



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP) Capstone Projects Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP) Capstones

8-15-2015

Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace: Employees and Managers Co-Creating Meaningful and Productive Work in Personal Development Discussions

Michaela Schoberova
mschoberova@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/mapp_capstone

 Part of the [Human Resources Management Commons](#)

Schoberova, Michaela, "Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace: Employees and Managers Co-Creating Meaningful and Productive Work in Personal Development Discussions" (2015). *Master of Applied Positive Psychology (MAPP) Capstone Projects*. 87.
https://repository.upenn.edu/mapp_capstone/87

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/mapp_capstone/87
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace: Employees and Managers Co-Creating Meaningful and Productive Work in Personal Development Discussions

Abstract

Positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship research shows that through job crafting employees can proactively make their work more engaging and meaningful and thus increase their overall well-being and performance. Organizations can support such employee efforts and benefit from a highly engaged, committed, high performing and innovative workforce. The goal of this Capstone is to propose an organization intervention that combines job crafting and personal development planning practice in organizations to support employees and managers in co-crafting meaningful and productive work in their current or future jobs. The new Personal Development Crafting practice could help employees and their managers to craft task, relational, and cognitive aspects of their jobs, increase 'calling' work orientation, imagine new futures, and work towards personal and organizational goals. Furthermore, when employees engage in job crafting on their own, unwanted consequences could ensue, such as misalignment with organizational goals. Having managers participate in job crafting could help prevent such outcomes.

Keywords

job crafting, job design, work engagement, personal development plan

Disciplines

Business | Human Resources Management

Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace:
Employees and managers co-creating meaningful and productive work in personal
development discussions

Michaela Schoberova

University of Pennsylvania

A Capstone Project Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Applied Positive Psychology

Advisor: Meredith Myers

August 1, 2015

Job Crafting and Personal Development in the Workplace:
Employees and managers co-crafting meaningful and productive work in personal
development discussions.

Michaela Schoberova

Capstone Project
Master of Applied Positive Psychology
University of Pennsylvania
Advisor: Meredith Myers
August 1, 2015

Abstract

Positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship research shows that through job crafting employees can proactively make their work more engaging and meaningful and thus increase their overall well-being and performance. Organizations can support such employee efforts and benefit from a highly engaged, committed, high performing and innovative workforce. The goal of this Capstone is to propose an organization intervention that combines job crafting and personal development planning practice in organizations to support employees and managers in co-crafting meaningful and productive work in their current or future jobs. The new *Personal Development Crafting* practice could help employees and their managers to craft task, relational, and cognitive aspects of their jobs, increase 'calling' work orientation, imagine new futures, and work towards personal and organizational goals. Furthermore, when employees engage in job crafting on their own, unwanted consequences could ensue, such as misalignment with organizational goals. Having managers participate in job crafting could help prevent such outcomes.

Key Words: job crafting, job design, work engagement, personal development plan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Capstone Project would not have been possible without the help and support of multiple people, whom I would like to acknowledge.

First, I am very grateful to my advisor Meredith Myers who provided invaluable feedback on the structure, flow and content of this paper, contributing her knowledge of positive psychology, positive organizational scholarship and job crafting. Meredith also encouraged me when I was losing motivation and shared helpful ideas on how to keep my momentum. My gratitude goes next to Judy Saltzberg-Levick, who kept the Capstone process going, persevered in finding my advisor, demonstrated empathy and provided numerous pieces of practical advice.

I thank professors Amy Wrzesniewski and Jane Dutton for their inspiring ideas, theories and research and the pleasure to watch them deliver these ideas with contagious energy, while embodying exemplary kindness, authenticity and humility. A greater congruence between words and deeds is simply hard to find.

Another source of inspiration is my friend Valeria, the kindest and most collaborative person I know, who excels at her work every day by focusing on others. My friends Katie, Robert and Joane and my mom provided continuous encouragement during the tough moments on the journey. And my colleagues at work have been willing to embrace my positive psychology adventure and patiently listened to both positive outbursts and complaints on the way.

Finally, I would have not set foot on the University of Pennsylvania campus, if it was not for my first psychology teacher, Dr. Dana Kusa, who helped me discover my passion for positive psychology even before the field formally existed and literally changed the course of my life.

This paper is dedicated to everyone who is looking to make their work more meaningful and to your managers who are willing to help.

I. Introduction

A. Research Question

Job crafting is a process through which individuals proactively redefine and redesign their work to make it more meaningful (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Since job crafting also generates greater engagement at work as well as improved performance (Tims, Bakker, Derks, & van Rhenen, 2013a), it would be a missed opportunity to stop at job crafting attempts employees initiate on their own without providing any managerial or organizational support.

In this paper, I set out to answer the question of how organizations and managers might encourage and support individual job crafting efforts to generate positive outcomes for individuals, managers and organizations. I propose that individuals and managers can collaborate and co-create meaningful and productive jobs using job crafting techniques, and explore the context of personal development discussions as a possible venue for co-crafting jobs.

B. Personal Background

The topic of job crafting is close to my heart. During my career I have benefited from it multiple times. In one of my first jobs in human resources, I was initially buried in repetitive administrative work, working 12-hour days, not feeling particularly engaged in my work. Over a few months, I managed to simplify the work, hire resources to help and got involved in exciting transformation projects with an inspiring business leader. Within twelve months I was so engaged in my job that I did not want to leave it when offered a new assignment. I realized my work engagement was in my hands.

Furthermore, while coaching numerous individuals dissatisfied with their jobs, I noticed that they considered making dramatic career changes to find more meaningful work but due to economic or other barriers stayed in their jobs, functioning below their potential. I have seen that job crafting offers an opportunity to start making positive changes towards a more meaningful work in one's current job.

Finally, a recent lecture by Jane Dutton solidified my conviction that “the organization” and relationships within organizations are the units worth targeting to create positive change (J. Dutton, personal communication, April 25, 2015). Humans are social and spend most of their time in various formal and informal organizations. We have agency, often more than we exercise, but we also need supportive environments to flourish, similarly as plants need a nourishing soil. If we target the organization where people spend most of their time nowadays, the workplace, people will be more likely to flourish. The organization is the level at which I would like to contribute and apply what I learned about positive psychology in the last year: by proposing a positive organizational intervention that aims to create an environment where employees use their strengths, grow and maximize their potential. I will also draw upon my practical experience of designing development planning processes and tools in a large global corporation and training and coaching employees and managers on using them.

C. Overview of Subsequent Chapters

In Chapter II, I provide an introduction to the paradigms in which job crafting is embedded: positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship. Chapter III, based on extensive review of relevant empirical research, describes what job crafting is

and what are its forms, outcomes, enablers and risks at individual and organizational level. In Chapter IV, I introduce co-crafting, a new form of job crafting, that involves employees and managers jointly co-creating meaningful and productive jobs. Finally, Chapter V proposes the organization practice of personal development planning as a possible venue for co-crafting.

II. Introduction to Positive Psychology and Positive Organizational Scholarship

Before delving into the discussion of job crafting, it is important to understand the perspectives of positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship, from which the concept of job crafting stems.

A. Positive Psychology

In 1998, Martin Seligman, the president of the American Psychological Association, launched a new field of psychology, named positive psychology. Seligman argued that psychology historically almost exclusively focused on human pathology and it was time to study human beings at their best. Positive psychology declared three pillars of emphasis: positive emotions; positive individual traits such as character virtues and strengths; and positive institutions such as families, schools, businesses, communities, and democratic societies (Seligman, 2002). Peterson and Seligman (2004) created a classification of 24 human character strengths and virtues and later showed that optimized use of top or “signature” strengths improves engagement, achievement, and well-being (Seligman, Steen, Park, & Peterson, 2005). Utilizing one’s strengths more at work is one of the key components of job crafting. Subsequently, Seligman developed

a model of well-being, flourishing, or optimal human functioning, called PERMA, consisting of five elements that people pursue for their own sake, rather than as a means to another end (Seligman, 2011). Conceptually, job crafting includes all elements of PERMA: Positive emotion (applying one's strengths and interests at work is enjoyable), greater work Engagement, enhanced Relationships with co-workers, greater Meaningfulness of work and Achievement through exercising one's strengths. However, when Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) first described job crafting, they were interested in efforts people make to increase the meaningfulness of their work. The focus on strengths and pursuing meaning at work connects job crafting with positive psychology.

In the past fifteen years, the growing positive psychology literature and empirical research has attracted the attention of both scholars and the public. Positive psychology, focusing primarily on the individual, has made the least progress in the area of understanding and creating positive institutions (M. Csikszentmihalyi, personal communication, June 28, 2015). In this endeavor it has been aided by its sibling, positive organizational scholarship, concerned with flourishing at organizational level.

B. Positive Organizational Scholarship

Positive organizational scholarship (POS) is a multi-disciplinary framework for understanding organizational behavior, emphasizing development of strengths and capabilities and the generative dynamics of organizing (Dutton & Glynn, 2008). Unlike positive psychology, the field of POS was not an attempt to shift focus on studying the positive (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014). The organizational change research was already focused on positive phenomena such as growth, performance or teamwork. POS

emerged because organizational research was overemphasizing competitiveness and efficiency while ignoring other organizational phenomena such as thriving and positive deviance (results that considerably exceed expectations).

Leading POS scholars Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) first described job crafting after they studied how people in low-status jobs, such as hospital cleaners, create meaning in their work and discovered something unexpectedly positive: a good portion of them found their jobs highly meaningful. POS postulates that people and organizational capability can be unlocked through the generative engines of positively deviant performance, positive meaning creation, and cultivation of positive emotions and high quality connections in organizations (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). High-quality connections are short-term, positive interactions between two people in a work context characterized by vitality, positive regard and mutuality (Dutton, 2003) that lead to greater physiological functioning (strengthened cardiovascular, immune and neuroendocrine systems), collaboration, adaptability, job satisfaction and engagement (Dutton & Spreitzer, 2014). Job crafting involving changes to interactions with others at work increases high quality connections.

Similar to positive psychology, positive organizational scholarship adopts a positive view of organizational behavior and affirms the best of the human condition, while not denying the existence of negative phenomena (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014). Empirically grounded theories and interventions are the foundation for the credibility of both positive psychology (Seligman et al., 2005) and positive organizational scholarship (Dutton & Glynn, 2008), thus distinguishing them from positive thinking and

other positive but empirically unsupported approaches. In the same spirit, our subsequent discussion of job crafting will draw on extensive review of relevant job crafting research from the past fifteen years.

III. Job Crafting

In this chapter I provide the definition of job crafting and describe its various forms along three different dimensions. I then present empirical evidence for the outcomes, enablers and risks of job crafting with the goal of creating an effective and empirically grounded job crafting intervention in organizations.

A. Definitions of Job Crafting

Job crafting is the process through which individuals proactively redefine and redesign their work to make it more meaningful (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg, Dutton, & Wrzesniewski, 2013). Job crafting occurs primarily in three areas:

- Task crafting: taking on more or fewer tasks, expanding or diminishing the scope of tasks, or changing how one performs tasks;
- Relational crafting: changing the nature or extent of one's interactions with other people within or outside of the organization;
- Cognitive crafting: altering how one perceives tasks or thinking about the tasks involved in one's job as a collective whole as opposed to a set of separate tasks.

Job crafting stems from Wrzesniewski's earlier work on work orientation i.e. people's relationship to their work (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). People in various professions tend to evenly divide into three work orientations: viewing

their work as a Job (work for pay, financial end), as a Career (seeking advancement, social prestige and power) and as a Calling (work is fulfilling, an end in itself, work contributes to greater good as defined by the individual). Perceived meaningfulness of work is highest when people define their job as a calling (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). When individuals modify their jobs to better fit their unique strengths, interests and values, they are actively crafting elements of callings into their jobs.

Most of the research on job crafting in North America uses the Wrzesniewski and Dutton conceptualization while majority of European research is set within the Job Demand and Resource (JD-R) framework, which proposes that all job characteristics can be categorized as either job demands or job resources. Its authors, Tims and Bakker (2010) define job crafting as self-initiated changes that employees make to balance their job demands and resources with their personal needs and abilities. These changes can be categorized into four broader and more abstract categories: increasing structural resources (e.g. requesting more autonomy or skill development), social resources (e.g. asking for support and feedback), or challenging demands (e.g. taking on extra tasks and projects) and decreasing hindering demands (e.g. minimizing contact with unpleasant people) (Bakker, Tims, & Derks, 2012). The JD-R model excludes cognitive crafting because the authors consider it a passive rather than proactive adaptation. This may, however, be limiting since changing one's mindset can lead to very tangible outcomes (Crum & Langer, 2007). While both Wrzesniewski and Dutton and Tims and Bakker define job crafting similarly, they differ in classifying job crafting efforts.

B. Forms of Job Crafting

I will now distinguish various forms of job crafting along three different dimensions: employee-initiated vs. facilitated, individual vs. collective and involving vs. not involving the management. These distinctions will provide greater conceptual clarity as we review empirical evidence about the outcomes, enablers and risks of job crafting.

Employee-initiated vs. Facilitated

Job crafting naturally occurs in the workplace (Berg et al., 2013). Employees, on their own, make modifications to their jobs for a greater fit and meaning, unaware that researchers call their efforts job crafting. We will refer to this form of job crafting as *employee-initiated* job crafting. These modifications could be both visible and invisible to managers and co-workers but they are generally not authorized or supervised by managers. In a study of salespeople, Lyons (2008) found that more than 75% engaged in various forms of unsupervised job crafting, such as personal skill development, expanding tasks or advancing relationships.

Job crafting can be also encouraged and facilitated by making employees aware of what job crafting is and providing them with tools to do more of it. We will refer to this form as *facilitated* job crafting. Given positive outcomes of employee-initiated job crafting (see more in section III.C), a structured *Job Crafting™ Exercise* (JCE), was designed by Berg, Dutton and Wrzesniewski (www.jobcrafting.org).

Individual vs. Collective

Employee-initiated job crafting can be both an *individual* and a *collective* effort (Leana, Appelbaum, & Shevchuk, 2009), in which work groups collaboratively change the task and relational boundaries of their jobs. Bertolotti and colleagues (Bertolotti, Macri,

& Tagliaventi, 2005) conducted a qualitative study of a group of fashion pattern makers and found spontaneous self-managing practices or collective job crafting. The group resisted management direction towards specialization and division of labor to protect their work identity as versatile innovative craftsmen involved in the entire design process, indicating that motivation behind collective job crafting is also higher meaningfulness of work. Facilitated job crafting could also have both individual and collective format.

Involving and not involving management

We set out to answer the question of how managers and organizations can support job crafting. As already mentioned, employee-initiated job crafting is generally not authorized or supervised by managers. Even the facilitated JCE does not explicitly call for involvement of management, other than suggesting crafters solicit support from other people who could help make their ideas reality. Most research on job crafting outcomes, enablers and risks is focused on job crafting with no management involvement beyond sanctioning the study.

There is, however, an emerging concept in the area of employee-initiated job modifications called 'idiosyncratic deals' or 'i-deals' (Rousseau, Ho, & Greenberg, 2006). Unlike job crafting, i-deals involve managers. I-deals are mutually beneficial, personalized nonstandard agreements, negotiated between individual employees and their employers. Employees negotiate i-deals such as schedule and location flexibility (flexible work arrangements), task and work responsibilities, development and training opportunities and financial incentives (Hornung, Rousseau, & Glaser, 2008; Rosen,

Slater, & Johnson, 2013). The practices of job crafting and i-deals are similar since both are work arrangements customized to the idiosyncrasies of the individual and are initiated by the employee. There are, however, some important differences: while i-deals selectively involve highly valued employees who make special contributions and/or have a serious personal need, job crafting applies to a broader employee population. While i-deals must be by definition mutually beneficial to the individual and the organization, job crafting has so far been primarily motivated by individual benefits, with possible positive organizational outcomes as a side effect. Research on i-deals can inform our design of job crafting interventions involving managers that benefit both the individual and the organization.

C. Outcomes of Job Crafting

While employees engage in job crafting with the aim to increase the meaningfulness of their work, research confirms that multiple positive individual, group and organizational outcomes ensue when employees job craft, mostly in the areas of employee well-being and performance.

Employee well-being at work can be described in terms of work meaningfulness, work engagement and job satisfaction. By work engagement we mean a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by energy, dedication and absorption (Bakker, 2011). In a recent longitudinal field study, employee-initiated job crafting was positively related to work engagement and job satisfaction and negatively to burnout (Tims, Bakker, & Derks, 2013b). Moreover, job crafting and engagement seem to reinforce each other, creating an upward spiral. Hakanen and Peeters (2015)

found that the relationship worked both ways: job crafting boosted work engagement and work engagement boosted pro-active job crafting behaviors over time, while mere job satisfaction did not boost future proactivity. Engaged workers proactively change their work environment in order to stay engaged, thus actively managing their well-being at work (Bakker, 2011). This finding resonates with the realization I came to after being able to transform my work experience.

Research also confirms that both individual and collective job crafting is positively related to job performance (Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2010; Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010; Tims et al., 2013a), such as higher quality of care in child-care centers (Leana et al., 2009), more phone time and money raised in a fundraising organization (Grant et al., 2007), or higher quality of worker output in car manufacturing (Ghitulescu, 2007). Tims and colleagues (2013a) found that job crafting at both collective and individual level improved job performance of occupational health professionals via the mechanism of increased work engagement. Job crafting can thus lead to not only more meaningful but also more productive work.

Job crafting is also associated with increased levels of resilience and resourcefulness and reduced absenteeism levels (Ghitulescu, 2007). Fritz and colleagues (Fritz, Lam, & Spreitzer, 2011) studied effectiveness of the strategies knowledge workers employ to sustain their energy at work. The self-reported strategies most related to high vitality were: learning-oriented (e.g., learning something new), relational (e.g., doing something that will make a colleague happy), and meaning-related (e.g., reflecting on how I might make a difference at work). These all fall under the definition of job

crafting.

While work engagement, job satisfaction, and performance have been strongly supported by research as positive outcomes of job crafting, increased adaptability, innovation and collaboration are emerging as outcomes deserving further research. Given the changing nature of work, these are increasingly valued in organizations. Some promising studies have been already conducted.

In the area of readiness for change and adaptability, Hornung and Rousseau (2007) in a study of hospital workers found that increased autonomy lead to more positive responses to change. Individuals engaging in meaning-making or cognitive job crafting adapt better to organization change (Van den Heuvel, Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010).

Job crafting motivated by misalignment between the work people perform and their professional identity can lead to valuable business innovation (Mattarelli & Tagliaventi, 2012). Offshore R&D (research and development) workers who were dissatisfied with the limited scope of their jobs worked together to proactively introduce new markets, industries, and services, which allowed them to maintain meaning and professional identity and benefited their employer as well. This type of job crafting had to be made visible to management and, in fact, was actively encouraged and recognized by both local and home office managers. We can view job crafting as a form of creative problem solving (Petrou, Demerouti, Peeters, Schaufeli, & Hetland, 2012) and introducing innovations to work processes. Managers can no longer expect employees to just carry out their assigned tasks; they now depend on employees to adapt to

changes and introduce changes to their work (Grant & Parker, 2009). Finally, idiosyncratic modifications to jobs and employment conditions may be piloted by individuals and later adopted as best practice or standard employment conditions for the entire organization (Rousseau et al., 2006).

These empirically supported positive outcomes of job crafting as well as new areas of promise constitute a strong business rationale for introducing and encouraging job crafting in organizations and can be used to create management buy-in, critical for implementing any interventions in organizations (see Appendix C).

D. Enablers of Job Crafting

Research shows that individual differences in job crafting behaviors are related to some personal and contextual factors. Positive self-image, perceived control, and readiness to change were significantly related to frequency of work modifications in a study of sales people (Lyons, 2008). Bakker and colleagues (2012) found that individuals with proactive personality (dispositional tendency to engage in proactive behavior in a variety of situations) engaged in more job crafting and had higher work engagement and performance.

The more discretion or autonomy people had in their jobs, the more likely they were to engage in individual and collective job crafting (Leana et al., 2009; Petrou et al., 2012), while greater discretion better enabled broadly skilled workers rather than those with narrower skills (Ghitulescu, 2007). This does not mean that employees in low-autonomy jobs may not be able to craft their jobs: nurses, hospital cleaners, workers in chemical and car manufacturing were found to modify their jobs to make them more

meaningful (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Level of discretion, interdependence, strong social ties among coworkers and supportive supervision style predicted more collective job crafting (Leana et al., 2009). Manager and organization support of job crafting could help those who are not predisposed with high proactivity or those who lack or perceive the lack of autonomy in their jobs.

E. Risks, Challenges and Obstacles to Job Crafting

Although the consequences of job crafting are largely positive there are some potential risks at both individual and organizational level. Job crafting and high engagement in one's work can result in taking on too many tasks and create stress or even burnout (Wrzesniewski, Berg, & Dutton, 2010). Individuals with calling orientation have higher job and life satisfaction but also spend more time at work and work is more central to their lives. Zookeepers with a greater sense of calling were more willing to sacrifice money, time, and physical well-being for their work (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). High work engagement should, however, not be mistaken for workaholism. Workaholics are less likely to increase their social resources (ask for feedback and help) and tend to experience more burnout than engaged workers (Hakanen & Peeters, 2015).

Organizations could disproportionately benefit from highly engaged employees (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011), raising concerns of fairness and exploitation. High engagement is a win-win situation for both employees and managers only when the employer matches high job demands with high job resources. The zookeepers with calling orientation, discussed above, were more vulnerable to potential exploitation by

management, which was evidenced by lower incomes compared to their colleagues (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009).

Job crafting may lead to lower performance if employees alter their tasks without understanding their manager's and organizational goals (Wrzesniewski et al., 2010, Tims et al., 2013b) and if their work is highly standardized (Leana et al, 2009). Reduced standardization resulting from job crafting could lead to inefficiency or lower product quality (Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Standardization, although defying human nature, is highly valued in large organizations as a pathway to greater efficiency. There are many jobs of similar nature and as people move in and out of them, some consistency is beneficial. The engagement and performance benefits of job crafting should however outweigh such efficiency losses, especially in a knowledge-based and service economy.

Individual job crafting can have negative effects at the team level (Bakker et al., 2011), for example when people focus on enjoyable work and delegate the tasks that are painful and disliked by everyone. A potential drawback of managers and individuals co-creating unique jobs could be perceptions of inequity by other co-workers that erode cooperation and trust. Such negative outcomes were observed by Rousseau and colleagues (2006) while studying i-deals. The perceived inequity could be reduced if everyone is given access to job crafting. Coworkers' belief in the likelihood of obtaining comparable future opportunity was positively related to their acceptance of another's i-deal (Lai, Rousseau, & Chang, 2009).

Rigidity of job content, both real (e.g. requirements from regulators) and

perceived (fixed mindset of employees, managers, and interdependent coworkers), is a barrier to job crafting. People need to perceive their jobs as changeable to be motivated to job craft (Berg et al., 2013). Berg, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2010) found differences between lower-rank and high-rank employees in what challenges they perceived and how they subsequently adapted. Higher-rank employees limited their job crafting efforts because of their own expectations of time constraints and concerns about encroaching on their colleagues' responsibilities. Lower rank employees felt limited by autonomy constraints in the design of their jobs and expectations from others. They adapted to these challenges by trying to gain others' support for job crafting.

The concern about disrupting other people's work is connected to the extent of task interdependence. High task interdependence was positively related with cognitive and relational crafting but not with task crafting (Ghitulescu, 2007). Interdependence seems to be detrimental to individual job crafting but an enabler of collective crafting (Leana et al., 2009). Focusing on small incremental wins in order not to encroach on others' scope of work could provide some remediation (Berg et al., 2013).

Employees and managers must be made aware of potential risks of job crafting such as taking on too much, exploitation, misalignment with organizational goals, perception of inequity in the team and the challenges of autonomy constraints and task interdependence. By involving managers in job crafting, we can actually alleviate some of these potential risks associated with job crafting.

IV. Co-Crafting

In this paper, I propose a new facilitated form of job crafting, *co-crafting*, that involves both employees and managers and enables them to co-create meaningful and productive work in partnership. While individuals spend hours dreaming about jobs that feel like a calling, organizations and researchers spend a lot of effort on finding ways to match individuals to the right job. Co-crafting productively engages managers in job crafting to leverage its positive outcomes and minimize its potential risks, thus making it more beneficial for both the individual and the organization. Co-crafting also constitutes a new form of collaborative job design, better suited to the workplace of the 21st century. We will now describe these two aspects of co-crafting in more detail.

A. Effective Involvement of Managers in Co-Crafting

Having a better understanding of what makes job crafting more and less effective, we can now turn to the specific role of the manager in co-crafting i.e. what managers can do to increase positive outcomes of job crafting and prevent or alleviate the risks and challenges.

As already mentioned, the majority of research studies on job crafting are focused on employee-initiated job crafting, occurring without management participation. Their authors, however, repeatedly call for job crafting interventions involving managers. (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2007; Wrzesniewski et al., 2010; Petrou et al., 2012; Berg et al., 2010; Tims et al., 2013 a and b, Berg et al., 2013). The table below lists multiple ways managers should get involved, suggested by the researchers, and connects them to the benefits of manager

involvement.

Manager Involvement	Benefits
Acknowledge that job crafting naturally occurs and can be a mutual benefit. Inform employees about job crafting strategies and stimulate them to take initiative and manage their engagement.	Greater awareness of job crafting. Encouragement of individuals who are less proactive.
Build a shared understanding that job crafting is encouraged as long as it is aligned with organizational goals.	Avoiding risk of lower performance due to goal misalignment.
Communicate organizational goals in a clear manner to prevent dysfunctional job crafting.	Avoiding risk of lower performance due to goal misalignment.
Provide clarity on the interdependencies with end goals of other employees and teams.	Reducing constraint of task interdependence and risk of encroaching on others. Increasing collaboration.
Create space in job design for crafting by providing more autonomy.	Reducing constraint of low autonomy.
Help identify opportunities to job craft.	Generating more job crafting ideas and thus amplifying positive outcomes.
Encourage relational crafting that increases high quality connections (Stephens, Heaphy, & Dutton, 2011).	Increasing well-being benefits of job crafting. Increasing collaboration.
Consider mutually beneficial delegation of tasks where employees can get involved in an activity that enriches their job, which the manager could benefit from delegating.	Increasing work engagement benefits of job crafting for both employee and manager.
Maintain open communication about job crafting efforts and ensuing benefits or detriments.	Course-correcting to avoid dysfunctional job crafting.

By involving managers in co-crafting in the manner described above, we can increase multiple positive outcomes and alleviate several of the potential risks associated with job crafting.

B. Co-Crafting as an Alternate Form of Job Design

Co-crafting also constitutes an alternative form of job design better suited to the workplace of the 21st century. While job design has been historically viewed as top-down, with management and later Human Resources determining the content of jobs (Oldham & Hackman, 2010), job crafting, as proposed by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), provided a new understanding of job design as a proactive bottom-up process. Job crafting complements the established job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) postulating that skill variety, task identity, task significance, feedback and autonomy are the characteristics of well-designed stimulating jobs. People in jobs that allow for higher levels of autonomy, skill variety, task identity, and task significance (impact on others) do experience their work as more meaningful (Rosso et al., 2010). Job crafting, however, emphasizes the active role or agency of employees in job design. Individual's relationship to the job and agency in shaping it matters more than the job content itself (Wrzesniewski, 2003).

Since employee opportunities to exercise wide discretion over their work and job craft without managerial authorization tend to be constrained, Hornung and colleagues (Hornung, Rousseau, Glaser, Angerer, & Weigl, 2010) propose that i-deals (see Chapter IIIB) constitute a middle ground between top-down and bottom-up approaches to work

design. Co-crafting, that we propose here, is a collaborative bottom-up and top-down job design approach that includes the manager, thus reducing such constraints.

Are i-deals and co-crafting the same thing? In fact, it may be the nature and magnitude of changes to jobs that differentiates co-crafting and i-deals. Since most i-deals involve negotiations over the time and location of work (customized employment terms) or changes requiring resource investment, these modifications must be authorized. Most job crafting efforts are not about employment terms and do not require authorization. People can think about their hospital cleaner job as healing or provide directions to hospital visitors even though it is not part of their job description, with or without their supervisor approval. However, sharing such job modifications with one's manager (co-crafting) can make job crafting more effective, as described in the previous section. In co-crafting employee and manager collaborate to create new job designs, in i-deals they negotiate or make special deals about employment conditions.

Both job crafting and i-deals that emphasize employee agency are more relevant and contemporary perspectives on job design (Grant & Parker, 2009; Oldham & Hackman, 2010) since the nature of work has changed significantly in the 21st century. Knowledge and service economy has largely replaced manufacturing. Virtual work and interdependent teamwork and collaboration are on the rise and job tasks and boundaries are constantly evolving, rendering job descriptions obsolete. It is not specific jobs but rather dynamic relationships among people and their work activities that need to be better understood in the new world of work (Oldham and Hackman, 2010). Therefore relational and proactive perspectives on job design are gaining importance

(Grant & Parker, 2009).

Co-crafting is a relational job design approach, emphasizing increased interdependence and interactions with coworkers and service recipients and greater social embeddedness of work. For example, Grant and colleagues (2007) found in a controlled field experiment that the perceived meaningfulness of work was enhanced by personal interaction with recipients of services, a relational job modification. Employees who had direct contact with the beneficiaries of their work subsequently displayed more persistence in goal achievement and had significantly greater productivity, compared to those without contact to beneficiaries.

Co-crafting is also a proactive job design approach (Frese & Fay, 2001, Grant & Ashford, 2008), characterized by employees taking initiative to anticipate and create changes in how their work is carried out in a fluid, constantly changing environment. Since co-crafting is more incremental, collaborative and can involve broader employee population rather than a selected few, it may have greater potential to increase adaptability, collaboration and innovation that organizations of the future need, compared to i-deals.

Given the changing nature of work, organizations and management should embrace co-crafting as the new practice of job design, rather than ignoring the existence of job crafting and leaving it to the efforts employees initiate on their own, which may remain invisible and unrecognized.

V. Proposed Intervention: Personal Development Crafting

In order to embed co-crafting in an organization, I propose to combine job crafting with the practice of personal development planning discussions that is already established in many organizations. To distinguish this intervention from traditional personal development planning, I suggest the new combined process is called *Personal Development Crafting* (PDC). Since *crafting* means to make or build something with care and imagination through a continuous process of small steps, this new term will better communicate the ownership, proactivity, uniqueness and incremental rather than one-time nature of the practice.

While some managers will be predisposed to interact with their team members in ways that are supportive of co-crafting, others will need guidance, training and encouragement. Similarly, employees who do not naturally initiate discussions about their job content may benefit from a structured opportunity to do so. A supportive organizational practice can nudge managers and employees in the right direction. By incorporating co-crafting into personal development planning we can fuel generative dynamics in the organization.

A. Definition of Personal Development Planning

Personal development plans (PDP) are action plans for learning and development that are agreed between managers and individual members of their team. Personal development planning has emerged as a popular HR practice already in the 1990s. Employers were aiming to transfer career ownership to the employees since they could no longer guarantee lifetime employment and to develop a more autonomous

workforce. Additionally, they wanted to increase on-the-job learning opportunities with the line manager as a coach rather than investing in central training departments (Tamkin, 1996). In the 21st century, personal development planning is still a very common HR practice in organizations. Usually on an annual basis, employees meet with their manager for a discussion about their future career goals, strengths and areas for improvement and create or a plan on what actions to take next (Beauseart, Segers, & Gijsselaers, 2011a). Managers provide feedback and stimulate self-reflection. Most large employers have customized competency catalogues to create a common language around competency assessment to which the chosen development actions should be linked.

Unlike regular performance review meetings when employees and managers discuss past performance against goals and performance ratings are assigned, PDP discussions should be future oriented, focused on the individual rather than performance and thus provide a safer environment for development (Tamkin, 1996). There are two broad purposes for the use of PDPs in organizations: (1) learning and development where learning is the orientation, and (2) promotion and selection where presenting oneself and proving competence is the focus. The latter reduces openness towards critical self-reflection. When employees perceive PDPs as serving learning and development purposes, they are more likely to undertake learning activities and increase their performance (Beauseart et al., 2011a).

Beauseart and colleagues (Beauseart, Segers, van den Rijt, & Gijsselaers, 2011b) conducted a literature review of empirical studies of PDPs in the workplace, mostly in

educational or healthcare settings since studies in business are scarce. They found that PDPs are an effective tool for personal or continuing professional development, stimulating reflection and improving professional practice. The most common outcomes of effective career discussions are a clearer view of future direction, self-insight, awareness of opportunities, and feeling reassured about self or work (Kidd, Jackson, & Hirsh, 2003). Additionally, the time and resources provided and the support from a supervisor or coach were shown as supportive conditions for PDPs. Supervisors providing feedback (looking back) as well as feedforward (looking forward and making suggestions on how to improve) fostered greater employee competence development (Beauseart, Segers, Fouarge, & Gijsselaers, 2013). Honest, non-judgemental and affirmative approach, challenging and providing specific feedback and advice, asking open questions and listening empathically are effective manager behaviors in career discussions (Kidd, Hirsh, & Jackson, 2004). Our *Personal Development Crafting* intervention should therefore be separated from the annual performance discussion, emphasize learning goals and promote managerial behaviors that enhance development.

B. Synergies in Combining Personal Development Planning and Job Crafting

There are multiple similarities and synergies between PDP and job crafting that make them good candidates for a mutually beneficial merger:

- For both, the initiative and ownership must come from the employee but manager support is also needed. It is now a given that employees own their

- learning and career development. Employees are encouraged to be proactive and craft their careers rather than climb a management prescribed career ladder, largely because jobs change faster than career guides can be updated and organizations can guarantee neither jobs nor careers. Similarly, as we discussed earlier, the notion that people job craft to own their engagement or co-design their jobs is gaining prevalence in a knowledge-based economy.
- Both processes target change and growth towards maximizing employee potential and benefit both individuals and organizations. While job crafting on its own could lead to complacency by the employee choosing to do only what they enjoy, adding the developmental context promotes a mindset of growth and positive change.
 - Job crafting and PDP conversation with manager is a conversation about personal strengths and the opportunity to capitalize on strengths. Formal or informal assessment of strengths is incorporated in both.
 - Both are aimed at increasing self-awareness and reflection.
 - Both encourage proactive experimentation and innovation, trying something new. Similarly as proactive personality has been linked to more job crafting, work engagement and performance (Bakker et al., 2012), proactive personality is also positively related to innovation, career initiative and career progression and satisfaction (Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 2001). In her qualitative research of individuals who successfully changed careers, Ibarra (2003) found that new working identity was not discovered while reflecting in solitude, but rather

through testing various activities and roles. Both job crafting and PDP can prepare people (the more and the less proactive) for their next roles, in the same or different organization. The time of lifelong careers is over (Ashford, George, & Blatt, 2007) and employers should foster an environment where people function at their best during the time they stay with each employer.

- Managers, usually having a broader perspective, can help identify additional opportunities to job craft and develop.
- Actions that are identified must be aligned with organizational goals.
- Actions coming from job crafting and development planning are often similar – for example getting involved in a new project, having greater visibility with stakeholders or recipients of one’s work, learning something new etc.
- Both practices involve creating and following up an action plan. Here also lies a common challenge – both job crafting and personal development plans often get created but are not implemented. Therefore a regular follow-up process is needed.
- Finally, both require employee motivation. Employees who are not interested in or considered for career moves to other positions often disengage from PDP and sadly sometimes also from their jobs. While these employees are reluctant to have developmental conversations with their managers, managers are also wary of talking to them about development. Since job crafting takes places even in low-status jobs that are not a major focus for talent management investments, incorporating job crafting into the PDP discussion could revive broader interest

in PDP and drive greater engagement, performance and development across the organization, also for those who lack career ambitions in the traditional sense and remain long in the same jobs.

One area of potential mismatch between personal development planning and job crafting lies in the choice of strengths assessment to be used. PDP utilizes work-related competency or skill frameworks customized to the organization (e.g. planning and priority setting or marketing strategy development). Job crafting focuses on more universal and deeper character strengths or virtues spanning beyond the organizational boundaries, which have a higher potential to create meaningful experience of work. This challenge, although not a detriment to implementing a co-crafting intervention, could be an area of further empirical research. In a field experiment, multiple experimental conditions could be created. One group using only competency assessment, second group using VIA Character Strengths survey (viacharacter.org) and a third group using Gallup's *Strengthsfinder* (<http://www.strengthsfinder.com>) that has the reputation of being more work-relevant than VIA.

Finally, from a research point of view, linking career development, job crafting and job design is not an entirely new idea. While in management literature those studying job design and careers went largely their separate ways, job design and career theory can enrich each other and contribute to designing jobs and careers that are productive and fulfilling, and stimulate learning, growth, and employability (Hall & Heras, 2010). Tims and Bakker (2010) connected job crafting and personal development. Specifically they established increasing structural resources (seeking

learning opportunities, professional development and using one's capacities to the fullest) as one of the job crafting categories. Finally, Fried and colleagues (Fried, Grant, Levi, Hadani, & Slowik, 2007) explored the temporal aspects of job design and suggested that employee reactions to job design and their willingness to craft more stimulating jobs may depend on their time in job and time in their career span. For example, at later career stages, employees will react positively to task significance but negatively to task complexity and variety. They suggest that if managers want to understand employees' reactions to job design, they must gain an understanding of employees' career plans and future expectations. *Personal Development Crafting* can provide that opportunity.

C. Personal Development Crafting Intervention Design

In order to design the *Personal Development Crafting* (PDC) intervention, I reviewed two publicly available intervention designs and incorporated their elements into a step-by-step implementation process and a structured guide for employees and managers. I also propose that the impact and effectiveness of PDC is measured in a structured manner to demonstrate effectiveness and drive continuous improvement.

The first intervention considered, *The Job Crafting™ Exercise* (JCE) is an interactive visual tool for facilitated individual job crafting that helps individuals create a more optimal fit between their values, strengths, and passions and their jobs. JCE focuses people on resourcefully using and altering elements of their job, challenges them to think about and to experience their job in a new way, unlocks insights through visual representation and serves as both a diagnostic and a prescriptive tool (Wrzesniewski, 2015).

In practice, the JCE has been mostly used in organizations in the form of facilitated group workshops where participants complete the exercise on their own and discuss their insights and action plans with others in the classroom. Managers may also participate in the workshops and thus become familiar with the process and experience crafting of their own jobs. As part of the action plan, participants are encouraged but not required to solicit support from other people who could help make their ideas reality. Organizations recognized as best places to work, such as Google (large size) or Motley Fool (medium size) have implemented job crafting in this format (A. Wrzesniewski, personal communication, March 28, 2015). The JCE is a well-designed and tried intervention and therefore I incorporated it into the PDC intervention as necessary pre-work that the employee should complete before meeting with the manager.

Second, French (2010) proposed an organizational Job Crafting Intervention (JCI) explicitly requiring active involvement of the manager. The JCI consists of formal assessment of employee strengths, communicating to employees both their strengths and individual and organizational performance goals, and supporting employees in crafting their jobs within the boundaries created by desired goals. An important component of this intervention is the assessment and discussion of strengths, which could be the 'active ingredient' that will drive employee engagement and performance. If managers are focused on strengths there is only 1% chance that their team members are 'actively disengaged' i.e. spreading negativity to others in the workplace (Rath, Harter, & Harter, 2010). A recent study by McQuaid (2015) showed that employees who

have meaningful conversation about their strengths with their supervisors, are more likely to feel engaged and energized by their work, perceive that their work makes a difference and is appreciated, as opposed to employees whose managers provide a positive but non-specific feedback (“pat on the back”), focus on weaknesses or are unsupportive. Therefore our PDC intervention must include the assessment and conversation about strengths. The explicit discussion of individual and organizational goals, that French (2010) proposed in her JCI, was also incorporated into our PDC intervention to ensure that employee’s job crafting efforts are aligned with goals, lead to higher performance and benefit both employee and the organization.

Appendix A, includes a step-by-step process of how to implement Personal Development Crafting in an organization, including training and support of HR and senior leadership. The intervention will consist of Job Crafting workshops, where employees will get familiar with job crafting and complete JCE as pre-work, followed by a guided 1-on-1 discussion and action planning with manager. In Appendix B, I provide an outline of a *Personal Development Crafting* guide that includes guidance to both the crafter and his/ her manager in one joint guide. This transparency will foster trust and the perception that employees and managers are partners in the process, co-crafting together. The outline includes open-ended questions and suggestions for both parties to create open and meaningful conversations. Both job crafting risks and enablers described in Chapter III were taken into consideration when creating Appendices A and B.

In order to measure the impact and effectiveness of PDC, I propose to focus on

three variables: the volume of job crafting efforts, job performance and work engagement. To measure the change in job crafting efforts, I suggest that a job crafting questionnaire is administered prior to the intervention and six months later. The volume of job crafting is expected to increase due to greater awareness of job crafting by both employees and managers, additional possibilities to job craft identified and sanctioned by managers, and a structured approach that facilitates the process. The questionnaire should be completed by both employees and managers and customized to the jobs of intervention participants by including typical examples of job crafting relevant in their work context. Job crafting researchers (Ghitulescu, 2007; Leana et al., 2009) recommend this methodological approach, where first exploratory qualitative interviews are conducted to identify specific employee-initiated job crafting strategies in the studied context and then a customized job crafting questionnaire is created. For sample job crafting questionnaires, refer to questionnaires developed by Ghitulescu (2007), Tims, Bakker, and Derks (2012), and Ficapal-Cusí, Torrent-Sellens, Boada-Grau and Hontangas-Beltrán (2014). The post-intervention volume of job crafting should be compared against the baseline, the participation in *Job Crafting Workshop* and in the PDC discussion, which will need to be tracked.

Job performance and work engagement should also be measured before the intervention and 6 months later. Change in job performance can be measured through annual performance ratings and a brief 360-degree online survey involving manager, co-workers, and other internal and external stakeholders. Most organizations have qualitative definitions of what constitutes high performance that can be adapted as

survey items. For example, in my workplace we use: timely completion of objectives, amount of supervision required, and level of initiative and creativity as differentiators of performance. Work engagement can be measured through the existing internal company engagement survey, which would reduce the overall amount of employee surveying. If the organization does not have an engagement survey, one of the established measures, such as the *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)*, which is in the public domain and can be used free of charge.

Measuring the impact and effectiveness of positive organizational interventions is not only aligned with the empirical grounding of positive psychology and positive organizational scholarship, but also critical to their success and continuous improvement. Systematic evaluation of the Personal Development crafting, proposed above, will enable further adjustments and fine-tuning of the intervention design and supporting materials.

VI. Conclusion

In this Capstone Project, we set out to answer the question of how organizations and managers should encourage and support job crafting efforts to generate positive outcomes for individuals, managers and organizations. We proposed a new form of job crafting, co-crafting, which actively involves both individuals and managers in a collaborative design of meaningful and productive jobs. Using synergies between job crafting and the practice of personal development discussions as well as empirical knowledge of outcomes, enablers and risks of job crafting, we designed a new

measurable positive organizational intervention, *Personal Development Crafting*, that has the potential to embed co-crafting in organizations, generate benefits for employees and employers, and co-create stronger and more adaptive organizations.

References

- Ashford, S.J., George, E., & Blatt, R. (2007). Old assumptions, new work: The opportunities and challenges of research on nonstandard employment. In A.P. Brief & J.P. Walsh (Eds.), *Academy of management annals* (Vol. 1, pp. 79–143). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(4), 265-269.
- Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Work engagement: Further reflections on the state of play. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20*(1), 74-88.
- Bakker, A. B., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human Relations, 65*(10), 1359-1378.
- Beausaert, S. A., Segers, M. S., & Gijssels, W. H. (2011a). Using a personal development plan for different purposes: Its influence on undertaking learning activities and job performance. *Vocations and Learning, 4*(3), 231-252.
- Beausaert, S., Segers, M., Fouarge, D., & Gijssels, W. (2013). Effect of using a personal development plan on learning and development. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 25*(3), 145-158.
- Beausaert, S., Segers, M. R., van der Rijt, J., & Gijssels, W. H. (2011b). The use of personal development plans (PDPs) in the workplace: A literature review. In

- Building learning experiences in a changing world* (pp. 235-265). Springer Netherlands.
- Berg, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2013). Job crafting and meaningful work. In B. J. Dik, Z. S. Byrne & M. F. Steger (Eds.), *Purpose and meaning in the workplace* (pp. 81-104). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., Dutton, J.E. (2007). *What is Job Crafting and Why Does It Matter?*. Retrieved from: <http://positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/What-is-Job-Crafting-and-Why-Does-it-Matter1.pdf>
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2-3), 158-186.
- Bertolotti, F., Macrì, D. M., & Tagliaventi, M. R. (2005). Spontaneous self-managing practices in groups: evidence from the field. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 366–84.
- Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J. A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(1), 32-57.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). An introduction to positive organizational scholarship. In K. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship*, (pp. 3-13).
- Cameron, K., & McNaughtan, J. (2014). Positive Organizational Change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 50(4), 445-462.

- Crum, A. J., & Langer, E. J. (2007). Mind-Set Matters Exercise and the Placebo Effect. *Psychological Science, 18*(2), 165-171.
- Dutton, J. E. (2003). *Energize your workplace: How to create and sustain high-quality connections at work*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dutton, J.E., & Glynn, M. (2008). Positive Organizational Scholarship. In C. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, (pp. 693-711). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Dutton, J. E., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2014). *How to Be a Positive Leader: Small Actions, Big Impact*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Kindle Edition.
- Ficapal-Cusí, P., Torrent-Sellens, J., Boada-Grau, J., & Hontangas-Beltrán, P. M. (2014). *Job change without changing job? Exploring job crafting in Spain*. IN3 Working Paper Series. Retrieved from: <http://journals.uoc.edu/index.php/in3-working-paper-series/article/view/2342>
- French, M. (2010). Job crafting. In R. Watkins & D. Leigh (Eds.), *Handbook of improving performance in the workplace* (Vol. 2, pp. 555-568). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). 4. Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 23*, 133-187.
- Fried, Y., Grant, A., Levi, A., Hadani, M., & Slowik, L. (2007). Job design in temporal context: A career dynamics perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*(7), 911-927.

- Fritz, C., Lam, C. F., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2011). It's the little things that matter: An examination of knowledge workers' energy management. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 25*(3), 28-39.
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 28*, 3-34.
- Grant, A. M., Campbell, E. M., Chen, G., Cottone, K., Lapedis, D., & Lee, K. (2007). Impact and the art of motivation maintenance: The effects of contact with beneficiaries on persistence behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 103*(1), 53-67.
- Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*, 273–331."
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16*, 250-279."
- Hakanen, J. J., & Peeters, M. (2015, June). *Who are job crafters? A longitudinal study on How Different Work-related States Predict Each Other and Job Crafting*. Poster presented at the 4th World Congress on Positive Psychology, Lake Buena Vista, FL.

- Hall, D. T. T., & Heras, M. L. (2010). Reintegrating job design and career theory: Creating not just good jobs but smart jobs. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(2-3), 448-462.
- Hornung, S., & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Active on the job—proactive in change how autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*(4), 401-426.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D.M., & Glaser, J. (2008). Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 655-664.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D. M., Glaser, J., Angerer, P., & Weigl, M. (2010). Beyond top-down and bottom-up work redesign: Customizing job content through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(2), 187.
- Ibarra, H. (2003). *Working identity: Unconventional strategies for reinventing your career*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kidd, J. M., Hirsh, W., & Jackson, C. (2004). Straight talking: The nature of effective career discussion at work. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(4), 231-245.
- Kidd, J. M., Jackson, C., & Hirsh, W. (2003). The outcomes of effective career discussion at work. *Journal of vocational behavior, 62*(1), 119-133.
- Lai, L., Rousseau, D.M., & Chang, K.T.T. (2009). Idiosyncratic deals: Coworkers as interested third parties. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 547-556.
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (2009). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(6), 1169–1192."

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

Mattarelli, E., & Tagliaventi, M. R. (2015). How Offshore Professionals' Job Dissatisfaction Can Promote Further Offshoring: Organizational Outcomes of Job Crafting. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(5), 585-620.

McQuaid, M. (2015) *The 2015 Strengths @ Work Survey*. VIA Institute on Character.

Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 463–479."

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Oxford University Press.

Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M. C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(8), 1120-1141.

Rath, T., Harter, J., & Harter, J. K. (2010). *Wellbeing: The five essential elements*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.

Rosen, C. C., Slater, D. J., & Johnson, R. E. (2013). Let's make a deal development and validation of the ex post I-deals scale. *Journal of Management, 39*(3), 709-742.

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in organizational behavior, 30*, 91-127.

Rousseau, D. M., Ho, V. T., & Greenberg, J. (2006). I-deals: Idiosyncratic terms in employment relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(4), 977-994.

- Seibert, S. E., Kraimer, M. L., & Crant, J. M. (2001). A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career success. *Personnel psychology, 54*(4), 845-874.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist, 60*, 410–421. DOI:10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410.
- Stephens, J.P., Heaphy E., & Dutton, J. (2011). High quality connections. In K. Cameron and G. Spreitzer (eds.), *Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp.385-399). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tamkin, P. (1996). Practical applications for personal development plans. *Management Development Review, 9*(7), 32-36.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36*(2), 1-9.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*, 173-186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013b). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 18*(2), 230-240.

- Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., Derks, D., & van Rhenen, W. (2013a). Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance. *Group & Organization Management* 28, 427-454.
- Van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Personal resources and work engagement in the face of change. *Contemporary occupational health psychology: Global perspectives on research and practice*, 1, 124-150.
- Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning in work. In K. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 296-308). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Wrzesniewski, A. (2015, March). *Job crafting and the meaning of work*. Lecture presented at University of Pennsylvania, Master of Applied Positive Psychology.
- Wrzesniewski, A., Berg, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Turn the job you have into the job you want. *Harvard Business Review*, 88 (6), 114-117.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179–201.
- Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(1), 21-33.

Appendices

A. Recommended Approach for Implementation of *Personal Development Crafting*:

1. **Gain management and HR buy-in for the intervention**

In anticipation that not all HR professionals and business leaders will embrace the idea of Personal Development Crafting with open arms, Appendix C includes examples of entry points or platforms through which PDC can be introduced, using empirical evidence for positive outcomes of job crafting, discussed in Chapter III.

Once buy-in is secured, appoint a Business and HR leader as sponsors of the initiative.

2. **Select business unit to conduct the intervention.**

The business unit should have an established practice of personal development planning, separated from performance reviews. A business unit with some level of autonomy in the work performed should be selected so there is room for job crafting. Ideally, baseline performance and engagement data should be available for this unit.

It is critical that all employees in the selected business unit are given access to the PDC intervention to avoid perceptions of inequity. Participation should, however, not be forced since proactivity and autonomy are key elements of job crafting.

Use a similar business unit in the same organization as a control group: employees in this unit will participate in the regular development planning process.

3. **Conduct exploratory interviews** with a sample of employees, representing different functions and organization levels in the business unit. The goal is to understand the nature of work and typical examples of job crafting in order to customize the Job Crafting Questionnaire that will be used to measure volume of job crafting before and after the intervention. Sample questionnaires are referenced in Chapter V.

The following questions can be used in the exploratory interviews:

- In what ways do you (or people in your team) customize the way you perform your job responsibilities?
- Have you (or your team members) taken on more or fewer tasks? Tell us more.
- Have you (or people in your team) increased or decreased the scope of your job? In what ways?
- Can you think of examples when you (or your colleagues) changed the way you interact with other people within or outside of the organization in order to derive more meaning from your work?

- Have you (or your team members) adjusted the volume of interaction with other people within or outside of the organization? Why?
- What is the purpose of your job? What role(s) do you play? Do you (or people on your team) describe your job or its parts in ways that are unique to you?

4. Define performance and engagement measures

Obtain PDC participants' performance ratings for the past 3 years and/or create an online survey to collect 360 degree feedback from their various stakeholders on qualitative aspects of individual performance, as defined by the organization.

For example:

Does [name] achieve the desired outcomes?

Does [name] achieve objectives on time?

Does [name] demonstrate initiative and self-direction while achieving objectives?

Does [name] demonstrate creativity/innovation while achieving objectives?

Does [name] collaborate with others?

Obtain baseline engagement survey results prior to the intervention, or select an engagement survey to be administered if the organization does not currently measure engagement.

5. **Measure** naturally occurring job crafting through the customized *Job Crafting Questionnaire* prior to the intervention to establish a baseline. Make sure baseline performance and engagement data are also available. If not, measure them.
6. **Select competency assessment** to be used. It could be the established catalogue of work-related competencies or skills the organizations uses. However, we recommend to include an assessment of more deeper character strengths spanning beyond the organizational boundaries, which have a higher potential to create meaningful experience of work, such as VIA Character Strengths survey (viacharacter.org) or Gallup's Strengthsfinder (<http://www.strengthsfinder.com>).
7. **Create communication and training materials:**
 - Kick-off communication from leadership sponsors
 - Video testimonials from early supporters
 - Personal Development Crafting form and guide (See appendix B)
 - Job Crafting Workshop materials
customized to the organization's culture, language and business priorities. Use examples collected through exploratory interviews to bring the content to life for the target audience.

Emphasize the outcomes that the organization values most, for example: high performance and business growth, innovation / continuous Improvement,

collaboration / teamwork, employee engagement, providing personal development and career opportunities, adaptability to change, diversity, employee wellness / health.

8. **Train HR facilitators** to deliver *Job Crafting Workshop* and to support managers and employees as they try *Personal Development Crafting*.

The 2-hour Job Crafting Workshop should include the following:

- Participants complete *JCE Part A Before Sketch* as pre-work
- The concept of job crafting is introduced, as well as its connection to personal development. Facilitator conducts group discussion on potential benefits and risks of job crafting (see Chapter III).
- Participants are matched to become peer coaches for the duration of the workshop
- Participants complete the *JCE Part B After Diagram* and get feedback from a peer coach
- Participants complete the *JCE Action Plan* and get feedback from peer coach
- Facilitator answers questions and helps participants 1-on-1
- Expectation to share the plan with one's manager is set and benefits of doing so covered in a group discussion
- Quick review of Personal Development Crafting guide

Conduct train-the-trainer workshops for HR business partners who are embedded in the business unit teams. The train-the-trainer participants first observe and then practice delivery of the *Job Crafting Workshop* content. Participants generate scenarios for challenges that could be encountered in the PDC discussions and role-play these situations. For example:

- employee is satisfied with their job and not interested to job craft or develop
- employee perceives their job responsibilities / development potential as fixed
- manager perceives employee's job / development potential as fixed
- employee creates job crafting ideas that promote stagnation rather than development
- employee creates job crafting ideas that ignore organizational goals and task interdependence with others
- employee has low self-awareness of their strengths and development areas
- manager sees strengths only / development areas only
- manager is too rigid and controlling and rejects job crafting ideas from the employee)
- manager is concerned about how others in his/her team will perceive the job modification
- job crafting leads to unforeseen negative consequences

Use feedback from train-the-trainer sessions to further customize communication and training materials.

9. Offer 2-hour *Job Crafting Workshops*.

- Create diverse participant groups through self-registration.
- Provide JCE booklet prior to workshop as pre-work.
- Everyone participates with the goal to craft his/her own job (even if a people manager).
- Instead of the *Job Crafting Workshop*, the control group is offered a refresher workshop on the personal development planning process.

10. Employees complete the online **Personal Development Crafting form** (see Appendix B) as additional pre-work.

11. **Conduct PDC discussions** during the usual time of the year when PDP discussions are normally done. Employees bring their PDC diagrams and action plans to the discussion with their manager, receive feedback and finalize plans. Managers can seek advice from next level manager and trained HR facilitators before finalizing plans.

12. Managers and individuals **schedule regular check-in meetings** (recommend bi-monthly) to monitor progress and deal with challenges, such lagging behind on the PDC action plan, task overload, encroaching on responsibilities of others, avoiding business critical interactions, misaligned job crafting efforts etc. Allow tracking completion of action plans in the online PDC forms.

13. Measure intervention effectiveness after 6 months

- a. Repeat *Job Crafting Questionnaire*. Compare volume of job crafting against baseline, participation in *Job Crafting Workshops* and in PDC discussions.
- b. Measure change in performance through annual performance ratings and/or a brief e360 online survey involving manager, co-workers, and other internal and external stakeholders
- c. Measure change in engagement through a repeated engagement survey.
- d. Conduct qualitative analysis of actions planned in the online PDC action plans. Use selected ideas in communications and training throughout the year and in the next PDC cycle.

B. Outline of *Personal Development Crafting* Guide

Why are we having a *Personal Development Crafting* discussion?

- This is an opportunity to make your current work more meaningful, engaging and productive or start planning a journey towards future roles, with the help of your manager.
- In this discussion we will be looking at future possibilities, not at the past.
- Our goal is to reach a shared understanding of your strengths and development areas, and actions you can take to continue to grow.
- This is also an opportunity to agree on job modifications that will benefit both you and our organization.
- Together we will craft an action plan.

What is going to make our *Personal Development Crafting* discussion successful?

- Thorough preparation
- Authentic and open dialogue
- Asking open-ended questions
- Active listening
- Accepting disagreement
- Commitment to take action

Step 1: Preparation

First, both employee and manager will prepare individually.

Employee will attend the Job Crafting Workshop and submit a draft PDC form to the manager. Manager will review employee's draft PDC, objectives for the year and any other information about the content of his or her work (e.g. job profile). Both employee and manager should think about the people and groups the employee interacts with and how their work is interdependent.

Step 2: Joint discussion between employee and manager: exchange feedback about your plan, create a shared understanding of your development goals and next steps. If the employee has a tendency to be less proactive or has a fixed mindset about his/her job and development potential, the manager should set the stage at the beginning of the discussion by exploring and giving examples of past successful job modifications and development actions.

The table below includes the questions posed in the PDC form and additional guidance on how to answer them for both the employee and the manager.

Personal Development Crafting Form Questions	Guidance for employee Blue = use during the meeting	Guidance for manager Blue = use during the meeting
What work / tasks do you enjoy the most?	Think about what makes these tasks so enjoyable. Look for patterns.	Think of times when you saw this individual fully engaged in their work. What tasks and projects was he/she working on? Share those examples during the meeting. Ask: What makes these tasks / work enjoyable and motivating for you?
Identify up to 5 strengths that you bring to your job.	Please select strengths from our competency guide / or other strength assessments you participated in. Consider feedback you received from others informally or in your e360 assessments. When do you feel most energized and which of your strengths contribute to that? Discuss your selection with your manager, provide examples.	Think about this individual when they were most energized and performed at their best. What strengths were they demonstrating? Think about recognition and positive feedback you received from others about this individual. Discuss your selection with the employee, provide examples. Take time to recognize strengths. If you disagree, make sure your understanding of the competency is the same.
Identify up to 2-3 areas where you would like to improve.	These can also be your strengths that you want to develop further. Consider feedback you received from others informally or in your e360 assessments. How would improving in these areas make a difference to you, your colleagues and the organization? Share with your manager.	These can also be strengths that can be further developed. Think about constructive feedback you received from others about the employee. Brainstorm ideas of how employee could try to improve in these areas going forward (feedforward).
What are your development goals in your current role?	Think of ways to apply your strengths in a new way or to improve a competency / skill.	Help employee identify learning goals (I want to become better at Project Management) rather than task goals (I want to finish this project faster). Look for opportunities for job enrichment that fit employee’s strengths.
What changes to your current job would better align the work with your strengths, values and passions while contributing to	Refer to your <i>Job Crafting Exercise</i> booklet and action plan for the task, relationship and mindset modifications you would like to	Ask: Are these proposed job modifications aligned with our team and larger organizational goals? What will be the impact on others

<p>our company goals?</p>	<p>implement.</p> <p>You can choose not to show your <i>After Diagram</i> to your manager but be prepared to talk about it.</p> <p>How will these changes add value to you, your team and organization? Are there any potential risks? How can we avoid them?</p> <p>Identify the people at work with whom you consistently have high quality connections? Can you increase your interactions?</p> <p>Propose the changes you want to implement, make a case for their benefits and listen to your manager’s feedback and questions.</p> <p>You can agree to experiment with the proposed modification for a limited period and jointly evaluate its outcomes</p>	<p>who work with this individual?</p> <p>What other modifications could I suggest that would benefit this individual?</p> <p>Which of the modifications proposed by the employee should I explore as a possible best practice for others in our team?</p> <p>If other people on the team ask for the same modification, am I prepared to agree to it? Why? Why not?</p> <p>Listen carefully to make sure you understood the proposed modifications. Give feedback using the considerations above. Try not to reject ideas, rather modify them to avoid traps.</p> <p>You can agree to experiment with the proposed modification for a limited period and jointly evaluate its outcomes.</p>
<p>What other jobs are you interested in? What do you expect to learn in these? What are your career aspirations?</p>	<p>Why would these be a good next step? What strengths will you be using? How much do you know about these jobs and who could help you learn more?</p> <p>What action / experiment could allow you to get a better idea whether this desired future role would be a good fit?</p> <p>It is ok if you want to develop in your current role and are not interested in other roles at this time.</p>	<p>What jobs can you see the employee grow into in the future? Do you agree with their selection? Why? Why not?</p> <p>Ask: In what new ways can you contribute to the organization in the future?</p> <p>Share information about desired roles or suggest who employee should talk to or help them make a connection.</p>
<p>What actions will you take to achieve your development goals?</p>	<p>Refer to your job crafting actions. Use the Development Action Guide for additional ideas for developmental work experiences, opportunities to learn from others and formal learning opportunities. Prioritize up to 3 actions you are willing to commit to.</p>	<p>Make sure development actions are realistic.</p> <p>Ask: How will you balance the new actions we identified and the rest of your workload?</p> <p>Ask: How can I support you in your development?</p>

Step 3: Finalize plan, start implementation and schedule bi-monthly follow-up meetings so you can stay on track.

Step 4: Follow-up meetings

Sample reflection questions for a follow-up meeting:

- What actions from the PDC plan did I complete? What was the impact on me, my colleagues, the organization? How can I take these to the next level? If I encountered some challenges, how did I overcome them?
- What actions from the PDC plan did I not yet take? What has gotten in the way? Can I still complete them or do I need to modify my plan? If not, what else can I do?

C. Business rationale for implementing job crafting in organizations.
Platforms to introduce job crafting to an organization.

It is important to understand the business, human capital and HR strategies of the organization before choosing a platform to promote job crafting.

In the table below, the first column lists programs or initiatives that are likely to exist in business organizations and could align well with job crafting. The second column lists stakeholders in organizations who usually drive these initiatives. The third column lists empirically grounded outcomes of job crafting (see Chapter III) that could be emphasized to get buy-in from those stakeholders.

Platform / Entry Point Existing organizational initiatives that job crafting can sit on	Interested stakeholders in large organizations People to talk to get buy-in for job crafting using each platform	Outcomes and points to emphasize with those stakeholders
Personal development / career development	HR Executive sponsors Leadership Development	Emphasize greater job-fit, greater development in current job, experimentation and higher career mobility
Employee engagement Best place to work	HR Executive sponsors	Engagement as key driver of increased performance. Role of manager in employee engagement.
Business growth / high performance	Business leaders	Increased performance driven by greater engagement. Employee job crafting efforts aligned with organizational goals.
Innovation / Continuous Improvement	Groups most focused on innovation: Research and Development Marketing	Creative problem solving. Encouragement of proactive behaviors. Continuous improvement ideas. Test and learn experiments
Collaboration / Teamwork	Groups implementing cross-functional / cross-business unit collaboration projects	Higher awareness of interdependence and relationships, helping behaviors, high quality connections, team effectiveness by aligning team’s work to complementary strengths of individual members.
Change management / organization development / transformations	Leaders of Transformation Projects HR Organization Development Organization Effectiveness	Greater adaptability, readiness for change and proactiveness. Continuous improvement.
Valuing Diversity Flexible Work Arrangements Generational differences in the	Workplace Inclusiveness and Diversity HR	Job crafting allows for unique ways to accomplish results. Better adaptability and building

workplace	Legal Employee Interest Groups (women, minorities)	relationship networks in a way that does not feel forced.
Wellness / Health Initiatives	Employee Benefits, HR Administration, Finance / actuaries	Emphasize employee well-being outcomes: job satisfaction, engagement, less absenteeism, greater energy and resilience, high quality connections