., Pham, L. B., Rivkin, I. D., & Armor, D. A. (1998). Harnessing the imagination:
42
43 Mental simulation, self-regulation, and coping. *American Psychologist*, 53, 429–439.
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.53.4.429>
46
47
48 Tegano, D. W. (1990). Relationship of tolerance of ambiguity and playfulness to
49
50 creativity. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 1047–1056.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1990.66.3.1047>
53
54
55 Terkel, S. (1974). *Working: People talk about what they do all day and how they feel about*
56
57 *what they do*. New Press.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tews, M. J., Michel, J. W., & Allen, D. G. (2014). Fun and friends: The impact of workplace
4
5 fun and constituent attachment on turnover in a hospitality context. *Human*
6
7 *Relations*, 67, 923–946. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713508143>
8
9
10 Thorson, J. A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Sense of humor and dimensions of
11
12 personality. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 49, 799–809.
13
14 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(199311\)49:6%3C799::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199311)49:6%3C799::AID-)
15
16 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(199311\)49:6%3C799::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199311)49:6%3C799::AID-)
17
18 [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(199311\)49:6%3C799::AID-](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199311)49:6%3C799::AID-)
19
20 JCLP2270490607%3E3.0.CO;2-P
21
22 Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting
23
24 scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 173–186.
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009>
27
28 Tsaur, S. H., Hsu, F. S., & Lin, H. (2019). Workplace fun and work engagement in tourism
29
30 and hospitality: The role of psychological capital. *International Journal of Hospitality*
31
32 *Management*, 81, 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.03.016>
33
34 Tuckman, B. W. (1991). The development and concurrent validity of the procrastination
35
36 scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 473–480.
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164491512022>
39
40 van Hooff, M. L. M., & van Hooft, E. A. J. (2014). Boredom at work: Proximal and distal
41
42 consequences of affective work-related boredom. *Journal of Occupational Health*
43
44 *Psychology*, 19, 348–359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036821>
45
46
47 Van Vleet, M., & Feeney, B. C. (2015). Young at heart: A perspective for advancing research
48
49 on play in adulthood. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10, 639–645.
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615596789>
52
53
54 Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement
55
56 invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational
57
58
59
60

research. *Organizational Research Methods*, 3, 4–70.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>

Webster, J., Heian, J. B., & Michelman, J. E. (1990). Computer training and computer anxiety in the educational process: An experimental analysis. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Information Systems*, 171–182.

Weintraub, J., Cassell, D., & DePatie, T. P. (2021). Nudging flow through ‘SMART’ goal setting to decrease stress, increase engagement, and increase performance at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 94, 230–258.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12347>

West, S. E., Hoff, E., & Carlsson, I. (2016). Play and Productivity: Enhancing the Creative Climate at Workplace Meetings with Play Cues. *American Journal of Play*, 9, 71–86.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review*, 66, 297–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040934>

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

<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>

Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40, 126–146.

Zhou, J. (2003). When the presence of creative coworkers is related to creativity: Role of supervisor close monitoring, developmental feedback, and creative personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 413–422.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.413>

Biographies

Yuri S. Scharp (scharp@essb.eur.nl) is a post-doctoral researcher at Erasmus University Rotterdam in the Netherlands. His research interests include playful work design, gamification, and technology as well as their relation with employee well-being and performance. Find more at www.yurischarp.com.

Arnold B. Bakker (bakker@essb.eur.nl) is Professor of Work and Organizational Psychology at Erasmus University Rotterdam, and visiting professor at the University of Johannesburg, North-West University, the University of Zagreb, and the University of Bergen in Norway. His research interests include work engagement, Job Demands–Resources theory, job crafting, playful work design, and the Work-Home Resources model. He is included in Thomson-Reuters' list of most influential scientists since 2013. Find more at www.arnoldbakker.com.

Kimberley Breevaart (breevaart@essb.eur.nl) is an Associate Professor of Organizational Psychology at the Erasmus University Rotterdam in The Netherlands. Her main research topic is leadership; she studies abusive supervision, day-to-day leadership, and the relations between personality, leadership, and employee well-being. She is currently section editor at *Stress & Health*.

Kaspar Kruup (kaspar.kruup@ut.ee) is junior lecturer of Communication Sciences at the University of Tartu in Estonia. His fields of interests are rhetoric, leadership, strategic thinking, systems theory, and technology theory.

Andero Uusberg (andero.uusberg@ut.ee) is a senior researcher at the University of Tartu in Estonia. He studies how affective states regulate the way people behave and how people in turn regulate their own and others' affective states. He holds a PhD from the University of Tartu and has worked as a postdoctoral researcher at Stanford University.

Table 1

Items, means, standard deviations, alpha 's, and standardized factor loadings of the playful work design scale (Study 1, N = 428)

							Factor loading								
							1.	2.							
							M	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	$\rho_{X_{iR(i)}}$	α			
<i>Designing Fun</i>															
														.75	
1.	I look for humor in the things I need to do.						3.60	1.01	-.68	.17	.51		.80		
2.	I approach my work in a playful way.						3.19	1.01	-.52	-.17	.51		.80		
3.	I look for ways to make tasks more fun for everyone involved.						3.52	.99	-.60	.29	.49		.64		
4.	I approach my tasks creatively to make them more interesting.						3.50	.90	-.58	.50	.49		.60		
5.	I look for ways to make my work more fun.						3.24	.99	-.60	.08	.49		.54		
6.	I use my imagination to make my job more interesting.						2.49	1.18	.16	-1.10	.47		.46		
<i>Designing Competition</i>															
														.73	
7.	I try to set time records in my work tasks.						2.98	1.23	-.23	-1.03	.43			.80	
8.	I try to keep score in all kinds of work activities.						2.61	1.13	.04	-1.04	.43			.73	
9.	I compete with myself at work, not because I have to, but because I enjoy it.						3.11	1.20	-.34	-.78	.55			.69	
10.	I try to make my job a series of exciting challenges.						2.79	1.08	-.17	-.79	.55			.55	
11.	I push myself to do better even when it isn't expected.						3.97	.73	-.66	1.10	.35			.48	
12.	I approach my job as a series of exciting challenges.						3.20	1.09	-.49	-.44	.47			.43	

Note. Factor loadings > .35 are shown. The original Dutch items were translated into English. Items were rated on a five-point scale (1 = never, 5 = very often). $\rho_{X_{iR(i)}}$ = corrected item-total correlation.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities (Between Brackets), and Correlations of the Variables (Study 1, N = 428)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Designing fun	3.26	.68	(.75)											
2. Designing competition	3.11	.71	.56**	(.73)										
3. Personal initiative	4.07	.56	.36**	.42**	(.81)									
4. Curiosity	3.62	.71	.42**	.46**	.47**	(.88)								
5. Openness to experience	3.54	.54	.40**	.31**	.39**	.51**	(.73)							
6. Playfulness	4.38	1.25	.45**	.18**	.20**	.28**	.33**	(.87)						
7. Humor	3.80	.54	.41**	.13**	.24**	.31**	.28**	.53**	(.80)					
8. Creative personality	3.75	.60	.36**	.24**	.41**	.38**	.62**	.30**	.29**	(.72)				
9. Competitiveness	2.82	.95	.21**	.47**	.28**	.36**	.19**	.12*	.04	.16**	(.85)			
10. Achievement striving	4.18	.54	.22**	.34**	.65**	.42**	.34**	.10*	.18**	.34**	.30**	(.83)		
11. Procrastination	1.98	.83	-.01	-.01	-.27**	-.09	-.04	.13**	.01	-.10*	.01	-.43**	(.90)	
12. Cynicism	2.18	1.07	-.08	-.13**	-.27**	-.15**	-.08	-.06	-.11*	-.13**	-.03	-.28**	.26**	(.84)

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 3*Confirmatory Factor Analyses for Playful Work Design and Job Crafting (Study 2)*

Model	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	Comparison	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf
Playful Work Design										
1. 1-factor model	195.95	54	3.63	.858	.826	.061	.061			
2. Proposed 2-factor model	129.41	53	2.44	.923	.905	.069	.048	1 vs. 2	66.54**	1
Playful Work Design and Job crafting										
3. Proposed 5-factor model	654.09	314	2.08	.903	.891	.059	.052			
4. 1-factor model	1287.46	324	3.97	.717	.693	.099	.083	3 vs. 4	633.37**	10
5. 2-factor model (PWD, JC)	921.78	323	2.85	.824	.809	.078	.061	3 vs. 5	267.69**	9
6. 4-factor model (DF and STR)	940.96	318	2.96	.818	.798	.081	.071	3 vs. 6	286.87**	4
7. 4-factor model (DF and SOC)	954.91	318	3.00	.813	.793	.081	.072	3 vs. 7	300.82**	4
8. 4-factor model (DF and CHA)	876.68	318	2.76	.836	.819	.076	.068	3 vs. 8	222.59**	4
9. 4-factor model (DC and STR)	885.85	318	2.79	.833	.816	.077	.069	3 vs. 9	230.76**	4
10. 4-factor model (DC and SOC)	890.35	318	2.80	.832	.814	.077	.071	3 vs. 10	236.26**	4
11. 4-factor model (DC and CHA)	823.77	318	2.59	.851	.836	.073	.065	3 vs. 11	169.68**	4

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation;

SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. PWD = Playful Work Design; JC = Job Crafting; DF = Designing Fun; DC = Designing

Competition; STR = Increasing Structural Job Resources, SOC = Increasing Social Job Resources; CHA = Increasing Challenge Job Demands.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities (Between Brackets), and Correlations Between the Variables (Study 2, N = 302)

	Mean	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.
1. Designing Fun	3.24	.75	(.80)												
2. Designing competition	3.01	.74	.59**	(.75)											
3. Structural crafting	3.63	.80	.43**	.44**	(.79)										
4. Social crafting	2.32	.87	.40**	.43**	.62**	(.84)									
5. Challenge crafting	2.66	.97	.49**	.52**	.67**	.65**	(.83)								
6. Imagination	2.19	.94	.22**	.23**	.00	.12**	.14*	(.85)							
7. Behavioral rigidity	2.70	.62	-.23**	-.22**	-.25**	-.15**	-.27**	-.09	(.64)						
8. Job autonomy	5.21	1.34	.17**	.23**	.44**	.21**	.29**	-.05	-.19**	(.81)					
9. Support for fun	3.21	1.04	.23**	.21**	.34**	.40**	.24**	.01	-.10	.46**	(.92)				
10. Laziness	1.84	.58	-.01	-.11	-.21**	-.11	-.15*	.36**	.16**	-.14**	-.15*	(.63)			
11. Work engagement	5.09	1.08	.30**	.36**	.54**	.41**	.36**	-.08	-.20**	.43**	.46**	-.03	(.92)		
12. Job boredom	1.80	.73	.02	.04	-.19**	-.06	.00	.42**	.05	-.27**	-.28**	.20**	-.47**	(.86)	
13. Exhaustion	2.75	1.09	.01	-.07	-.17**	-.03	-.06	.22**	.24**	-.31**	-.17**	.11	-.45**	.41**	(.91)

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 5*Longitudinal Invariance Test of Playful Work Design (Study 3)*

	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR	MLR	Comparison	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf
Model 1. Configural Invariance	424.12	234	1.81	.920	.906	.054	.062	1.0822			
Model 2. Metric Invariance	433.20	244	1.77	.921	.910	.053	.065	1.0808	1 vs. 2	8.80	10
Model 3. Scalar Invariance ^a	464.73	256	1.82	.912	.906	.054	.068	1.0768	2 vs. 3	32.36**	12

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. MLR = Scaling Correction Factor for MLR. $\Delta\chi^2$ = Sattora-Bentler Scaled Chi-Square Difference. ^a scalar invariance is not rejected based on the recommendations for testing measurement invariance (Chen, 2007).

Table 6*Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities (Between Brackets), and Correlations Between the Variables (Study 3)*

	Mean	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.	19.	20.
1. Designing Fun _{T1}	3.57	.62	(.80)																			
2. Designing Competition _{T1}	3.43	.59	.43**	(.69)																		
3. Designing Fun _{T2}	3.51	.60	.78**	.40**	(.83)																	
4. Designing Competition _{T2}	3.36	.58	.32**	.69**	.44**	(.72)																
5. Fun Activities _{T1}	2.49	.69	.07	.14*	.06	.12*	(.77)															
6. Personal Initiative _{T1}	3.96	.49	.35**	.51**	.37**	.41**	.03	(.81)														
7. Job Crafting _{T1}	3.55	.44	.28**	.50**	.31**	.48**	.21**	.63**	(.85)													
8. Drive _{T2}	4.79	.94	.10	.35**	.16**	.34**	.07	.45**	.34**	(.72)												
9. Reward Responsiveness _{T2}	5.85	.53	.23**	.36**	.23**	.38**	.09	.33**	.26**	.47**	(.61)											
10. Fun Seeking _{T2}	4.50	.83	.31**	.25**	.36**	.26**	.05	.32**	.23**	.44**	.40**	(.57)										
11. Behavioral Inhibition _{T2}	4.87	1.00	-.09	-.01	-.14*	-.03	-.11	-.11	-.01	.02	.10	-.10	(.85)									
12. Work Engagement _{T2}	3.80	.56	.30**	.46**	.30**	.46**	.04	.33**	.19**	.12	.26**	.12	-.13*	(.89)								
13. CR Work Engagement _{T2}	3.93	.48	.28**	.31**	.23**	.23**	.07	.24**	.20**	.19**	.11	.11	-.09	.43**	(.87)							
14. CR Relational Energy _{T2}	3.98	.64	.11	.04	.07	-.03	.03	.05	.04	.04	-.01	.03	-.07	.12	.48**	(.90)						
15. CR Job Effort _{T2}	4.21	.52	.08	.24**	.12	.24**	.02	.27**	.21**	.23**	.12	.09	-.01	.16*	.57**	.48**	(.87)					
16. CR Informal Learning _{T2}	4.02	.65	.18**	.21**	.17*	.16*	.05	.22**	.25**	.11	.02	.17*	.06	.14*	.46**	.41**	.57**	(.83)				
17. CR Creative Performance _{T2}	3.88	.69	.28**	.17*	.24**	.02	.03	.30**	.20**	.17*	.07	.22**	-.05	.12	.40**	.44**	.42**	.54**	(.88)			
18. Psychological Overcommitment _{T2}	2.85	.74	-.02	.09	-.06	.03	-.13*	.17**	.07	.12	.02	.04	.37**	-.08	.11	.12	.12	.15*	.05	(.79)		
19. Behavioral Overcommitment _{T1}	4.04	7.55	-.06	-.06	-.04	.06	-.04	.03	-.01	.01	-.03	-.00	-.00	-.01	.07	.02	.05	.07	-.05	.21**		
20. CR Idling Behavior _{T2}	2.03	.58	-.01	-.01	.09	.03	.12	-.04	.03	-.02	.04	-.01	-.01	-.06	-.28**	-.23**	-.34**	-.20**	-.13	-.08	-.04	(.70)

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. CR = Colleague-rated.

Table 7

Incremental Predictive Validity of the Playful Work Design Instrument (Study 3)

	Control Variables		Playful Work Design ¹				Fun Activities				Personal Initiative				Job Crafting			
	DF _{T1}	DC _{T1}	DF _{T2}	DC _{T2}	DF _{T1}	DC _{T1}	DF _{T2}	DC _{T2}	DF _{T1}	DC _{T1}	DF _{T2}	DC _{T2}	DF _{T1}	DC _{T1}	DF _{T2}	DC _{T2}		
Drive	-.07	.32**	.01	.29**	.09	.32**	.15*	.32**	-.08	.11	-.01	.17*	.02	.21**	.07	.21**		
Reward Responsiveness	.10	.29**	.11	.31**	.25**	.36**	.26**	.38**	.15*	.24**	.17*	.29**	.20**	.29**	.20**	.31**		
Fun Seeking	.23**	.15*	.26**	.17*	.32**	.27**	.36**	.30**	.23**	.10	.27**	.19**	.27**	.16*	.30**	.21**		
Behavioral Inhibition	-.08	.00	-.13	.01	-.09	-.03	-.13	-.04	-.05	.03	-.10	.00	-.09	-.03	-.13	-.04		
Work Engagement	.14*	.39**	.17*	.36**	.32**	.47**	.34**	.46**	.24**	.38**	.26**	.38**	.29**	.44**	.30**	.42**		
CR Work Engagement	.18**	.21**	.15*	.14*	.29**	.31**	.23**	.22**	.23**	.22**	.16*	.14*	.26**	.24**	.18**	.15*		
CR Relational Energy	.11	-.01	.09	-.07	.12	.04	.07	-.04	.10	.01	.05	-.06	.11	.02	.06	-.06		
CR Job Effort	-.02	.25**	.01	.21**	.11	.27**	.12	.24**	.01	.14*	.02	.14*	.05	.16*	.04	.14*		
CR Informal Learning	.09	.16*	.11	.10	.18**	.21**	.16*	.16*	.11	.11	.09	.08	.12	.11	.09	.05		
CR Creative Performance	.23**	.06	.25**	-.10	.28**	.18**	.23**	.02	.20**	.02	.14*	-.12	.25**	.09	.19**	-.08		
Psychological Overcommitment	-.06	.12	-.08	.08	-.01	.12	-.04	.07	-.08	.00	-.12	-.03	-.03	.06	-.08	.01		
Behavioral Overcommitment	-.05	-.02	-.07	.08	-.07	-.05	-.03	.06	-.09	-.09	-.05	.05	-.07	-.06	-.04	.06		
CR Idling Behavior	.00	.02	.08	.00	.01	.01	.08	.02	.02	.05	.10	.05	.00	-.01	.07	.01		

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. DF = Designing Fun; DC = Designing Competition; CR = Colleague-rated. ¹Controlling for the other PWD dimension.

Table 8*Results of the Dominance Analyses (Study 3)*

	Self-rated			Colleague-rated			Colleague-rated			Colleague-rated			Colleague-rated		
	Work Engagement _{T2}			Work Engagement _{T2}			Effort _{T2}			Informal Learning _{T2}			Creative Performance _{T2}		
	<i>R</i> ²	% <i>R</i> ² rank		<i>R</i> ²	% <i>R</i> ² rank		<i>R</i> ²	% <i>R</i> ² rank		<i>R</i> ²	% <i>R</i> ² rank		<i>R</i> ²	% <i>R</i> ² rank	
Desinging Fun _{T1}	0.040	16.6%		0.042	32.3%		0.003	3.4%		0.014	17.3%		0.052	40.0%	
Designing Competition _{T1}	0.136	56.4%		0.050	38.5%		0.029	33.3%		0.016	19.8%		0.009	6.9%	
Fun Activities _{T1}	0.001	0.41%		0.004	3.08%		0.000	0.0%		0.002	2.5%		0.001	0.8%	
Personal Initiative _{T1}	0.050	20.7%		0.022	16.9%		0.039	44.8%		0.019	23.5%		0.054	41.5%	
Job Crafting _{T1}	0.014	5.81%		0.012	9.2%		0.016	18.4%		0.030	37.0%		0.014	10.8%	
Total	0.241	100.0%		.130	100.0%		0.087	100.0%		0.081	100.0%		0.130	100.0%	
Dominance Metrics	Comp	Cond	Gen	Comp	Cond	Gen	Comp	Cond	Gen	Comp	Cond	Gen	Comp	Cond	Gen
DF > DC	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	1.0	1.0	1
DF > FA	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	.5	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1
DF > PI	.5	0	0	1.0	1.0	1	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	0
DF > JC	.5	.5	1	1.0	1.0	1	.5	.5	0	0	0	0	1.0	1.0	1
DC > FA	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	.5	1.0	1
DC > PI	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	0	0	0	.5	0	0	0	0	0
DC > JC	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	0	0	0	.5	.5	0
FA > PI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FA > JC	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	.5	.5	0
PI > JC	1	1	1	1.0	1.0	1	1.0	1.0	1	0	0	0	1.0	1.0	1

Note. DF = Designing fun; DC = Designing competition; FA = Fun activities; PI = Personal Initiative; JC = job crafting; Comp = Complete dominance; Cond = Conditional dominance; Gen = General dominance; 1 = X_i dominates X_j ; .5 = dominance cannot be established between X_i and X_j ; 0 = X_j dominates X_i .

Figure 1

Conceptual Model for the Validation of the Playful Work Design Instrument

