

Job crafting and organizational features: When to craft or not to craft

A qualitative study on how organizational features influence how employees craft their jobs within the Department of Occupational Health and Safety and Environmental Service of the Radboud University Medical Center.



Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen

Name: Josan de Gouw, BSc
Student number: s4148266
E-mail address: josan.gouw@student.ru.nl
Study: Master Business Administration
Specialisation: Organizational Design and Development
Supervisor: drs. L.G. Gulpers
Second examiner: dr. ir. L.J. Lekkerkerk
Date: Friday February 23th, 2018

Preface

Before you lies my master thesis, the last piece of work of my master Organizational Design and Development and the final step for graduation and receiving my master's degree in Business Administration. With this master thesis I also conclude some great years as a student of the Radboud University, a period that was very valuable for me in different ways.

Looking back at my master thesis, I can say that it was a long and in some ways unexpected journey with quite some hills along the way that I had not foreseen at the beginning of this thesis project. During this period I (more than ever) came to believe that some 'lessons' just take more time than others and that they have made this period into a more valuable and instructive personal experience. The last stretch to the finish line was a real sprint, but a fitting end for finishing my master and my time as a student.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank some important people, who supported me in many different ways. First, I would like to thank my supervisor drs. Liesbeth Gulpers for her guidance, patience, trust and detailed feedback during the execution of this thesis. Above all, I appreciate the fact that she triggered me to keep making my own decisions, even when I was having a hard time making particular choices. I believe that this was really helpful in finding my own ways. Besides, I enjoyed our meetings in which we had some valuable sparring sessions about the subject and in which we were also able to have a laugh or to have personal conversations. I would also like to thank my second examiner dr. ir. Hans Lekkerkerk for his time and efforts to read my master thesis and mw. Remke Friesen for her supporting words during our meetings.

In addition, I would like to thank my contact person at the AMD of the Radboudumc for his time, help and ideas. He gave me new inspiring insights that were helpful for defining the scope of this thesis and for conducting the interviews. Furthermore, I would also like to thank the interviewees for participating in my interviews and providing me with valuable information that was needed to delve deeper into the subject of job crafting. Finally, I would like to thank my family, boyfriend, friends and fellow students for supporting me during this master thesis trajectory, but also during my entire study period. They have made this period more joyful, cheered me up when needed and helped me 'craft' my own ways, thoughts and choices. I hope you enjoy reading my master thesis.

Josan de Gouw

Nijmegen, January 2018

Abstract

In today's working life and within literature in the field of job design, job crafting has emerged as a promising research topic that complements traditional top-down (re)design approaches. According to the literature, employees can craft their jobs by means of making changes to the task, relational and cognitive boundaries of their own jobs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), which in turn can be beneficial for the employee and the organization in different ways. Although job crafting is described as behaviour that is initiated by the individual, researchers acknowledge that organizational features play an important role in job crafting processes of employees. However, research on how these features influence job crafting is still in its infancy (Demerouti, 2014). Therefore, the aim of this master thesis is to gain an empirical and in-depth insight in how organizational features influence job crafting of employees working at the Department of Occupational Health and Safety and Environmental Service (in Dutch: AMD) of the Radboudumc, by means of exploring how these processes take place in practice, by means of qualitative research methods. The research question of this study is defined as: "How do organizational features influence job crafting processes by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?". In this master thesis a single (explorative) case study is conducted at one department of one organization. Furthermore, theory-oriented research is conducted in a qualitative way, with both inductive and deductive methods. Thirteen semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were conducted as a means of data gathering. The interviews are recorded on audiotape and transcribed afterwards. The collected data is analysed by means of a template analysis. The results of this study show that not all job crafting techniques were used by employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc in the same way as described in the literature. They were also used in different degrees. This could be explained by the fact that employees working at this department are mostly highly educated professionals who are independently operating (in teams) and see job crafting as inherent to their jobs or who make changes together. Moreover, organizational features were found to influence job crafting of employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc in different ways. Some organizational features, such as autonomy on the job, were important in facilitating job crafting of employees, whereas others, such as a supportive supervisor or a safe culture, appeared to support job crafting of employees. Furthermore, some organizational features, such as built-in task variety, lower the need for employees to engage in particular job crafting techniques. So, organizational features are found to influence the opportunity employees have in this case study to engage in job crafting, but also their need for doing so.

Table of contents

Chapter 1. Introduction	7
1.1 Job crafting in today’s working life.....	7
1.2 Theoretical relevance.....	8
1.3 Framing the research problem	9
1.3.1 Research problem and research question	9
1.4 Research approach.....	10
1.4.1 Theoretical contribution.....	11
1.5 Practical relevance	12
1.6 Outline of the thesis	13
Chapter 2. Theoretical Framework	14
2.1 Traditional theory on job design and job redesign	14
2.1.1 Individual job redesign - a proactive perspective	15
2.1.2 Job crafting within the proactivity perspective on job redesign	16
2.2 Conceptualizing job crafting	17
2.2.1 Comparing conceptualizations of job crafting.....	18
2.3 Antecedents of job crafting.....	20
2.3.1 Job crafting - a process view.....	22
2.3.2 Organizational features	23
2.3.2.1 Structural features	23
2.3.2.2 Relational features.....	24
2.3.3 How organizational features influence job crafting processes.....	25
2.3.3.1 The case of professionals	26
2.4 Theoretical framework	27
Chapter 3. Methodology	29
3.1 Research method.....	29
3.2 Research design	30
3.2.1 Exploratory case study	31
3.3 Case description.....	31
3.4 Semi-structured interviews	32
3.4.1 Interview guide	33
3.4.2 Sample selection	33
3.5 Data analysis.....	35
3.6 Quality of the study	36
3.7 Ethical research practice	37
Chapter 4. Results	39

4.1 Job crafting	39
4.1.1 Task crafting	39
4.1.1.1 Adding tasks	39
4.1.1.2 Dropping tasks.....	41
4.1.1.3 Emphasizing tasks	43
4.1.1.4 Redesigning tasks	45
4.1.2 Relational crafting.....	46
4.1.2.1 Building relationships	46
4.1.2.2 Altering the extent of relationships	48
4.1.2.3 Reframing and adapting relationships.....	49
4.1.3 Cognitive crafting	51
4.1.3.1 Expanding perceptions	52
4.1.3.2 Focusing perceptions.....	53
4.1.3.3 Linking perceptions.....	55
4.2 Organizational features.....	56
4.2.1 Structural features	57
4.2.1.1 Professional autonomy	57
4.2.1.2 The organization of work: A structural perspective.....	59
4.2.1.3 Task characteristics	61
4.2.2 Relational features	63
4.2.2.1 Organizational culture and climate	63
4.2.2.2 Role of the supervisor	65
4.3.1 Answer to sub-question 1.....	67
4.3.2 Answer to sub-question 2.....	68
4.3.3 Answer to sub-question 3.....	69
Chapter 5. Conclusion and Discussion	71
5.1 Conclusion.....	71
5.2 Discussion.....	74
5.2.1 Methodological reflection.....	74
5.2.1.1 Personal reflection on the research process.....	76
5.2.2 Theoretical contributions of the study	77
5.2.3 Recommendations for future research	79
5.2.4 Practical implications.....	81
5.2.5 Job crafting: a challenge for the supervisor	83
Literature	85
Appendix A - Interview Guide	93
Appendix B - Initial Template.....	97

Appendix C - Final Template 98
Appendix D – Code List..... 100

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Job crafting in today's working life

Since the beginning of this century, job crafting has become an increasingly popular and blossoming research topic in the field of job design, organizational behaviour and occupational health psychology (Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Fried, 2016). Moreover, job crafting has emerged as a new bottom-up perspective on job redesign and refers to “the actions employees take to shape, mold and redefine their jobs, by initiating physical and cognitive changes in the task and relational boundaries of their work” (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 180). In this sense, job crafting is a way to think about job design that, unlike traditional top-down perspectives on job redesign, puts employees “in the driver’s seat” as they can create different jobs for themselves (Berg, Dutton & Wrześniewski, 2013).

Job crafting is especially promising in times of change arising from economic, technological, global and demographic trends in today’s working life (Grant & Parker, 2009; Demerouti, 2014; Peeters, Taris & de Jonge, 2014). First, the nature of jobs has become more complex, dynamic and interdependent due to applications of information and communication technologies and the economic globalization (Grant & Parker, 2009; Oldham & Fried, 2016). In addition, the organization of work in terms of how, when and where work is conducted is changing as well, bringing along opportunities for flexible working methods and challenges for employees to balance work and nonwork domains (Peeters et al., 2014). Second, the mutual expectations of both employees and organizations regarding work are rising. Organizations are no longer seen as a place for lifelong employment, but are viewed more and more as a means for employees to strengthen their employability and to develop themselves (Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006; Grant & Ashford, 2008), and in which employees expect to fulfil an increasingly larger set of needs (Hornung, Rousseau & Glaser, 2008; Rosso, Dekan & Wrześniewski, 2010). At the same time, employees are also required and expected to be more proactive as there is greater competition and an increasing demand for innovation, reflecting the increasing importance of this type of behaviour in today’s workplace (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007; Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Taken together, job crafting is claimed to complement the traditional literature on job redesign, as job crafting can be useful in responding to the complexity of jobs nowadays and in dealing with the specific needs of the current workforce (Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Fried, 2016).

1.2 Theoretical relevance

Despite job crafting being a relatively new subject in the literature on job design, the body of research has expanded rapidly since its introduction in 2001. Most prior research on job crafting mainly explored the ways in which employees can craft their jobs and on the role of job crafting in the working lives of people (e.g., Lyons, 2008; Berg, Grant & Johnson, 2010; Berg, Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2010; Berg et al., 2013). Within this research, job crafting is found to take the forms of task, relational, and/or cognitive crafting (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001). Task crafting involves employees altering the number of tasks or the way tasks are carried out. Relational crafting means that employees make changes in the interpersonal interactions and relations at work. Lastly, cognitive crafting refers to altering how one views the job or aspects of one's job (Berg et al., 2013). Next to the qualitative and conceptual studies, some quantitative field studies have revealed that job crafting can be associated with positive outcomes for individuals who craft their jobs, such as a better work performance (e.g., Leana, Appelbaum & Shevchuk, 2009; Petrou, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2015), enhanced work engagement (Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012; Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2013b), a higher level of well-being (e.g., Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013), enhanced employability (Tims, Bakker & Derks, 2012) and other positive psychological states (Berg et al., 2010a).

In light of the trends in today's working life as described above, it becomes increasingly challenging to design jobs and work conditions that are beneficial for work-related well-being, motivation and performance for each and every employee in a merely top-down way, especially for employees with more complex, dynamic and non-routine jobs such as professionals or knowledge workers (Demerouti, 2014) and for organizations that adopted flatter organizational structures (Wong, Skerlavaj & Cerne, 2017). Therefore, more recent job redesign approaches, such as job crafting, have come to recognize the role of the employee as proactive agents forming their own jobs (Grant & Parker, 2009; Nielsen, 2013; Oldham & Hackman, 2010). However, not every employee in every work context may feel inclined to make changes to his or her job (Demerouti, 2014). More specifically, the occurrence of job crafting techniques or efforts at least partly depend on features within the organizational context (e.g., Berg et al., 2010b; Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Hackman, 2016). Moreover, Berg et al., (2010b), have theorized that job crafting occurs "in the context of employees' prescribed jobs, which is marked by tasks, expectations and positions within the organizational context". Any of these related organizational features, for instance autonomy or discretion (Leana et al., 2009; Berg et al., 2010b) or empowering leadership (Wang, 2016), may influence employees' perception of their opportunity to engage in job crafting (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Ghitulescu, 2007).

Likewise, job crafting has recently been assumed as a practice that can be challenged or facilitated by the organization, when creating or not creating the ‘right’ boundary conditions (e.g., Berg et al., 2013; Oldham & Fried, 2016; LeBlanc, Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). However, to date relatively little is known about the role of these organizational features in job crafting processes and empirical research on organizational features as antecedents of job crafting remains scarce (Tims et al., 2012; Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Hackman, 2016).

1.3 Framing the research problem

As outlined above, many researchers (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al., 2010b; Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Fried, 2016), highlighted the importance of job crafting in today’s working life as well as its contribution to the literature on job redesign. Moreover, the influence of organizational features on job crafting processes has also been acknowledged. However, as research on the antecedents of job crafting is still in its infancy (Demerouti, 2014), researchers call for more empirical research on the role of organizational features within job crafting processes (e.g., Tims et al., 2014; Hackman & Oldham, 2016), in order to increase our understanding on how job crafting processes unfold in different organizational contexts. In this way, light can be shed on the circumstances within the organizational context in which job crafting takes place and on how job crafting of employees can be facilitated.

1.3.1 Research problem and research question

To study job crafting processes in practice, one of the departments of the Radboud University Medical Center has been approached to conduct an empirical research at, namely the Department of Occupational Health, Safety and Environmental services (in Dutch: Arbo- en Milieudienst), hereafter AMD of the Radboudumc. This department is part of a complex knowledge intensive and service oriented organization and counts over 60 employees, mainly professional knowledge workers working within different disciplines who support internal processes of the Radboudumc and the Radboud University of Nijmegen. This specific case provides an interesting organizational context to explore job crafting processes and the relationship with organizational features, as will be discussed later in this chapter. The objective of this study is: “To gain an empirical in-depth insight in how organizational features influence job crafting of employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc, by means of exploring how these processes take place in practice, by means of qualitative research methods.”

Following the objective of this study, the research question of this study is defined as: “*How do organizational features influence job crafting processes by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?*”.

Within former research (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Niessen, Weseler & Kostova, 2016) it has been suggested that the three forms of job crafting may be ‘predicted’ by different organizational features or in different ways. For example, jobs in high reliability organizations characterized by little discretion may limit task and relational crafting, but may give rise to crafting one’s perceptions (Berg et al., 2013). In line with this emerging reasoning and in order to provide an answer to the formulated research question of this study, three sub-questions are distinguished which are: (1) “How do organizational features influence task crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”, (2) “How do organizational features influence relational crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”, and (3) “How do organizational features influence cognitive crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?” The three formulated sub-questions are based on the three job crafting techniques as described by Berg et al., (2010b; 2013). When answering the how-questions as formulated above, insights will also be gained in which job crafting techniques are used and which organizational features play a role, as perceived by employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc.

1.4 Research approach

To provide an answer to the previously mentioned research questions, theory-oriented research is conducted, in which a contribution to existing literature will be made. Moreover, existing literature on job crafting processes (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al., 2010b; Berg et al., 2013) is used as a starting point to explore them in practice. Furthermore, this research will elaborate on the studies of Berg et al., (2010b) and Ghitulescu (2007), with regard to the relationship between job crafting processes and organizational features.

This study is conducted in a qualitative way, as qualitative research methods enable researchers to gain an in-depth understanding of processes and enable the researcher to capture the richness of an experience or phenomenon (Labuschagne, 2003). More specifically, an exploratory case study has been conducted as this is a useful method for studying processes within organizations and for exploring theory (Yin, 1984; Noor, 2008). So far, many of the studies on job crafting have a qualitative nature (Demerouti, 2014), as this approach enables the employees to share their perceptions of and experiences with job crafting (Berg et al., 2010b). Furthermore, Bakker,

Demerouti and Verbeke (2004), argue that qualitative research methods enable the researcher to generate knowledge on other organization specific elements during the research that are not defined at forehand. Moreover, to fully capture the process of job crafting and the role of organizational features, it seems necessary to collect personal stories, experiences and explanations. Therefore, semi-structured, open-ended interviews are conducted as a means of data collection, to be able to study employees' perceptions in more depth. In this master thesis a single case study is conducted, as data is gathered at one single department of one organization.

1.4.1 Theoretical contribution

This study makes contributions to the literature on job crafting in several ways. First, the case of this study involves professional workers, working in a knowledge intensive and service oriented department and who are mainly highly educated. According to the literature, such jobs are characterized by their complexity and 'rich' nature, which is due to for instance the non-routinized nature of the job tasks and the high level of skills and knowledge needed to perform tasks (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007). Moreover, due to organizational innovations such as re-engineering, self-managing teams and the increasing flexibility in work arrangements, the complexity of professional jobs is expanding (Demerouti & Bakker, 2014). The conceptual model of Wrześniewski & Dutton (2001) was based on insights on how hairdressers, nurses and hospital cleaners craft their jobs. More recent research involved job crafting of salespersons (Lyons, 2008), childhood educators (Leana et al., 2009) and assembly workers and special educational teachers (Ghitulescu, 2007). The case of this study provides an interesting context to explore job crafting as this case is not 'stereotypical', namely a knowledge intensive department with professional workers. Insights will be gained in whether and how job crafting techniques as indicated by former research (e.g., Berg et al., 2010b) take place in the same way in this case as indicated in the literature.

Second, as stated earlier, the main 'problem' that is addressed in this study is that there is little theory and empirical research with regard to the role of organizational features in job crafting processes of employees. Therefore, (which and) how organizational features influence job crafting techniques of employees in a particular single case is the central question looked at in this study. In this way, qualitative insights will be gained regarding which organizational features are perceived to play a role in job crafting processes and how these organizational features facilitate or challenge employees when they engage or want to engage in the three forms of job crafting.

The third contribution is related to the methodological choices made in this study. More specifically, in former research qualitative research methods were often found most suitable for studying job crafting, as discussed in the previous section. In this study, insight will be gained in whether a qualitative research approach is also suitable with regard to studying the relationship between job crafting and organizational features. This knowledge can be of value for future research on job crafting and the role of organizational features.

Concluding, this study can provide insights in what related topics and issues, such as more specific organizational features, other forms of job crafting related to this case study or methodological choices, should be paid attention to in future research.

1.5 Practical relevance

As becomes clear from the introduction of this study, job crafting is a promising research concept. Moreover, the surge of interest in employees' job crafting reflects the increasing importance of this type of behaviour in today's workplace in practice (Grant & Ashford, 2008; Grant & Parker, 2009; Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Furthermore, engaging in job crafting is associated with many potential benefits for employees, and in turn for the organization as well. Although job crafting is a bottom-up and individually driven approach, organizations are suggested to have a facilitating role in the engagement of employees in job crafting, for instance by giving them the 'freedom to do so', by creating a supportive climate or by designing particular boundary conditions (Demerouti, 2014; Oldham & Fried, 2016). Likewise, several scholars (e.g., Berg et al., 2010b; 2013) argue that job crafting is a concept that practitioners can use as a 'tool' to help employees foster specific personal outcomes themselves, such as enhanced person-job fit (Tims et al., 2012) or experienced meaningfulness (Berg et al., 2013), that in turn can positively influence other work-related outcomes.

In case of the department that will be looked at, the AMD of the Radboudumc, it could be relevant to gain a better understanding on how job crafting processes of employees in the department unfold and on how prevailing or present organizational features such as the design of one's job or the organizational culture, influence job crafting of employees. More specifically, professional workers will be looked at in this study, a case that is not stereotypical with regard to cases looked at in most former literature. It is interesting to look at the value of job crafting and specific forms of job crafting for these employees and to what facilitates or challenges them when making changes to their job and making their job more in line with personal interests or preferences. More specifically, exploring job crafting processes of employees in this department and looking at the role of organizational features with regard to

three distinguished job crafting techniques may be helpful for the professional workers in this department and the department itself, as job crafting is associated with many potential benefits for the employees and can influence how they experience their jobs.

1.6 Outline of the thesis

In the next chapter, the theoretical background with regard to the concept of job crafting will be discussed. In the third chapter, the methodological choices of this study will be elaborated on. Hereafter, in the fourth chapter, the results of the study will be presented and discussed. Moreover, in this chapter answers will be provided to the formulated sub-questions of this research. Lastly, in the fifth chapter of this research, the conclusion and discussion of the study will be presented. In the conclusion section an answer will be provided to the main research question of this study and in the discussion section, the limitations and the theoretical contributions of this research will be discussed as well as the recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the theoretical background with regard to the research topic will be presented. This chapter first discusses the theoretical roots of job crafting and shows how it can be situated within the broader literature on job redesign in section 2.1. This is followed by a review in section 2.2 of the state of the art on the conceptualization(s) of job crafting, in which will be elaborated on its different forms. In section 2.3, the antecedents of job crafting will be discussed as well as the process view on job crafting and the role of organizational features. Lastly, in section 2.4, a theoretical framework will be provided, which will demonstrate the theoretical lens through which the researcher has conducted this research.

2.1 Traditional theory on job design and job redesign

An employee's job is made up of "a set of task features and relationships grouped together under one job title and designed to be performed by a single individual" (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1992, p. 173). In this view, tasks are composed of "the set of prescribed working activities a person normally performs during a typical work period representing the most basic building blocks of the relationship between employees and the organization" (Griffin, 1987, p. 22). In addition, the design of jobs describes "how jobs, tasks and roles are structured, enacted and modified, as well as the impact of these structures, enactments and modifications on the individual, group and on the organizational outcomes" (Grant & Parker, 2009, p. 319). Traditional research on job design emphasizes the top-down, one-size-fits-all process of designing jobs, in which managers create jobs and form the conditions under which employees execute their tasks (Berg et al., 2010b; Demerouti & Bakker, 2014). In this way, jobs are not specifically designed to employees' personal motives, preferences or needs (Hornung et al., 2010; Demerouti & Bakker, 2014). Initially, job design is communicated to employees by means of written job descriptions, in which a static list of tasks, responsibilities and reported relationships is being displayed (Wrześniewski et al., 2013). Thus, employees performing the same job function will be provided with the same list of tasks and responsibilities. In this way, job designs can be used as a means of "top-down standardization and control" (Wrześniewski et al., 2013, p. 287). In addition to job design, job redesign describes "the process through which the management of an organization, more specifically a supervisor, makes changes to the tasks or job of an employee" (Tims & Bakker, 2010, p. 1). Traditional redesign efforts are focused on the fact that the structure and content of work can be redesigned by the organization, in order

to enhance work related outcomes such as performance, effectiveness, work engagement or employee well-being (Demerouti & Bakker, 2014).

A basic premise in the traditional literature on job design and job redesign is that so called ‘stimulating’ or ‘enriched’ jobs foster specific motivational states of employees, that in turn contribute to favourable behaviour and work outcomes, and positively influences one's work experience (Parker et al., 2006; Demerouti & Bakker, 2014). Some prominent theories such as the motivation hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966), the job characteristics model (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; 1980), socio technical systems theory (Trist, 1981), the interdisciplinary work design framework (Campion & McClelland, 1993) and the action regulation theory (Hacker, 2003) have stimulated much of the research in the field of job design and job redesign. A core assumption emerging from this traditional literature is that individuals are primarily viewed as passive receivers of the characteristics of their jobs, emphasizing their passive role in shaping their work experience and work activities (Ghitulescu, 2007; Wrześniewski et al., 2013).

2.1.1 Individual job redesign - a proactive perspective

The striking changes in the nature and organization of work, as described in the introduction of this study, have fuelled the rise of new theoretical perspectives in the field, guiding both scholars and practitioners in describing, explaining and changing the design of work (Barley & Kunda, 2001; Grant et al., 2001; Oldham & Fried, 2016). Moreover, traditional job design and redesign approaches have been criticized for no longer reflecting and integrating the changes in the work context (Humphrey et al., 2007; Grant & Parker, 2009; Hackman & Oldham, 2010). As a result, the literature on job design and redesign has gradually recognized that the ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach is no longer sufficient and that supervisors can no longer design fixed and static jobs in a merely top-down way. As jobs become more complex, work is increasingly socially embedded and expectations of employees are rising (Grant & Parker, 2009). Consequently, approaches recognizing the role of the individual as a proactive agent forming one’s job and job characteristics have come to complement the traditional job redesign literature (Fried et al., 2007; Oldham & Hackman, 2010; Bakker & Demerouti, 2014).

Within their review on redesigning work design theories, Grant and Parker (2009) describe the rise of the proactivity perspective on job redesign, emphasizing the growing importance of employees having an active role in (re)designing their job and of individuals taking the initiative in anticipating on how they enact their job, roles and tasks at work. In general, proactive behaviour can be defined as “taking initiative in improving current circumstances or creating new ones; it involves challenging the status quo rather than passively adapting to present

conditions” (Crant, 2000, p.436). Some important early perspectives on bottom-up individual job redesign at work can be found in theory on role innovation (e.g., Schein, 1971), organizational citizenship behaviour (e.g., Smith, Organ & Near, 1983), task revision (e.g., Staw & Boettger, 1990), personal initiative (e.g., Frese, Fay, Hilburger, Leng & Tag, 1997), employee voice (e.g., LePine & Van Dyne, 1998), role negotiation (e.g., Miller, Johnson, Hart & Peterson, 1999), job crafting (e.g., Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001), idiosyncratic deals (e.g., Hornung et al., 2008) and role adjustment (e.g., Clegg & Spencer, 2007). These concepts all imply that employees can go beyond their assigned tasks and job responsibilities in certain ways (Parker, Williams & Turner, 2006). In order to understand the concept of job crafting more closely, job crafting will be situated within the proactivity perspective on job redesign and will be compared to other concepts in the next section.

2.1.2 Job crafting within the proactivity perspective on job redesign

When reading the literature on bottom-up job redesign perspectives, several dimensions seem relevant in order to compare the perspectives related to how people enact their jobs. This section summarizes these perspectives along three dimensions found most relevant, which are: 1) the initiator and action orientation of the behaviour, 2) the impact and breadth of the behaviour, and 3) the content and depth of the behaviour. These dimensions were selected as they are supported by related literature reviews (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Grant & Parker, 2009; Tims et al., 2012; Vanbelle, 2017) and as they enable the researcher to contrast job crafting with related perspectives.

The initiator of the redesign behaviour can either be the organization (top-down redesign), negotiated between employee and employer (e.g., role negotiation) or initiated by the self (e.g., job crafting). Likewise, the action orientation of the behaviour is related to whether the employee's behaviour is reactive to specific cues in the work situation (e.g., task revision) or proactive and self-initiated (e.g., job crafting) (Ghitulescu, 2007; Tims et al., 2012). Second, the impact or breadth of the behaviour involves the intended primary target of the behaviour which can be focused on helping others or optimizing organizational goals (e.g., task revision and organizational citizenship behaviour) or focussed on the self and one's own work boundaries and thus not necessarily considering the effects on others or the organization (e.g., task revision and job crafting) (Grant & Parker, 2009). Third, the content of action involves what an employee is actually changing (Ghitulescu, 2007). This can either be actual behaviours (e.g., task revision) and/or cognitions and beliefs (e.g., job crafting). Likewise, the depth of the

behaviour involves whether the behaviour may change work identities of the individual (Ghitulescu, 2007; Wrześniewski et al., 2013).

Job crafting involves actions initiated by the employee that are aimed at changing something in one's own job and own work experience. Job crafting activities or techniques can range from changing the way one performs tasks, taking on additional tasks, changing one's work goals or altering relationships at work. In this sense, job crafting is mainly focussed toward one's own job and is not primarily intended at improving others' work or organizational performance (e.g., as organizational citizenship behaviour). However, this may be 'byproducts' of job crafting behaviour in certain situations (Ghitulescu, 2007; Demerouti, 2014). For instance, employees may find superior ways to perform their tasks, thus having an important contribution to organizational innovation. Furthermore, in contrast to other related concepts, job crafting may not only include actual behaviours, but also cognitions or perceptions about one's work. For example, Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) argue that job crafting can create alterations in the meaning of work and revisions of one's work identity. Within section 2.2.2 the different forms of job crafting will be discussed in more depth.

Taken together, there may be some overlap between the concept of job crafting and the conceptualizations of other job redesign constructs, but none of them captures the essence and the multi-faceted character of job crafting. Moreover, one of the basic premises of job crafting is that it can exist next to other top-down and bottom-up redesign approaches (Wrześniewski et al., 2013; Demerouti, 2014). In this way, defined tasks or working procedures and for instance organization's attempts to (re)design enriched jobs based on of the theories as discussed in section 2.1, could be viewed as a starting point from which employees initiate changes themselves.

2.2 Conceptualizing job crafting

The literature on job crafting mainly draws on two theoretical views. On the one hand, Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001, p. 179), the founders of the concept, refer to job crafting as "the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work". Within their conceptualization, Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) distinguish three forms of job crafting, which are task crafting, relational crafting and cognitive crafting. Employees can change the scope, the number (quantity) and type (quality) of tasks they conduct at work, by means of task crafting. By means of relational crafting, employees can make changes in the amount and nature of interactions and relationships they have at work. By means of cognitive crafting, employees can alter the way they perceive their job, or aspects of their

job. According to Wrześniewski & Dutton (2001) employees craft their jobs in order to cultivate meaningfulness in what they do at work and to create a work identity capturing who they are at work. The work of Wrześniewski & Dutton (2001) led to much more, especially qualitative, research on job crafting (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Lyons, 2008; Leana et al., 2009; Berg et al., 2010b; Berg et al., 2013; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013).

Next to the conceptualization of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001), Tims and Bakker (2010) situated job crafting within the job demands-resources model (JD-R model), developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2007). Tims and Bakker (2010, p. 4) define job crafting as “the actual changes employees make in their level of job demands and job resources in order to align them with their own abilities and preferences”. Moreover, based on the distinction between job demands and job resources, Tims et al., (2012) distinguish four different types of job crafting. Employees can either decrease the level of hindering job demands (e.g., emotional demands), increase the level of challenging job demands (e.g., tasks that require new skills), increase the level of structural job resources (e.g., autonomy), and increase the level of social job resources (e.g., social support). Tims et al., (2012) were the first to develop and validate a job crafting scale, which boosted further quantitative research on job crafting (e.g., Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012; Petrou et al., 2012).

2.2.1 Comparing conceptualizations of job crafting

Although these two main conceptualizations use different definitions and forms of job crafting, they have two crucial features in common, namely: 1) job crafting is about employees making self-initiated changes to their job, 2) with a pro-self-focused purpose (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Niessen et al., 2016; Vanbelle, 2017). Moreover, both task crafting and relational crafting of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) can be fitted into the theoretical framework of Tims and Bakker (2010). Employees might alter their task boundaries as they seek to increase structural resources or challenges, for instance by taking on additional tasks, or as they aim to reduce hindrances. Furthermore, relational crafting can be linked to changing social job resources at work as well as reducing hindrances such as limiting emotionally intense interactions (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013).

The main difference between both conceptualizations is that Tims and Bakker (2010) explicitly choose to focus on actual changes employees make. Hence, they do not include a dimension related to cognitive crafting or changing perceptions, as this, in their opinion, refers to coping with specific circumstances instead of actively shaping or changing them (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Niessen et al., 2016). Furthermore, the authors account for different reasons to

craft, such as creating meaning and identity at work (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al., 2013) and enhancing one's person job fit and well-being on the other hand (Tims & Bakker, 2010). However, Berg et al., (2013) do acknowledge that creating a better person-job fit is one of the main reasons employees craft their jobs, as this can lead to enhanced meaning or identity derived from work.

The remainder of this master thesis follows the conceptualization of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) and more recent insights from studies building on this conceptualization (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Niessen et al., 2016), especially as this traditional conceptualization forms the basis for the majority of qualitative studies on job crafting and therefore, fits the qualitative character of this study. Furthermore, within this study, cognitive crafting is viewed as important component of job crafting as it can serve as an important proactive strategy for achieving fit with the work environment and guides how individuals engage in changing one's work differently (Lu et al., 2014; Niessen et al., 2016). Moreover, the cognitive aspect differentiates job crafting from related constructs, as described in the previous section. In the next section, the three forms of job crafting, also described as job crafting techniques, as distinguished by Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) within their conceptualization are discussed in more depth.

2.2.2 Forms of job crafting

The first way of job crafting, task crafting, refers to the activities that can shape the content, number or scope of the tasks one performs at work and is targeted at changing one's task boundaries (Wrześniewski et al., 2001). Therefore, job crafting through changing tasks is related to employees "altering the set or nature of responsibilities prescribed by a formal job description" (Berg et al., 2013, p. 81). More specifically, employees may choose to do fewer, more or different tasks than originally prescribed in their formal job description and job responsibilities or decide to perform them differently (Berg et al., 2013; LeBlanc et al., 2017). The addition of certain tasks will mostly require the addition or development of new and desirable skills or competencies. According to Berg et al. (2010b; 2013), task crafting can be done by (1) adding tasks - employees can take on extra tasks and projects within the job, for instance to create more task variety, (2) dropping tasks - employees can decide to transfer tasks which they for instance do not perceive as meaningful, (3) emphasizing tasks - employees may allocate more energy, time and attention to specific parts of their job and thus, alter the scope of existing tasks, or (4) redesigning tasks - employees may change how existing tasks are carried out and alter their nature, for instance when making tasks your own.

The second way through which jobs can be crafted is by means of changing relationships (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001). Relational crafting involves “changing either the quality or amount of interaction with others at work, or both” (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 185). More specifically, employees can invest in building new relationships, reframe or strengthen extant interactions or opt to avoid specific demanding relationships (Berg et al., 2010b). Relational crafting can be done by (1) building relationships - employees can establish new relationships with others at work, (2) altering the extent of existing relationships - for instance by increasing or limiting the amount of interactions with specific others, (3) reframing relationships - employees can change the nature of existing relationships for instance by giving it a new purpose, or (4) adapting relationships - employees can create a reciprocal relationship of help and support with existing relationships and thus, deepen the relationship while increasing levels of mutual trust and positive regard (Berg et al., 2010b; Berg et al., 2013).

The third form in which jobs can be crafted is through cognitive crafting (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001). The first two forms of job crafting as discussed above, task and relational crafting, are related to changing something ‘objective’ or ‘physical’ in either the tasks performed in a job or within the interactions or relationships employees have while performing these tasks (Berg et al., 2013). In contrast to these two forms of job crafting, crafting one's perceptions, called cognitive crafting, does not involve changing ‘physical’ aspects of the job (Berg et al., 2010b). Wrześniewski et al., (2013 p. 283), define cognitive crafting as “employees’ efforts to perceive and interpret their tasks, relationships, or job as a whole in ways that change the significance of their work”. Moreover, cognitive crafting allows employees to appreciate the broader effects of their work and to recognize the value that their job may hold in their life (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013). Cognitive crafting can be done by (1) expanding perceptions - employees can think of their job as a whole rather than a collection of separate tasks and so broaden their perceptions of the impact or purpose of their job, (2) focusing perceptions - employees may narrow their perceptions by focussing on tasks or relationships that are particularly valuable or significant to them, and (3) linking perceptions - employees “taking advantage of existing components of their jobs by drawing mental connections between specific tasks or relationships and personal interests, outcomes, or aspects of their identities, that are meaningful to them” (Berg et al., 2013, p. 94).

2.3 Antecedents of job crafting

Within their theoretical model, Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) argue that every individual has some degree of latitude in whether and how to engage in the job crafting techniques as

described above. However, as mentioned earlier, not every employee in every work context may feel inclined to make changes to his or her job (e.g., Tims et al., 2014; Vanbelle, 2017). Within previous research on the antecedents of job crafting two broad approaches have been adopted to address what aspects trigger employees to engage in job crafting. The first approach focuses on personal or individual attributes as determinants of job crafting. Within this line of research the implicit reasoning is that certain individuals are more likely than others to actively redesign their job (e.g., Bakker et al., 2012; Petrou & Demerouti, 2015). Moreover, employees' work orientation (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001), proactive personality (Bakker et al., 2015), regulatory focus, (Petrou, 2013; Petrou & Demerouti, 2015), daily self-efficacy (Tims et al., 2014), self-image (Lyons, 2008) and work experience (Ghitulescu, 2007) are found to influence the degree to which employees craft their jobs.

Besides individual attributes having an impact on job crafting behaviour, job crafting is also influenced by features within the organizational context (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Tims et al., 2012). More specifically, when other aspects (e.g., individual differences) being equal, "some types of jobs, job venues or organizations will offer opportunities, invitations and perhaps, incentives to employees to modify their jobs" (Lyons, 2008, p. 27). Furthermore, not all jobs and job situations are equally conducive to job crafting (Berg et al., 2013). In line with these reasoning's, the second approach within research on the antecedents of job crafting (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Leana et al., 2009; Berg et al., 2010b; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Petrou et al., 2012) has focused on organizational features, such as the design of jobs or characteristics related to the organization, as stimulators of job crafting. Moreover, in this approach job crafting is examined from a more process oriented lens in which the organizational context plays an important role (Berg et al., 2010b).

Certainly, some individual difference features such as need for control over work, one's personality, motivational orientation, need for connection with others or need for challenge in work have potential implications for job crafting as mentioned earlier (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Ghitulescu, 2007; Demerouti, 2014). However, in line with the aim of this study and due to the scope of this thesis, there is no immediate intention to further investigate the role of these individual features or their interplay with organizational features in this research. Instead, features within the organizational context will be the main focus of this study. In the following section, the process view on job crafting will be discussed more deeply, as well as the role of organizational features and the related gap in the literature.

2.3.1 Job crafting - a process view

As already described in the first section of this chapter, job crafting puts the proactive, agentic behaviours of employees' centre-stage and involves employees creating or initiating changes to the boundaries of their jobs (Wrześniewski et al., 2013). However, job crafting is not an isolated or one-time event. On the contrary, job crafting can be viewed as a more continuous process, that is likely to be influenced by the context in which employees do their work (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b). This process view on job crafting corresponds with related constructs in the literature, such as the process model of proactive behaviour (Parker et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2010) and the issue selling process (Dutton et al., 2001).

In line with the propositions of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001), Berg et al., (2010b) propose that job crafting is a contextually situated process shaped in part by challenges perceived in the organizational context. More specifically, Berg et al., (2010b, p. 160) propose that “employees’ structural locations shape how they construct and act on their perceptions of the challenges to job crafting that they foresee or encounter along the way”. They define challenges as “perceived problems or constraints that limit opportunities to take action, focusing on challenges that employees perceive as limiting opportunities to craft their jobs as well as challenges encountered during their attempts to craft their jobs” (Berg et al., 2010b, p. 159). Challenges perceived during the process may for instance be located in the design of one’s job or in expectations and behaviour of others (Berg et al., 2010b). In order to overcome perceived challenges for job crafting within the organizational context or to prepare the way for job crafting, job crafting sometimes involves or requires adaptive efforts of employees. Adaptive moves may be enacted before crafting one’s job (e.g., building trust or approaching specific others), during a job crafting attempt (e.g., deploying strengths) or after a job crafting attempt (e.g., adjusting expectations) (Berg et al., 2010b).

On the contrary, organizational features can also provide opportunities to engage in job crafting and facilitate job crafting processes (Berg et al., 2010b; Berg et al., 2013; Niessen et al., 2016). More specifically, particular jobs or features of the organizational context can encourage employees to engage in job crafting or may facilitate job crafting intentions or efforts of employees (Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b). These facilitators can be found for instance in having enough decision latitude to make particular changes or in feeling supported by others in doing so. In the next section, organizational features that may be involved in job crafting processes, as implicated by prior research, will be discussed in more depth.

2.3.2 Organizational features

The importance of organizational features in influencing job crafting processes is suggested and demonstrated in prior research on the antecedents of job crafting (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b; Tims et al., 2012; Wang, 2016). In line with the conceptual model of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), Ghitulescu (2007) hypothesized that job crafting is a function of several structural and relational features related to the work context. Structural features such as autonomy on the job (e.g., Leana et al., 2009; Berg et al., 2010b), task complexity (Ghitulescu, 2007) and task interdependence (e.g., Niessen et al., 2012) are assumed to either restrict or enable employees to engage in job crafting. On the other hand, relational features such as the work climate (Ghitulescu, 2007), perceived social support (e.g., Tims et al., 2012) and transformational leadership (e.g., Wang, 2016) are also proposed to influence employees' job crafting processes. Hereafter, both categories of organizational features will be discussed in more depth. It is important to note that the discussed features are selective rather than exhaustive, due to the scope and the explorative character of this study. The features discussed below are selected based on prior research and their expected value with respect to the case of this research, as will be discussed in section 2.3.3.1 of this research.

2.3.2.1 Structural features

Within their model, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) theorized perceived work discretion (job autonomy) as an important prerequisite for job crafting. Hackman and Oldham (1976, p. 257) define autonomy on the job as “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures used in carrying [it] out”. A high level of job autonomy is generally thought to be beneficial at work (Humphrey et al., 2007), and studies have demonstrated that increased autonomy is positively associated with proactive behaviour and personal initiative (Frese et al., 1996; Ghitulescu, 2013; Hornung & Rousseau, 2007). Discretion over work enables an individual to adapt work elements to his or her skills and preferences, and creates a sense of responsibility and ownership in work regarding both the task and relationship sides (Ashforth & Saks, 2000). Moreover, employees who experience increased discretion in how to carry out their jobs may experience more psychological empowerment and control (Spreitzer, 1995, 1996) and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Theoretically, job crafting should be fostered by a sense of discretion that employees have in what they do in their jobs and how they do their jobs (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) and thus opening up opportunities to reflect about the job

and/or to effectively change task and social boundaries (Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b; Niessen et al., 2012; Petrou et al., 2012).

Next to autonomy on the job, theoretical work on job crafting (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001) has suggested that interdependence actually decreases one's perceived opportunity to craft the job. In any kind of organizational setting, there is some degree of task interdependence built into work, such that individuals do not carry out their tasks in complete isolation from the work of others (Ghitulescu, 2007). Task interdependence is defined as "the extent to which the items or elements upon which work is performed or the work processes themselves are interrelated so that changes in the state of one element affect the state of others" (Scott, 1987, p. 214). When task interdependence is perceived high, employees need to communicate and exchange resources, and they depend more on others to complete their work (Wageman, 1995). As a result, when employees aim to craft their job on the task level, they have to anticipate on the work of others. This might restrict the degree of possible task alterations (e.g., Berg et al., 2010b; Niessen et al., 2012). Moreover, task interdependence might restrict opportunities to craft social boundaries at work because it determines, to a certain degree, which individuals work together (Niessen et al., 2012).

Lastly, the nature of tasks performed by employees, for instance the task's' complexity, is also proposed as an important structural feature. Task complexity generally refers to the difficulty or ease involved in completing the task, involving specific knowledge, skills or resources (e.g., Wood, 1986). When tasks are perceived more complex, individuals need to make adjustments in their tasks strategies to accommodate the complexity they encounter (Ghitulescu, 2007). Moreover, since complex tasks require more exploration activities, employees will be more likely to interact with others in order to learn new knowledge or strategies (Ghitulescu, 2007; Tims & Bakker, 2010).

2.3.2.2 Relational features

Next to structural features, the relational or social context of work is also likely to shape job crafting behaviour, as the social context is a strong predictor of how individuals perceive their work in general, of sensemaking processes and of behaviour in the workplace (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Wrześniewski, Dutton & Debebe, 2003). Within the literature on job crafting, supportive leadership, a safe and supportive work climate and related social support are already theorized as important features with respect to job crafting. However, to date the role of relational features, such as the influence of leadership on job crafting, is often described in a relatively simplistic way.

At first sight, the influence of leadership on job crafting may seem paradoxical, as job crafting is initiated by employees themselves rather than instructed or designed by managers. However, some scholars (e.g., Berg et al., 2008; Demerouti, 2014; Haken & Mutanen, 2014; Wang, 2016) do argue that the role of leadership is important in facilitating job crafting behaviour. More generally, Parker and Wu (2014) suggested that leaders play a critical role in increasing or decreasing employees' motivation to behave proactively and be creative at work (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Moreover, different types of leadership should provide employees with more or less freedom, resources or legitimate reasons to engage in job crafting (Wang, 2016). Transformational leadership for instance, could encourage employees to find new ways of work, to address specific others and to reflect on personal formulated goals and thus to engage in all three forms of job crafting. Likewise, empowering leadership may make employees feel that they have the freedom to take initiative (i.e., self-determination), that they have the ability to successfully perform their tasks (i.e., self-efficacy) and that they are able to make a difference (i.e., impact) (Wang, 2016). Furthermore, supportive leadership can create a climate that is supportive of experimentation and new approaches to work, such as job crafting, as it ensures that employees feel comfortable in taking risks and trying new things (Ghitulescu, 2007). Likewise, Ghitulescu (2007) argues that a supportive interpersonal work climate may be important for individuals to engage in job crafting as it supports experimentation, trying new things and doing things differently and therefore facilitates individual learning, creativity and innovation at work (e.g., Cunha, Cunha & Kamoche, 1999; Vera & Crossan, 2004). Moreover, when employees perceive the interpersonal climate as safe (i.e., psychological safety), they are found to take more risks regarding task strategies, will interact more with others and are proactive in asking feedback from others, and thus will be more willing to be vulnerable to others (Rousseau et al., 1998). When individuals perceive their work climate as being safe for interpersonal risk taking and experimentation, they will feel more comfortable in crafting their jobs because others will not reject them for this, but will actually encourage them to do so (Ghitulescu, 2007).

2.3.3 How organizational features influence job crafting processes

As discussed in the previous section of this chapter, organizational features, both structural and relational features related to the organizational context, are likely to influence job crafting behaviour of employees. Following the reasoning of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) and Berg et al., (2010b), structural features are proposed to open up opportunities for employees to engage in job crafting (e.g., perceived autonomy on the job may enable an employee to take on

additional tasks) or to limit the opportunity to engage in job crafting (e.g., high task interdependence may hinder an employee to redesign existing working procedures). Moreover, challenges could arise in the employee's' ability to enact the job crafting activity or thought (Berg et al., 2010b). Relational features are assumed to shape the form of job crafting behaviour as well, as the social context for instance, can encourage employees to engage in job crafting (e.g., empowering leadership may activate an employee to take on a new role) or demotivate employees to engage in job crafting (e.g., lack of support from colleagues may scare employees to perform tasks differently).

Although some knowledge has been gained in previous research on which organizational features are involved in job crafting processes and on how they influence these processes, this relationship is probably more complex than previously suggested (Berg et al., 2010b). Moreover, empirical studies should elaborate the theory on job crafting processes across different organizational contexts in order to understand how job crafting unfolds and to understand the influence of organizational features. In the next section, the characteristics of the case selected for this research are discussed in more depth.

2.3.3.1 The case of professionals

As already mentioned in section 2.3.2, the organizational features derived from theory as discussed above are rather selective than exhaustive. One of the main reasons is that there is no exhaustive theoretical framework describing which organizational features influence job crafting behaviour in what ways. Furthermore, the nature of organizational features, as well as the related challenges and facilitators for job crafting, differs among different types of organizations, different types of jobs and different types of employees working within the organization (Berg et al., 2010b). In this research, professionals working in a service oriented, knowledge intensive department, namely the AMD of the Radboudumc, have been selected in order to explore the relationship between organizational features and job crafting.

There are several reasons why the work of professionals in this type of organization (and department) provides an interesting context to explore job crafting processes and, the influence of organizational features. First, the work of professionals in this service oriented department provides employees a significant level of autonomy and discretion to perform their jobs, and thus probably enhances their opportunity to engage in job crafting activities. Second, professional workers in this department draw upon a broad range of skills and knowledge to perform their jobs and it is likely that there are opportunities to develop these resources. Third, their work can be interpreted as ambiguous as there is not always “one right way to do the job”.

Moreover, in order to tailor and expand their work practices and to accommodate various demands and complex situations related to their jobs, they are likely to continuously adapt new work approaches. Fourth, the AMD of the Radboudumc contains multiple professional groups of people working in distinct and relatively autonomous teams, such as a team consisting of occupational health physicians and a team of biorisk professionals, all developing their own work practices and fostering their legitimacy in the organization. It is interesting to study how work that is organized in relatively autonomous teams might influence job crafting of individual members. Lastly, employees working in this department might face different identities, such as their own professional work identity, their occupational or work group identity and the identity of the organization. Work identity aspects (e.g., professional identification) may have a strong impact on the cognitive facet of job crafting (Ghitulescu, 2007; Wrześniewski et al., 2013).

2.4 Theoretical framework

Our current understanding of job crafting processes and the influence of organizational features mostly originates from theoretical assumptions (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001), from some empirical studies within only a small variety of organizational settings (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Leana et al., 2009; Berg et al., 2010b) or from insights of research on related constructs (e.g., Parker et al., 2010). Questions are raised to further explore which and especially how organizational features influence job crafting processes of employees in different research settings and on how job crafting can be facilitated.

The starting point of this research is the experience of employees regarding their own job crafting attempts or activities. In order to study which job crafting techniques are used by employees within the selected case engage, the conceptualization of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) and the additions of other authors (e.g., Berg et al., 2010b; Berg et al., 2013) regarding different forms of job crafting as discussed in section 2.2 of this chapter, are used to study job crafting in practice. Furthermore, as discussed in section 2.3, more recent research has acknowledged that job crafting can be viewed from a more process oriented lens in which organizational features can either challenge or facilitate job crafting and thus shape the process. Therefore, the mechanism as suggested by Berg et al., (2010b) is used to explore how employees within the selected case perceive the influence of organizational features on their job crafting activities or attempts. As there is no exhaustive theoretical framework or process model on how organizational features influence particular job crafting activities, the subdivision between structural and relational features of Ghitulescu (2007) as discussed in section 2.3.1, is used to categorize and study emerging organizational features. Moreover, selecting a

specific case in this research, namely the case of employees in a professional and service oriented organization, enables the researcher to understand how present organizational features are perceived by the employees and how they influence job crafting processes of employees in a specific organizational context.

Chapter 3. Methodology

In the third chapter of this research insight will be provided in how the empirical study is conducted and analysed. In section 3.1, the research design of this study will be elaborated on. Hereafter, in section 3.2, the design of the research will be explained. This will be followed by a description of the research case in section 3.3. In section 3.4, the method of data collection will be discussed, after which the method of data analysis will be elaborated on in section 3.5. In the final part, the quality of the study will be discussed by means of different assessment criteria in section 3.5 and some ethical considerations will be discussed in section 3.6.

3.1 Research method

The objective of this study was to gain an empirical in-depth insight into how organizational features influence job crafting processes of employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc, by means of exploring how these job crafting processes take place in practice, by means of qualitative research methods. Furthermore, this study aims to further our understanding on job crafting processes, by exploring the role of organizational features in how employees engage in these processes, as perceived by the employee.

Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001) state that there are some methodological challenges with regard to studying job crafting for a couple of reasons. Job crafting is a highly dynamic process, it can occur in many different forms and directions and it is related to how employees view their work and themselves within their work. In addition, the authors state that they believe that “it is no coincidence that the examples of crafting we discovered in the organisational literature arose from detailed qualitative studies of work” (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 196). It will be difficult to fully capture the process of job crafting by means of survey items for instance, in which collecting personal stories and explanations is not possible. Studying the narratives of employees by means of qualitative methods may be the best way of studying the process of job crafting. Therefore, a qualitative research method is used to provide an answer to the formulated research question.

Moreover, according to Labuschagne (2003, p. 100), in qualitative research there is an emphasis on “processes and meanings that are rigorously examined, but not measured in terms of quantity, amount or frequency”. In addition, qualitative methods are chosen since qualitative data have particular strengths for understanding processes in practice because they have the capacity to capture temporally evolving phenomena in rich detail (Langley & Abdallah, 2011). Qualitative research enables the researcher to capture the richness of an experience, by means

of people's own descriptions, as detailed data will be gathered from a relatively small number of people or cases. Capturing this richness is needed to understand employees' experiences with engaging in job crafting processes. In this study, thirteen in-depth interviews were conducted, which resulted in detailed insights in how job crafting processes take place and how employees perceive the influence of organizational features in whether and how they engage in job crafting processes. A qualitative research approach best matched with answering the 'how-questions' of this study.

3.2 Research design

The research design of this study consists of a case study, which can be described "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2009, p. 18). Building theory from case studies is a research strategy "that involves using one or more cases to create theoretical constructs, propositions and/or midrange theory from case-based, empirical evidence" (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007, p. 25). Because of time restrictions and the scope of the study, one single case study is conducted in this master thesis. Single-case studies can richly describe the existence of a phenomenon in a particular context (Siggelkow, 2007). Since this study focuses on both individual job crafting attempts and the job crafting process as embedded within an organizational context, the case study has an embedded design (Eisenhardt, 1989). By exploring how individuals craft their jobs and by exploring the role of organizational features as perceived by the employee, an overview of job crafting as a process can be created, including potential mechanisms that are encountered during this process. Since the research question that is addressed in this study focuses on exploring job crafting processes, by means of studying job crafting activities of employees in a particular organizational context, and exploring how they are influenced by organizational features, a case study approach, with its ability to provide in-depth descriptions of dynamic, real-life phenomena, seems to be an appropriate research design. The case study approach also fits the aim of complementing existing knowledge on job crafting, since case studies are very suitable for creating novel insights and reframing theoretical visions (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). More broadly, theory-building research using cases typically answers research questions that address "how" questions in unexplored research areas particularly well (Edmondson & McManus, 2007), as is the case in this research.

3.2.1 Exploratory case study

According to Yin (1984), there are three types of case study research, which are explanatory, descriptive and exploratory. The primary aim of an exploratory case study is to extend our understanding of complex social phenomena and processes (Ogawa & Malen, 1991). This research design enables the researcher to conduct a comprehensive and open-ended search for relevant information. Since exploratory case studies are by definition often applied in a research context that is not clearly specified and still requires data for the formulation of valid hypotheses, the researcher is provided with a high degree of flexibility and independence with regard to the research design as well as the data collection (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). So, it enables the researcher to identify major themes and patterns associated with the phenomenon studied in practice (job crafting related to organizational features in a particular context), to develop constructs that embrace the patterns of the constructs and their relations and to propose conceptual perspectives that might serve as fruitful guides for further research (e.g., Yin, 1994; Rowley, 2002).

One of the approaches within this study is deductive, which implies the use of existing theory as a starting point to study a phenomenon in practice (Bryman, 2012). Regarding the concept of job crafting, present literature already indicated general dimensions and sub-dimensions that can be used for studying job crafting in practice. In this study, the three dimensions and related sub-dimensions of job crafting as described by Berg et al., (2010) and Berg et al., (2013), that both build on the theoretical model of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001), will be used as a starting point to understand and study the process of job crafting. However, we know relatively little about job crafting of employees within organizational settings similar to this case study and current literature does not explain how organizational features influence job crafting processes in particular empirical research settings. Therefore, this study also uses inductive methods and can be considered as exploratory, which means there is an open approach to the data collection, keeping in mind the concepts found in theory (Symon & Cassell, 2012). Furthermore, although theoretical themes are used in the analysis, the researcher studies job crafting with an open view, as this case study is not stereotypical in comparison with most former studies on job crafting.

3.3 Case description

For this study, empirical research is conducted at the Department of Occupational Health, Safety and Environmental Service (AMD) of the Radboud University Medical Center. Within this section, the research setting will be elaborated on. The Radboudumc is a teaching hospital

located in Nijmegen (eastern-central part of the Netherlands). The Radboudumc is one of the largest and leading hospitals in the Netherlands, currently employing over 10.000 employees. Together with the Radboud University Nijmegen, they form an academic health science center, offering educational services for over 4000 students in medical, medical bioscience, dentistry and molecular mechanisms (Radboud University, 2017).

The AMD is a department of the Radboudumc, belonging to the overarching HR department of the Radboudumc, and supports employees working at both the Radboudumc and Radboud University. Among 60 people, mainly professional knowledge workers, are working at this specific department, for instance occupational health physicians, safety and sustainability advisors, social workers and office employees. So, the this department has a diverse workforce in terms of different professions belonging to the same department. The AMD of the Radboudumc in general highly values issues related to the psychological and physical health of people and to how employees experience their work. As this department finds it important to pay attention to how people experience and conduct their work, it seemed to be a suitable and interesting department for this study in relation to job crafting. Moreover, after discussing the research proposal of this study with the contact person of this department, it appeared that the department was interested in the topic and that they were open for conducting the research at their department.

3.4 Semi-structured interviews

Case studies can accommodate a rich variety of data sources, including interviews (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). In this study, in-depth, open-ended interviews were used as a means of data gathering. The data that can be gathered by means of open-ended interviews are “direct quotations from people about their experiences, opinions, feelings and knowledge” (Labuschagne, 2003, p. 101). Furthermore, Kvale & Brinkmann (2009, p. 124), argue that, “a semi-structured interview seeks to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena”. More specifically, in this study interviewees will be asked to share their perceptions and experiences, making it important that the interviews are conducted in such a way that the interviewees are willing to openly share these. Moreover, as the interviews are face-to-face, the interviewees are able to express their feelings and emotions (Bleijenbergh, 2013). Observed nonverbal behaviour of interviewees during the interviews may be of importance when interpreting their answers while analysing the obtained data (Boeijs, 2012).

As the interviews are semi-structured (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2012), the researcher uses an interview guide with prepared open-ended questions. However, the order of questions and the follow-up questions are determined by the flow of the interview and the participants' answers, which is also in line with the explorative character of this study. Moreover, the questions are open-ended in order to give participants the opportunity to elaborate upon their own actions, reasoning's, and experiences. The questions require participants to recall their past job crafting processes, therefore, the researcher probes for recent memories and asks to describe these memories as detailed as possible by asking follow-up questions, and allows time for recall (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). In essence, semi-structured interviews are find best suited for this study, as the structure facilitates the sorting, analysis and comparison of the data, while the openness allows new perspectives and questions to arise (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2012). This gives interviewees the opportunity to elaborate on aspects of the job crafting process and organizational features they consider most important.

3.4.1 Interview guide

The interview questions are focused on current or past job crafting activities and the role of organizational features, as experienced by the interviewees. Interviewees were asked to describe how they engage or have engaged in job crafting processes as detailed as possible and how they perceive the role of organizational features within these processes. The interview guide (Appendix - A), and thus the questions and topics that were included in the semi-structured interviews about job crafting, were partly based on literature of Wrześniewski and Dutton (2001), Ghitulescu (2007) and Berg et al., (2010), whereas also self-invented questions were added to the interview guide.

3.4.2 Sample selection

Due to restrictions regarding the scope of the study, the potential population of research participants was constrained to a smaller sub-group. Saunders (2012), argues that many researchers adopt such an 'opportunistic approach' when trying to gain access to an organization and in the process of finding and choosing research participants, as of the many difficulties related to gaining this access. Moreover, according to Holt (2012), coercion should not be used ensuring people to participate in research studies as of ethical considerations. One criterion of sample selections should be that the researcher is able to meet the aim of the study by the collection appropriate data (Saunders, 2012). When using a non-probability sample, which is

the case in this study, the researcher should be enabled to gain these appropriate insights and understandings about the constructs that are being studied (e.g., Patton, 2002).

During the exploratory conversations with the contact person within the organization, people who are most likely to provide valuable information and who are available at the time were identified. The contact person informs the possible interviewees of the research and asks them whether they are willing to participate in the research. If so, the contact person informs them that they will be contacted by the researcher to schedule an interview. Moreover, the researcher also selected or approached participants based on their belongingness to different professions within the department. Hereafter, the researcher send an email to potential interviewees with some practical relevant information, and the interviews were scheduled. The email includes a short description on the subject and aim of the study and the methods of data selection. Since all participants are Dutch, the email, the interview guide and the interview were all written and conducted in Dutch.

In this study, 13 interviews were held with employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc and the supervisor of the department. In table 3.1 a detailed overview is provided on the interviewees, their corresponding job positions, the data and duration of the interviews. It is important to note that these names are fictional and made-up by the researcher, to protect the interviewees' privacy.

Table 3.1: Overview of interviewees, job position, date and duration

Interviewee	Job position	Date	Duration
Interviewee 1 - Cees	Sustainability consultant	20-07-2017	1:09:31
Interviewee 2 - Jolanda	Higher safety expert	27-07-2017	1:19:43
Interviewee 3 - Karin	Management assistant mid office	01-08-2017	1:15:30
Interviewee 4 - Patrick	Occupational health physician	07-08-2017	1:01:59
Interviewee 5 - Anne	Project manager	09-08-2017	1:03:08
Interviewee 6 - Harrie	Safety engineer	15-08-2017	0:56:20

Interviewee 7 - Marc	Biorisk professional	29-08-2017	1:08:02
Interviewee 8 - Rene	General manager	31-08-2017	0:40:12
Interviewee 9 - Gerard	Environmental and sustainability consultant	31-08-2017	1:03:45
Interviewee 10 - Mirjam	Occupational health hygienist	04-09-2017	0:49:38
Interviewee 11 - John	Corporate social worker	06-09-2017	0:55:36
Interviewee 12 - Hanneke	Management assistant front office	07-09-2017	0:58:54
Interviewee 13 - Kiki	Occupational health nurse	11-09-2017	0:51:22

3.5 Data analysis

The phase of data analysis in this exploratory study starts during the data collection phase. Transcripts of conducted interviews were analysed and used to adapt the interview guide for the remaining interviews. The interview transcripts are analysed by means of template analysis. Template analysis can be described as relatively flexible technique in analysing data, in which only a few procedures are specified (King, 2012). More specifically, this technique does not insist on “a fixed number of levels of coding hierarchy, instead it encourages the researcher to develop themes more extensively where the richest data (in relation to the research question) are found” (King, 2012, p. 429). This technique was found most suitable as an open approach towards the data is necessary to study the relationship between job crafting and organizational features in a inductive way, in line with the explorative character. At first, the initial template was developed based on relevant themes found in existing literature on job crafting. The initial template is displayed in a list form in Appendix - B. Hereafter, all fragments of textual data, in this case interview transcripts, that are considered relevant for this study are coded with either a few words from the fragment itself (data-grounded) or from a theme that was established in the initial template. The transcripts were provided with preliminary codes, which helped the researcher to organize the data. After coding a few transcripts, the researcher tried to establish themes within the first-order codes. Hereafter, more transcripts were coded and groups of similar codes were clustered together to produce more general higher order codes, referred to as ‘hierarchical coding’, allowing the researcher to analyse the transcripts at varying levels of

specificity (Symon & Cassell, 2012). As (sub)themes were developing themselves when coding new transcripts, the initial template was constantly changing, until all relevant codes are included within the template. Normally, the researcher moves from “more concrete and data-grounded to more abstract and interpretive” when doing template analysis (King, 2012, p. 429). However, as was stated earlier in this chapter, the research approach within this study is partly deductive, implying the use of existing theories as a starting point to study job crafting in practice. Therefore, the initial template was not established purely from the data, but based on present theory instead. However, when moving from the initial template towards the final template, an open approach has been applied. Consequently, during the analysis some additional (sub)themes were found when developing and clustering the codes. These ‘codes’ were (often) mentioned by interviewees, but were not part of the main focus of this study or directly related to answering the main question. Therefore, these codes and (sub)themes are not displayed in the final template of this study (Appendix – C), but are present in the data set.

3.6 Quality of the study

Many scholars in the field of qualitative research paid attention to what constitutes ‘good’ qualitative research (Symon & Cassell, 2012). In quantitative research, criteria such as reliability and validity are well known assessment criteria. However, some scholars (e.g., Seale, 1999; Easterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle & Locke, 2008; Denzin, 2012) have argued that qualitative research cannot be assessed by the same criteria as those applied to quantitative research, as the methodologies used by researchers in both areas highly differ. In qualitative research, subjectivity, interpretation, and emancipation can be noticed as key elements, whereas objectivity and generalizability for instance are important within quantitative research (Symon & Cassell, 2012). In order to assess the quality of qualitative research, four assessment criteria are indicated by Guba and Lincoln (1989), based on a naturalistic or relativistic research approach are looked at, namely ‘credibility’, ‘transferability’, ‘dependability’, and ‘confirmability’.

Credibility of a qualitative research relates to “rather than trying to find the best fit between interpretation and reality, the researcher tries to demonstrate a good fit between ‘constructed realities of respondents and the reconstructions attributed to them’” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 237). In other words, credibility assesses whether the phenomena are accurately captured by the researcher (Symon & Cassell, 2012). In this research, credibility is enhanced by keeping a record in a research notebooks, in which initial constructions and the researcher's' thoughts and development of understandings were written down. In this way, original constructions have

been challenged. Furthermore, thoughts and data were discussed with fellow students and the supervisor of this study. They acted as a sounding board for the development of this research. Lastly, throughout the research process, the data and researcher's interpretations were 'discussed' with the participants in several ways. For instance, preliminary findings were discussed with the contact person multiple times during the data collection phase. Furthermore, all interviewees were asked if they wanted to receive the transcripts of their interview, to enable them to check the transcripts on correctness.

The criterion of transferability refers to "rather than trying to demonstrate that the results can be generalized to all other contexts, the researcher provides enough detail about the specific research case that the reader can judge what other (similar) contexts - and particularly whether their own situation - might be informed by findings" (Symon & Cassell, 2012, p. 207). Transferability can be enhanced for instance by providing a thick description of the research case. The transferability of this study will be discussed in the discussion section of this study. Dependability of a qualitative research refers to how "methodological changes and shifts in constructions' have been captured and are made available for evaluation" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 242). During the research process, methodological decisions and thoughts on changing constructs were made explicit by means of keeping notes in a folder, in the analysis program Atlas.ti and in (private) online documents. In here, the researcher elaborated on why certain concepts or codes were being removed or reframed during the analysis or why changes have been made to the interview guide. The notes can be used by readers and other researchers who plan to study job crafting.

The last criterion, confirmability, refers to the accurate descriptions about "where the data came from and how such data were transformed into the presented findings (Symon & Cassell, 2012, p. 208). In other words, this criterion discusses how data was gathered and analysed, in such a way that the reader of this study can be assured that the data, interpretations and outcomes are "rooted in contexts and persons" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 243). In this research, the methods of data collection and analysis were elaborated on in the methods section. The recorded interviews were transcribed and analysed. This 'process' is displayed presented in Appendix - B and Appendix - C. Moreover, a list of the codes is displayed in Appendix - D.

3.7 Ethical research practice

As conducting a research within an organization is likely to influence people who are involved in the research or the organization, it is important that the researcher pays attention to 'proper' research and takes into account the potential harmful effects of the study (Holt, 2012).

Therefore, several ethical considerations were taken into account during each phase of the research project when conducting the research. These phases include the development of the research proposal, data collection, data analysis, reporting on findings and the dissemination of information.

During the development of the research proposal several possible ethical issues that might arise are considered. Therefore, care is taken to design the research project in such a way that no harm is done to participants and that their dignity is respected at any time. In consultation with the contact person of the department, the researcher discussed how the participants could be selected and approached properly. Interviewees were informed in advance about the aim and approach of the study, by means of a short description of the study within an email. Furthermore, participants were informed about the extent of involvement and the duration of the research and were informed on their ability to withdraw from the research at any time. Moreover, measures to ensure that ethical issues are taken care of in practice, such as confidentiality and anonymity of employees, were discussed and explicitly addressed during the research.

During the data collection phase, the researcher always asked the interviewees for permission to record the interviews and assured their anonymity. Furthermore, all interviews took place in a closed room to ensure that the recording went well and responses remained confidential.

Within the data analysis and reporting phase the information about the participants is treated anonymously and confidentially, and is used only for the purpose of this master thesis. Interviewees were given the opportunity to examine the transcripts, in order to make sure that their content was interpreted correctly. Potential remarks were processed by the researcher if necessary.

During the whole research process the contact person of the organization was regularly informed about the progress of the research. Furthermore, the participants could contact the researcher at any time by sending an email. All participants of the interviews were asked whether they would like to receive the final version of this research in order to get an insight in the results. In addition, a management summary has been written to inform all participants on the results of the study, with information on how the results could be interesting for themselves or for their department.

Chapter 4. Results

In this chapter the results of this study will be presented. The templates and the codebook that were used in and resulted from the analysis of this study are displayed in Appendix B - Initial Template, Appendix C - Final Template and Appendix D – Code List. How these templates and the corresponding codebook emerged will be elaborated on in this chapter. Moreover, answers will be provided to the three sub-questions of this study.

4.1 Job crafting

Job crafting can be subdivided, as indicated by the literature of Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), Berg et al., (2010b; 2013) in three sub-themes, which are: task crafting, relational crafting and cognitive crafting. The three forms of job crafting are present at the AMD of the Radboudumc (in different ways) and will be discussed in the following sections.

4.1.1 Task crafting

According to Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), task crafting is related to employees altering the content, number or scope of tasks or job responsibilities at work. Based on literature of Berg et al., (2010b; 2013), task crafting can be subdivided into four sub-themes, namely: ‘adding tasks’ (4.1.1.1), ‘dropping tasks’ (4.1.1.2), ‘emphasizing tasks’ (4.1.1.3), and ‘redesigning tasks’ (4.1.1.4). All four sub-themes of task crafting will be elaborated on hereafter.

4.1.1.1 Adding tasks

According to Berg et al., (2013), ‘adding tasks’ refers to employees including all kind of additional tasks or projects to their jobs. In this way, employees can create different jobs for themselves (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al., 2010b). From the stories of the interviewees it can be concluded that all employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc are able to add particular tasks and projects to their regular job responsibilities in different ways. Furthermore, employees in this case study have different personal and mainly work-related motives to do so. In light of the direction of this study, the most striking finding regarding this job crafting technique is related to how the opportunity of ‘adding tasks’ being part of the job

already influences the need of employees to add tasks or facilitates them in changing their set of regular job tasks and including new projects. Moreover, as their job descriptions ‘invite’ employees to engage in this job crafting technique, the proactive and bottom-up character of this concept (as theoretically assumed in section 2.1.2) may be questioned.

In line with the theoretical assumptions on this subject, most employees working at this department explain they are able to shape their own jobs by means of for instance adding specific new tasks (Hanneke and Kiki), engage in new projects (Cees, Jolanda and Paul), take on tasks or projects outside the organization (Paul and Harrie), developing new job responsibilities involving new tasks (Gerard, Marc and Anna) or join specific work groups or trainings (John, Hanneke, Jolanda and Paul). Throughout the interviews it became clear that their motives for doing so are often two-sided or intertwined. On the one hand, in line with literature of Berg et al., (2010b) and Tims and Bakker (2010), employees describe they add tasks or new projects for personal reasons, mainly based on their own needs, qualities, ambitions or interests. Hanneke for instance explains it is part of her personality to continuously seek for new ‘challenges’ in her work, and that she therefore changed her job on a more detailed level (in consultation with her supervisor), based on her own competencies.

“I for instance, together with my former senior, created a new schedule in excel. Now, ehm, as she has left the organization that has become my own little task (...). And what is nice as well, the daily distribution of rooms (...), well I see that as one of my darlings too. (...) I did that at my previous work as well (...).”
(Interview 12 Hanneke, note 39, 41; 44).

On the other hand, almost all employees recognize that picking up specific new tasks or projects should be of value for the department or the overall organization (Radboud University or Radboudumc). Although Demerouti (2014) already suggested that contributing to organizational performance may be a ‘by-product’ of job crafting, this work-related motive seems to play a more important role in this case than expected and often ‘occurs’ in combination with personal motives or needs. In the preliminary interview, Cees explains he decided to set up an additional project around a specific theme, based on both his personal beliefs as well as the added value for the department.

“Regarding the content, we already talked about that, so I am doing a lot on my own initiative. (...) With the students that’s a nice example. I literally told my boss that I believed we should organize something more around students, or at least that I wanted to do that (...). I think it is important to connect these students with each other (...), now I teach them communication skills for instance, I organized that myself. (...) I think that we, the AMD, should treat students decently (...). (Interview 1 Cees, notes 54, 56).

When discussing this matter, the interviewees in this study, like Cees, often referred to the nature of their job descriptions and point at the absence of an ‘extensive blueprint’, creating

room for them to add new tasks or projects or to take part in particular projects at their own initiative. Likewise, most employees explain they have discretion in their jobs to make particular decisions themselves (to a certain degree), providing them the freedom to add tasks. Jolanda for instance explains that taking initiative is ‘built into’ her job and that she can include tasks related to topics she believes are interesting for herself or valuable for the organization.

“Within my basic job profile, there are some basic tasks [*belonging to safety experts*], such as incidents and risk assessment (...). But, apart from that, you come into contact with other groups, where you have incidents. Yes, so we have pay attention to ehm, that we persevere things. There is built in a lot of own initiative, like there is no particular blueprint that tells me what to do in the morning (...).” (Interview 2 Jolanda, note 57; 59).

In a similar vein, other employees (Cees, Anna, Jolanda and Harrie) explain that they see taking initiative in picking up new tasks or projects as inherent to their jobs, and describe this as more daily behaviour. This may reduce the need to explicitly engage in this job crafting technique or raise questions on whether ‘adding tasks’ still captures ‘proactive’ behaviour. Besides their perceived autonomy and freedom, this is also supported or triggered by prevailing expectations or norms on ‘being a professional’ in this case study. Professionals working at this department are made responsible for their own content-area and feel they are expected to act in line with what is best for their profession and their subdivision. This may explain why most interviewees do not speak directly to ‘adding tasks’ the same way as described in the literature on job crafting (e.g., Berg et al., 2013). In section 4.2 this will be discussed more deeply.

What can be concluded is that employees in this case study are able to add tasks and projects in certain ways, and that they can alter their own job designs. Employees are free (to a certain degree) to pick up specific tasks or projects that are in line with their personal interests, needs or ambitions. However, employees often keep in mind what is important for their profession or subdivision when adding tasks or projects and believe it is part of their job to take initiative in picking up additional matters. Moreover, employees working at this department are expected to engage in ‘adding tasks’, making it difficult to draw a line between deliberate job crafting behaviour and ‘just’ performing one’s job.

4.1.1.2 Dropping tasks

Besides adding tasks, employees can also alter the design of their jobs by dropping certain tasks, projects or job responsibilities (Berg et al., 2010b). From the stories of employees, it can be concluded that employees in this case study make use of this technique, mainly for two reasons

that somehow differ from theoretical assumptions, namely when they want to enable themselves to pick up other tasks or projects or when they have to set priorities regarding what is important organization-wise. Moreover, in addition to current literature, spending less time on certain tasks (for instance tasks perceived as less meaningful or interesting) turned out to be an important variant of dropping tasks.

In line with literature on this form of job crafting (Berg et al., 2013), some employees (Cees, Mirjam and Kiki) explain they try to make their work more meaningful or in line with their own preferences by trying to drop certain ‘side tasks’. However, as employees are not always able to ‘fully’ quit entire tasks or aspects of one’s job (some of them are ‘obligatory’ or can only be performed by one particular professional), employees sometimes limit the time they spend to these tasks (that are often not related to the core of their jobs). Cees and Mirjam for instance explain they try to be less involved with particular administrative tasks or consultations and meetings, as they do not perceive them as really meaningful. Furthermore, Kiki describes that she found a way to be less concerned with one of her job responsibilities she dislikes.

“Yes it is really like, some things you just have to do. One day at the week for instance, I have to do something (..), a program I really dislike. It is something, what I think, that is not where I have become a nurse for, too little challenge. So, I told that and now I only have to do that one day in two weeks. (..) I ehm, yes created some space to do things I do like to do.” (Interview 13 Kiki, note 112).

Throughout stories of other employees, it became clear that some employees in this case study drop or transfer certain tasks, not because they do not perceive that particular task or project as not meaningful or important (as indicated by literature of Tims et al., 2012 and Berg et al., 2013), but for other reasons. On the one hand, employees want to enable themselves to spend more time on projects or aspects of one’s job that are perceived as more meaningful or interesting and therefore have to transfer an ‘old’ task as a logical consequence. For instance, because the ‘new’ task or project is more in line with the employees’ current ambitions or interests. Gerard for instance explains that his team was willing to take care of some of his regular job tasks, so he was able to drop them and in this way focus on particular new tasks.

“Next to that, I said that I wanted to take on an additional project (..), name something ehm, a ‘shitty task’ nobody wants to do. Give me that job. (..) And, ehm, look that new thing I was planning to do, was going to take two whole days in my working week. So, that automatically meant that I had to drop some things from my regular task package, to be able to do that. Fortunately that was possible. (..) Yes, sure that [*delegating tasks to team members*] is possible.” (Interview 9 Gerard, notes 48, 58).

When discussing this particular job crafting technique, it appeared that dropping tasks is often associated by employees with managing one’s workload. More specifically, some employees (Jolanda, Mirjam and Marc) feel ‘forced’ to drop or delay certain tasks or projects when their

workload is too high. Although employees feel in control when deciding which tasks or projects deserve priority, this behaviour does not particularly capture job crafting behaviour as conceptualized in this study, as it is not initiated by the self or aimed at enhancing the meaningfulness of work. However, it does illustrate the ability of employees to make their own decisions, based on particular knowledge and skills.

What can be concluded is that employees in this case study can shape their job design (to certain degrees) by dropping tasks or transferring them to team members to make room for new tasks or as particular tasks do not fit them anymore. However, employees are not always able to quit entire tasks or projects. In the latter case, spending less time on particular side tasks perceived as less meaningful becomes an important variant of this particular job crafting technique found in this case study.

4.1.1.3 Emphasizing tasks

The third way in which tasks can be crafted is by means of emphasizing tasks. According to Berg et al., (2013) employees may allocate more energy, time and attention to specific parts of their job, and thus leverage existing tasks perceived more meaningful or interesting. From the stories of the interviewees it can be concluded that employees (to a certain degree) emphasize specific aspects of their jobs for different reasons. As the reasoning behind emphasizing tasks does not particularly differ from former theoretical assumptions (e.g., Berg et al., 2013), the most remarkable findings in light of the aim of this study regarding this job crafting technique are related to particular limitations and facilitators employees often mentioned when discussing this subject. More specifically, employees with more 'static' job designs and fixed subtasks explain they are bound to these subtasks and to existing divisions of tasks within their subdivisions. However, divisions of tasks within sub teams may also enable employees to focus on aspects they perceive most interesting or are in line with one's own qualities or interests.

In line with the theoretical assumptions of this study, some employees (Mirjam, Helma, Paul, Marc and Hanneke) describe that they sometimes allocate more time and attention to specific aspects of the job they enjoy most or believe are most important. However, most employees also explain that they are either bound to fixed subtasks in their own job description, related to their profession (receiving clients, carrying out administrative tasks or joining staff meetings for instance) or to tasks that 'present' themselves in the organization (incidents for instance). A quote of Mirjam, one of the occupational health hygienists, is illustrative regarding such a situation.

“But yes, I think that I, the nicest part for me is contact with clients and go looking at work spots and doing research over there. But, I think that I spend thirty percent of my time to being at clients and yet, seventy percent is necessary to write reports, work things out, doing phone calls, sending emails, other administrative things or consultations. In my opinion that is a ridiculous amount of time. (..) Actually, I would like to spend more time to meet clients (..), yes you want to write a decent report as well (..). (..) So yes, that is a part belonging to the job (..). (Interview 10 Mirjam, notes 28;30).

Likewise, other employees (Paul and Marc) explain that some tasks just cannot be ‘deprioritized’ as they are too important for keeping things running at the department or for their overall performance. Furthermore, during some of the interviews it appeared that present divisions of tasks may limit the opportunity for spending more time to particular aspects in a way. More specifically, it is not always possible for the individual to ‘focus’ on particular issues or to leverage particular tasks or responsibilities perceived most interesting as one have to take into account the vision of the group and the agreements that are made.

On the other hand, another interesting finding related to the shared responsibility of dividing tasks and responsibilities can be found in the ability of individuals to develop ‘focus areas’ in one’s job. More specifically, within all subdivisions of this department, teams make arrangements on which employee focuses on which specific area or role relevant to the profession or the subdivision. In this way, it is reasonable to expect that team members can negotiate the role or subject they want to specialize or develop themselves in. Throughout the interviews it became clear that occupational health hygienists and corporate social workers for instance developed their own ‘fields of knowledge’. Such a way of working enables individuals in this case to emphasize parts of their job or profession they most interesting or in line with one’s qualities. Besides, as teams also develop shared visions and determine important aspects for the upcoming year together, this job crafting technique does not only capture individual behaviour. As Leana et al., (2009) already suggested, job crafting involves group-level thinking and acting, as it is often accompanied by divisions of tasks and shared visions within teams, involving negotiation and consultation within teams.

What can be concluded is that emphasizing tasks can be seen as a means for creating a job that suits one’s interests or skills better, especially when an employee perceives one aspect of his or her job as ‘more’ meaningful. This is in line with the theoretical assumptions of Berg et al., (2013). Challenges for leveraging existing parts of the job can be found in employees feeling bound to subtasks related to their job description or profession and to the current divisions of tasks. However, divisions of tasks may also enable employees to focus or specialize oneself in particular areas and thus to emphasize certain tasks. As divisions of tasks and shared visions

are being negotiated or developed together, this may be an indication of employees crafting their jobs together.

4.1.1.4 Redesigning tasks

The fourth way of task crafting is redesigning tasks and refers to employees changing how existing tasks are carried out (Berg et al., 2010b & 2013; Niessen et al., 2012). What can be concluded from the interviews is that employees in this case are able to develop their own ways of working and can fill in (to a certain degree) how work is carried out. The most striking finding on this subject is related to the value professional employees attach to this job crafting technique and the connection with some organizational features, namely professional autonomy, autonomous teams and the attitude of the supervisor. Moreover, in the literature (Berg et al., 2013) redesigning tasks is described as an ‘adaptive’ technique, that ‘appears’ when employees do not have the ability to engage in the other task crafting techniques. However, in this case employees believe that filling in how tasks are carried out (individually and together) and changing work procedures proactively, illustrates them being professionals.

Although working protocols, legislations and arranged working methods with team members may restrict employees from making particular changes, most employees in this case explain they feel free to decide how job tasks are carried out. Moreover, throughout the interviews some employees explain they give personal twists to their tasks and introduce more efficient (minor) working procedures, for instance by creating own styles in editing reports, texts or presentations (Harrie and Helma), by developing own treatment methods (John), by proactively approaching others (Jolanda and Hanneke) or by introducing new methods during team meetings (Anna). It appeared that these actions make employees’ jobs more in line with their own preferences, which is in line with theoretical assumptions of Berg et al., (2010b; 2013).

However, employees in this case seem to attach more value to having the ability to change tasks and working procedures, than to the actual result of the job crafting move. In a way, this illustrates the process view on job crafting discussed in section 2.3.1. The fact that employees see improving working methods as part of their professional jobs may explain this perspective. What is illustrative for this case is that having the ability to do so, is often related to employees’ interpretation of being a professional with particular degrees of autonomy. Within the fourth interview, Paul illustrates this interpretation.

“We always had a supervisor who starts from the principle of professional in the lead. That is not much about how a professional does his work, the professional knows best how to perform tasks in the best

possible way, the results have to be okay. We are judged as experts on the results, and how you actually do that, there you have much freedom to do so.” (Interview 4 Paul, note 101).

These beliefs seem to be supported or triggered by ‘giving’ employees the freedom and corresponding responsibility to decide themselves or to discuss in teams what are best practices for carrying out tasks. More specifically, as work in this department is organized in different teams who are made responsible for their own profession, employees are ‘invited’ to think about new ways of working, together. Moreover, as the supervisor of this department does not directly ‘judge’ the employees on a daily basis, but emphasizes them being ‘in the lead’ and calls on their autonomy, employees feel supported to make actual changes. For this reason, motives for redesigning tasks are often two-sided or intertwined, as employees (partly) see it as part of their jobs to improve tasks and to optimize work procedures from a professional point of view, but also as this is in line with their own personal beliefs and work preferences.

What can be concluded is that employees can introduce personal or new and more efficient ways of working, together or individually, on a daily basis. Furthermore, as employees are also able to engage in other task crafting techniques, employees in this case seem to proactively use ‘redesigning tasks’ to shape their jobs. What is most illustrative for this case study is that employees link redesigning tasks to their professionalism and that they attach much value to having the ability to make changes in how work is carried out. Some organizational features were mentioned by employees regarding this ability, namely professional autonomy, the organization of work (autonomous teams) and the attitude of the supervisor. These features will be discussed in more depth in section 4.2 of this section.

4.1.2 Relational crafting

As expected by literature of Berg et al., (2010) and Berg et al., (2013), relational crafting can be subdivided into three sub-themes, which are: ‘building relationships’ (4.1.2.1), ‘altering the extent of relationships’ (4.1.2.2), and ‘reframing and adapting relationships’ (4.1.2.3). All three sub-themes of relational crafting will be discussed hereafter.

4.1.2.1 Building relationships

The first way in which employees can craft their relationships is by building relationships. According to Berg et al., (2010b; 2013) this technique refers to employees establishing new relationships with others at work, for instance because these new relationships can foster the meaningfulness employees derive from their work or as they want to enlarge their own network. From the stories of the interviewees it can be concluded that employees are building new

relationships at work for multiple reasons and that they can be proactive regarding this matter. However, employees build most of their relationships for work-related goals or see this as inherent to carrying out tasks or joining (new) projects.

All interviewed employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc explain that they are able to form new relationships with specific others at work. In line with the theoretical assumptions of this study, employees explain they can (partly) decide themselves to what extent they engage in getting to know new people at work, as they have the freedom and ability to do so. Throughout the interviews it became clear that some employees have a ‘wait-and-see’ attitude, whereas others proactively approach others and build their own network. Likewise, some employees (Hanneke, Mirjam, Anna and Jolanda) explain that having a diverse and large network in their jobs is making their work more valuable and joyful.

“Well, what is really my way, is that I sometimes go ‘inside the house’ to meet new people, and that’s not particularly a standard procedure. (...). Some have less need for that and for me it is nice. (...) My supervisor said just do that, it is your job, you have to have a good time”. (Interview 12 Hanneke, notes 88; 85).

However, it has been frequently noticed that adding new tasks or being involved in projects for instance, result in building new relationships as a logical consequence. More specifically, most employees (Cees, Anna, Jolanda, Paul, Gerard, Marc and Mirjam) explain that in order to carry out their regular tasks, to pave the way for new projects or to grow within the organization or their profession, they have to collaborate with different parties and they ‘automatically’ build new relationships, making it inherent to one’s work. From the perspective of de Sitter (2000) and Grant and Parker (2009) this seems logical, as jobs can be seen as networks of tasks and relationships and become more socially embedded. Moreover, some employees (Mirjam, Anna and Cees) go one step further by explaining that being actively involved with others belongs to a professional work attitude, illustrating their perception of this technique.

“Ehm, well I am closely involved in projects regarding rehousing. I always try to proactively go after the state of affairs if I have not heard anything for a while. I really pick up those things myself. (...) It [*building relationships*] is more based on the content, to share things with others because we work for the same organizations. You can steer this yourself (...). (...) I do really like that. (...) Yes, because you know, at the one moment you are at logistics and the other time you are working at the OK (...). (...) No, but look, I am not calling people just like that, it has to have a work-related goal. (Interview 10 Mirjam, notes 78, 80, 82, 84; 86).

The variety of tasks and projects within the jobs of employees and the related interdependencies bring along diverse contacts and opportunities to meet new people on a daily basis. Furthermore, although professionals mostly work with clients or cases individually, like the

corporate social workers and occupational health physicians, the complexity of their tasks makes it useful (or part of their professional work attitude) to get into contact with other disciplines and to share knowledge and expertise within (external) networks. Lastly, the AMD of the Radboudumc, as well as the larger organizations this department supports, are characterized by a diverse workforce, creating a rich context full of opportunities to establish new relationships.

Concluding, employees in this case study explain they build relationships with others as this is personally valuable to them, but mainly for work related ends, as they see this as part of their job and responsibilities. It could be the case that employees in this case do not particularly point at building relationships to derive more meaning or achieve other personal goals, as assumed by Berg et al., (2013), as they already have diverse and valuable relationships in their work and meet new people inherent to new tasks or projects, making building relationships a less applicable job crafting technique.

4.1.2.2 Altering the extent of relationships

A second way in which relationships can be crafted is by altering the extent of existing relationships. According to Berg et al., (2010b), employees can alter the extent of relationships by increasing or limiting the amount of interactions or communication with specific others. Throughout the interviews it became clear that employees nurture particular relationships they believe are important. Decreasing interactions with others appeared to be less applicable in this case study. Most importantly, employees in this case feel free to be proactive in whether and how to invest in particular relationships.

Although investing in relationships is often accompanied with ‘getting the job done’, as is the case with building relationships, employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc also explain they nurture particular relationships to get more personal use or satisfaction out of their work. When discussing this matter, most employees (John, Anna, Kiki, Paul and Cees) mention creating close relationships with direct colleagues at work and link this to the warm and safe culture within the department. Moreover, most employees in this case find it important to make an effort to get to know others well at work and join or even organize social events at the workplace (Kiki and Jolanda). Other employees (Anna and Jolanda) point at nurturing the relationship with their supervisor as they are eager to learn, to share thoughts or to get feedback.

“Yes, my supervisor is very important in this case. Every week we come together to discuss certain topics. (...) that feedback is really necessary ha-ha. And ehm, yes that is something that is intensified at my request. I really like that, I can learn in my own role, but also from his role as a supervisor. I never thought

I would want to become a manager myself, managing seemed nice, but I've always said in a small organization." (Interview 5 Anna, note 97).

Likewise, other employees explain they find it meaningful to invest in particular relationships, for instance with people from other departments (Jolanda and Paul) or with external groups of people like professional associations or committees (John and Hanneke) or students (Cees and Mirjam). However, personal reasons in this case are often accompanied by considerations of what is valuable for performing one's job. On the contrary, decreasing contacts or interactions was not particularly mentioned by employees in this case. Regarding this matter, Tims and Bakker (2010) have assumed that employees may 'reduce' particular social aspects in their work as they sometimes perceive particular relationships with others as emotionally demanding. So, it is likely that employees in this case do not perceive their current relationships as emotionally demanding, which may be associated with the warm and safe culture they describe, making this variant not applicable as could be expected from the literature (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Berg et al., 2013).

What can be concluded is that employees in this case can proactively shape existing relationships in their work by nurturing particular contacts with others, which illustrates the proactive character of job crafting as theoretically assumed in this study. Moreover, the prevailing culture in this department may be related to employees easily approaching others and wanting to take an effort in getting to know others well.

4.1.2.3 Reframing and adapting relationships

Next to altering the extent of relationships, employees can also alter the nature of existing relationships by means of two techniques, namely reframing relationships and adapting relationships (Berg et al., 2013). Throughout the interviews it became clear that employees in this case study do not particularly think about deeper purposes of relationships or deliberately change how they approach others. Moreover, relationships seemed to be 'reframed' only when employees change job functions or when they get to know each other better. Furthermore, employees do not 'proactively' adapt relationships, as providing help and support are often seen as already part of the prevailing culture and as 'daily behaviour'. Thus, from their stories it follows that both reframing and adapting relationships are not present the same way as described in literature by Berg et al., (2013).

Some employees (John, Mirjam and Hanneke) hint at interactions becoming less distant and superficial or shifting to more informal when one gets to know direct colleagues better at work. Throughout their stories on these so-called 'natural processes' employees mentioned that,

especially for new entrants at the department, the ‘distance’ between subdivisions at the department may challenge the process of getting to know others better. More specifically, some employees (John, Hanneke and Jolanda) explain that when they started working at the department, the different subdivisions were separated ‘islands’ for them and that relationships with others got tighter over time. Although the shape of relationships may change in this way, ‘reframing relationships’ in this case does not occur ‘deliberately’ and does not capture the proactive aspect of relational crafting as described in the literature (Berg et al., 2013). This could be explained by the fact that this concept of relational crafting appeared to be a bit ‘vague’ and difficult for employees to link to their actual behaviour or. It could also be that employees in this case perceive no actual need for engaging in this technique. This will be discussed in more depth in the last chapter of this study.

Within theory of Berg et al., (2013), adapting relationships is related to providing valuable help to others, which will encourage others to provide support in return and increases the level of mutual trust. In line with theoretical assumptions of Berg et al., (2013), one of the employees (Helma) mentioned a situation in which a relationship has been strengthened as she proactively provided help.

“Yes, well, when ehm at my initiative, I offered to help this colleague of my with particular cases, and yes because of this that relationship is really strengthened. (..) She has a really spicy character, at first I thought who is this person. Ehm, but because I approached her and offered my help ehm, we built a relationship based on trust. (..) Without using words we now know where we stand with each other and I think she is really thankful for that.” (Interview 4 Helma, note 151).

Throughout the interviews, most other employees explain they see providing help as an important aspect of their work that is part of their jobs on a daily basis. More specifically, employees explain they provide support when new employees enter the organization, when close colleagues need some advice, when heavy tasks are being divided over more people (relieving team members) or when employees have certain questions about particular protocols, working procedures or issues related to other subdivisions. In general, employees explain they enjoy helping others and being involved in each other. This may explain why adapting relationships does not appear the same way as described in literature of Berg et al., (2013). In turn, the prevailing organizational culture or work climate at this department may explain why employees see helping others as daily behaviour. More specifically, most employees (Cees, Kiki, Helma, Paul, Anna and Kiki) describe that the culture at the AMD of the Radboudumc can be characterized by people helping each other, in which people do not hesitate to approach others when needing advice or help. Kiki and Anna for instance explain there is an ‘open-door’

policy within the department, so they can easily ask others for advice. Moreover, Marc and John describe that they have periodical peer meetings with their sub teams, in which everyone can bring in complex matters to be discussed. Furthermore, Cees illustrates that the culture in this department is very open and safe.

“Ehm, well open and transparent again. People here [*within the AMD of the Radboudumc*] are very compliant with others and compassionate in things somebody initiates or asks. In principle, one is always willing to support or help. Thinking: “oh I really want to help you, but I am very busy right know, how can we do solve this?” (..) So it is not the case that everyone stays in his or her office and says do not come in. And, mainly stay positive to each other.” (Preliminary interview 1 Cees, note 198; 200).

Other employees (Kiki and Helma) also explain that there is a culture at the department in which everyone is being treated equally. Kiki for instance describes that, although the workforce of the AMD of the Radboudumc is divers in terms of different professions belonging to the department, everyone is willing to help when necessary and approaches each other on an equal footing. This may be stimulated by the fact that there is no formal hierarchy within the department anymore.

What can be concluded is that both reframing and adapting relationships are not applicable in this case study the same way as described in literature of Berg et al., (2013). More specifically, relationships were not being reframed deliberately, but get stronger or less distant when employees get to know each other better, especially when employees are not directly involved with each other profession-wise. Moreover, when talking about reframing the nature of relationships, it appeared that this concept was a bit vague, making it more difficult for interviewees to think about an accurate answer. Regarding adapting relationships, employees in this department already proactively approach others for advice or provide others support. This finding could be explained by the presence of an open-door policy and helping culture in which employees see providing help to others as an important aspect of their jobs. These ‘norms’ regarding providing help and equality, stimulate employees to engage in helping others and contributes to a nice working environment, making adapting relationships unnecessary in a way.

4.1.3 Cognitive crafting

The third way in which jobs can be crafted is by means of cognitive crafting (Wrześniewski & Dutton). In contrast to the two forms of job crafting discussed above, cognitive crafting does not involve changing any ‘physical’ aspects of one’s job, but is related to one’s perceptions (Berg et al., 2010b). As expected by literature of Berg et al., (2010b; 2013), cognitive crafting

can be subdivided in three sub-themes, which are: ‘expanding perceptions’ (4.1.3.1), ‘focusing perceptions’ (4.1.3.2), and ‘linking perceptions’ (4.1.3.3). All three sub-themes of cognitive will be elaborated on hereafter.

4.1.3.1 Expanding perceptions

The first way of cognitive crafting is related to expanding one’s perceptions regarding the purpose or impact of one’s job (Berg et al., 2013), and is related to how employees perceive or interpret their tasks, relationships or jobs as a whole (Wrześniewski et al., 2013). Although the other approach on job crafting (Tims & Bakker, 2010) assumes that changing one’s perceptions cannot be seen as ‘purely’ job crafting, as this (according to them) refers to coping with specific circumstances instead of actively shaping them. From the stories of the interviewees it can be concluded that employees can alter the experience of their job in different ways by means of expanding their perceptions. When exploring this cognitive crafting technique, the most striking finding in light with the aim of this study can be found in its coherence with particular ‘task characteristics’, namely task significance and task identity.

In line with the theoretical assumptions of this study, some employees (Jolanda, Cees and Paul) explain they ascribe a larger significance to their work and that they try to keep a holistic purpose of their jobs in mind in different ways. Jolanda for instance explains that tasks of higher safety experts could be seen as dealing with separate incidents on a daily basis. However, she deliberately tries to view her work as a ‘larger process’, instead of a set of discrete tasks. In this way, she unconsciously hints at task identity, as her job allows her in a way to be involved in a larger process with an outcome that is more visible and meaningful for her, namely a better safety policy within the hospital.

“Yes sure, I would say I hope that I can say over seventeen years when I retire, that I have the feeling that I really contributed to a better safety policy within the hospital, instead of that I dealt with a X amount of incidents”. (Interview 2 Jolanda, note 165).

In a similar way, some employees (Paul, Anna, Gerard and Mirjam) mention that in essence, their jobs have a supporting function within the larger organization and that they see themselves as a ‘small cog in the wheel’. However, they also try to ‘zoom-out’ and recognize that although they are not a core business of the Radboudumc, they are responsible for supporting some main processes, which can be very important and intrinsically motivating. This reasoning can be linked to task significance, as it touches upon the impact of one’s job on other people and on the larger organization. Furthermore, their jobs seem to allow the employees within this case to think about the outcomes of their jobs on a larger level. On the other hand, some other

employees also put their role into perspective, but identify themselves with the output of the organization as well, like Paul, one of the occupational health physician does.

“If you assess whether I am occupied with the well-being at the ‘Radboud level’, than I do not think that is the case. It is exaggerated in my opinion. (..) However, at the other hand I do believe that this hospital provides good care to its people. I see my role as a small radar in the bigger part, to maintain the current level of care and maybe, to improve it a little bit. For me, what matters is that people are just happy in their work and have fun, that’s what it is about for me.” (Interview 4 Paul, notes 137; 139).

Some other employees (John, Marc, Paul and Cees) explain that they ‘made’ zooming-out or looking at long-term impacts of tasks or projects part of their jobs as they for instance join organizational committees concerned with issues related to the larger organization (political one’s for instance), are involved in projects related to the organization at large (durability issues for instance) or in prevention projects (employability issues for instance). Moreover, by means of regular meetings with the supervisor or by joining peer meetings or brainstorm sessions with team members and reflecting together, it becomes more of a routine to ‘zoom-out’ every now and then.

So, concluding, employees in this case can shape the cognitive boundaries of their jobs by for instance viewing their work as a whole or by seeing the broader significance of their tasks or jobs on others or the larger organization, which is in line with the reasoning of Berg et al., (2013). Furthermore, this reasoning also touches upon the task identity and task significance perceived by employees working at this department. More specifically, the type of tasks or projects they are involved in allow them in a way to be better able to ‘zoom-in’ or ‘zoom-out’ within their work. However, these aspects may also ensure that some employees do not actively feel the need to engage in this job crafting technique. For some employees in this case for instance, expanding one’s perceptions is something that is inherent to their work, as they are involved in projects or meetings that are related to issues of the organization at large or something they do more unconsciously.

4.1.3.2 Focusing perceptions

The second way of cognitive crafting is focusing perceptions, and is related to employees “narrowing their mental scope of the purpose of their job on specific tasks or relationships that are particularly valuable or significant to them” (Berg et al., 2013, p.92). The explanations of the employees in the interviews do not speak directly to this specific job crafting technique. The most interesting explanation for this is related to the ability employees in this case have to

make actual changes, making focusing perceptions less necessary in a way. However, this particular cognitive technique can give rise to other job crafting techniques.

As in line with the theoretical assumptions on focusing perceptions, one of the employees (Helma) explains that she tries to focus on aspects of her tasks that are more in line with her own interests, especially as she dislikes some specific tasks she has to perform. In this way, she tries to make her job more satisfying without making actual changes.

“Actually, initially I try to do that with all things I do. In each assignment or within every piece of work I try to see something in it, I try to make it a positive thing. In that one I take pleasure out of getting things organized fast, so I make some kind of sport out of it actually”. (Interview 3 Helma, note 95).

Most other employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc do not specifically mention to mentally focus on specific tasks or relationships in their job. Some employees (Jolanda, Cees and Mirjam) explain that there are always some aspects of the job, such as administrative tasks, meetings or ‘irrelevant’ working protocols, that are perceived less meaningful or interesting, but ‘just’ need to be done. Moreover, most employees try to ‘minimize’ the role of these tasks and acknowledge that these contain only a small part of the whole job. As most employees in this case have varied job descriptions and tasks, this becomes more easily.

An additional finding is related to making actual changes. Within their stories, the interviewees explain (although the need to do so is particularly low) that they were able to quit or transfer tasks that do not make them happy or do not fit them well. In this way, they enable themselves to put their time and energy into tasks fitting them better or are perceived more interesting. As employees working at this department feel free to for instance drop or emphasize tasks as described in the first section of this chapter, there seems to be no actual need to engage in focusing perceptions. However, it could be the case that this cognitive job crafting technique gives rise to or even goes hand to glove with these other forms of job crafting.

What can be concluded is that focusing perceptions is a job crafting technique that becomes unnecessary when employees have the ability to make actual changes in their job, such as dropping particular tasks or spending less time to them. However, it could be the case that employees use this technique before or simultaneously with making physical changes. Furthermore, the fact that employees working at this department perceive most of their tasks as meaningful or valuable and that the variety of tasks ensures that the role of these tasks stays particularly small, decreases the need for employees to narrow their mental scope as well.

4.1.3.3 Linking perceptions

The third way in which employees can craft their cognitions is by means of linking perceptions. According to Berg et al., (2010b) this technique is related to employees linking their personal values, interests and preferences to their work. In this way, employees draw mental connections between aspects of their identities that are meaningful or valuable to them and aspects of their work (Berg et al., 2013). Throughout the stories of the interviewees, different ways were found in which employees apply this specific job crafting technique. In light of the focus of this research, the most striking finding in this analysis when exploring this technique relates to the strong link with one's 'professional identity' and the related role of shared beliefs. Furthermore, as employees in this case feel free to share and discuss personal interests, values or beliefs about work with team members and the supervisor, this can result in physical job crafting behaviour or in building a 'stronger' identity.

In line with the theoretical assumptions of this study, employees mentioned different ways in which they 'link' aspects of themselves to their jobs or to the organization, namely by applying personal values in their work (Jolanda, Cees, Anna and Gerard), inserting personal passions or lifestyles (Cees, Paul, Harrie, Marc, Jolanda and Helma), deploying own qualities (Jolanda, Anna, John and Kiki) and by sharing personal lessons, visions or experiences with others (Paul, Gerard and John). Moreover, regarding a passion like sportivity for instance, some offices have desk bikes available, there is a punch ball at the lobby and employees get the opportunity to go exercise during work days, as Marc for instance explains.

"Ehm, well, almost every day I go to the gym at noon. (..), or at least three times a week. (..) Ehm, I have that autonomy, between 12 and 2 I can schedule time in my agenda ehm, (..), to say like I go exercising. (..) I also have my guitar over here, and Friday afternoon that's a way to relax with some colleagues (..). Within this organization, I have the opportunity to create my own schedule, and to shape my working day towards my own needs. I mean, there is nobody really telling me not to do that in that sense." (Interview 7 Marc, notes 123, 125; 127).

Although this quote hints at actual behaviour, there is a link between the employees' passion for sport and music and how his work week looks like, which seems to make his work more pleasant. Likewise, other employees (Jolanda, Cees, Anna and Helma) for instance highly value social aspects of work and close connections with others, and link their social character to how they approach relationships. This illustrates how linking perceptions can give rise to physical job crafting behaviour.

Although these discussed matters do tap into valued personal interests, shaping one's professional identity appeared to be a more illustrative finding, as this strongly influences employees' beliefs about work and provides a link between their way of working and how one

sees the self. Most employees within this department identify themselves with their profession (Paul, John, Jolanda and Mirjam), with the appearance of the department (Jolanda and Cees) or with the goals of the larger organization (Hanneke, Gerard, Kiki and Anna). Furthermore, employees of this particular department have some ideas on 'being a professional' in common and start to identify themselves with a professional in the lead way of thinking. More specifically, as the general manager of this department explains, he believes that adapting this way of thinking invites and inspires employees in this department to shape one's own boundaries and to engage in job crafting.

"A very important thing is to address each other, but that's more easier said than done, so we have regular meetings to talk about it. Not in theoretical sense, but we invite people to discuss what they have done, to see "he that is a beautiful example". People do not even always recognize what they are doing, and that they are giving shape to being 'professional in the lead' or terms like 'job crafting'. When discussing these examples and to search for feedback, there is more awareness." (Interview 8 Rene, note 45).

By regularly sharing thoughts and by reflecting on shared visions or particular behaviour, it becomes easier for employees to give shape to their professional identity and to reflect on the meaning of work.

So, although slightly different than was expected from theoretical assumptions, linking perceptions illustrates the depth of the job crafting 'behaviour' involved, namely linked to one's (professional) work identity as discussed in the theoretical chapter of this study. In line with the literature, it is important for employees to be able to link certain personal values or interests to aspects of their jobs and to have room for initiatives. Moreover, it appeared to be important for employees in this case study that there is an open and inspiring work climate in which there is room for taking initiative, sharing thoughts and reflection. A professional in the lead way of thinking appeared to be an important shared believe in this department, and influences how employees see one's job and how that flows into actual behaviour.

4.2 Organizational features

The main question of this research concerns how organizational features influence job crafting behaviour by employees (as situated above). Within theoretical assumptions of Berg et al., (2010b) job crafting is described as a contextually situated process, shaped in part by challenges and facilitators employees experience within an organizational context, shaped by organizational features. Organizational features can be organized, as indicated by literature of Ghitulescu (2007) into two general sub-themes, which are structural features (4.2.1) and relational features (4.2.2). Throughout their stories on job crafting, interviewees provided

information on the present organizational features within the AMD of the Radboudumc and about their relationship with the job crafting attempts as described in the previous sections.

4.2.1 Structural features

In the second chapter of this study (section 2.3.2.1, structural features), a selective and general outline has been provided on some particular structural features influencing job crafting of employees by way of illustration, based on different theoretical assumptions (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2010b; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Niessen et al., 2012; Petrou et al., 2012). Throughout the stories of the interviewees, several structural features came to the fore when discussing how job crafting processes unfold. Hereafter, the three most striking features will be elaborated on, which are professional autonomy (4.2.1.1.), the organization of work (4.2.1.2), and task interdependence (4.2.1.3.).

4.2.1.1 Professional autonomy

Autonomy on the job has become a large sub-theme within the analysis of this research and is related to the freedom or discretion an employee experiences in making one's own decisions regarding how work is carried out and in scheduling the work. Autonomy appeared to be related to three sub-themes in this analysis, namely the nature of jobs, the design of jobs and the idea of 'professional in the lead'. From the stories of the interviewees it can be concluded that these features enable employees to make changes to one's task boundaries or to engage in relational crafting techniques, which is in line with theoretical assumptions (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Berg et al., 2010b). Although jobs within the AMD of the Radboudumc differ in some aspects, almost all employees see taking initiative as inherent to their (professional) jobs. This could have something to do with the autonomy and responsibilities built into the jobs of the professional knowledge workers, as will be explained in this section.

Throughout the interviews it appeared that some jobs within this department are more or less structured by regular job tasks, responsibilities and fixed working methods than others. More specifically, sustainability consultants and the project manager in this department for instance have more 'ad hoc' jobs and are more designated to their own initiative regarding picking up particular tasks and projects (Johns, 2010), as Cees, one of the consultants for instance describes.

"No I do not really have a delineated profile. (..) Well, it are more the current projects and tasks I get involved in, right. The function is something like an advisor, but than a really free advisor ha-ha."
(Preliminary interview Cees, notes 24; 26)

This ‘freedom’ opens up opportunities for employees to shape their own job and to get involved in particular tasks or projects on a daily basis, as most employees (Cees, Kiki, Paul, Jolanda and Gerard) explained during their stories on job crafting. On the other hand, some jobs of other professions have less ‘abstract’ job descriptions and leave less room to create one’s own task package and to make alterations. Occupational health hygienists for instance are mainly occupied with writing reports and analysing work spots, corporate social workers with holding conversations with clients and management assistants with particular administrative tasks. This may limit their opportunities for adding particular tasks or building relationships, but not in for instance emphasizing aspects of their jobs or redesigning tasks.

Despite these differences, almost all employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc explain they have enough decision latitude or work discretion to be able to make their own decisions with regard to their work and especially regarding how tasks are carried out. More specifically, being able to decide how one is carrying out work, based on one’s knowledge, skills, competencies or previous work experience is perceived as important and even essential for ‘a professional job’ or feelings of ‘being a professional worker’. Furthermore, employees are allowed to make their own decisions regarding what is best content-wise and person-wise, creating a sense of ownership and responsibility in work, which is in line with theoretical assumptions (Ashforth & Saks, 2001). During the interview Harrie for instance explains it is part of the responsibilities of the professional to come up with initiatives on courses for instance.

“It is always a topic in the annual interview, like where do you want to see yourself in five years ehm, (...) I indicated that I want to gain more substantive knowledge. In the past I followed a course on ‘asbestos’ so the opportunities are there. For a part this comes back in the conversations, however for a large part it has to come from yourself. I think that fits the role of ehm, yes if a professional here.” (Interview 6 Harrie, note 150).

From the interviews it also follows that autonomy on the job expresses itself by means of employees being able to schedule their working days, as also assumed in the theoretical part of this study. These different forms of autonomy perceived by the employees seemed to be supported mainly by the facilitating and supportive attitude of the supervisor (4.2.2.2) and are related to the way work is organized in this department (4.2.1.2), as will be discussed in the next sections.

An additional finding regarding this issue, interesting for this case study, is related to the implications for the concept of job crafting. On the one hand, the built-in forms of autonomy as discussed above can enable or provide opportunities for professional workers to engage in job crafting. On the other hand, these features may also ‘reduce the need’ to engage in particular

techniques, such as adding tasks, getting involved in new projects or getting to know new people for instance, are these already seen as part of their jobs on a daily basis. From a socio-technical systems perspective this seems logical as different forms of regulation are built into the jobs of professional workers in this case, and hereby provide the opportunity to think of new ways of doing the work and experiment with them (e.g., de Sitter, 1994). This finding may raise questions on the concept of job crafting and may be related to the difficulty in this case of distinguishing job crafting from ‘just’ performing one’s job and capturing the proactivity of this type of behaviour. More specifically, proactivity of employees was described as an essential element of job crafting, whereas ‘job crafting’ in this case can also be seen as a logical consequence of how jobs are designed or carried out (i.e., built-in autonomy and regulation). Within present literature on job crafting, this conceptual issue has not been paid deliberate attention to yet, especially as this case of professional workers is not ‘stereotypical’ with regard to existing literature on job crafting. However, Berg et al., (2013, p. 19) already hinted at the interrelationship of job crafting of employees and ‘top-down’ design: “to colour outside the lines of a job, one needs lines there in the first place”. In this way, it can be seen that employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc do proactively use the opportunity autonomy provides them to shape their own jobs and to make them more in line with their personal skills and preferences, but also with what they think is appropriate for performing one’s job. So, concluding, autonomy on the job clearly opens up opportunities for employees in this case to engage in job crafting, but also generates some interesting questions on the concept of job crafting in general, and especially on job crafting of professional (knowledge) workers.

4.2.1.2 The organization of work: A structural perspective

An important sub-theme related to professional autonomy, or giving rise to perceived autonomy, can be found in how work is organized, related to the organizational structure of this department. As already mentioned in the previous sections, the AMD of the Radboudumc is organized around different independent professions. Throughout the stories of the interviewees, it appeared that this theme can be divided into two sub-themes, namely a flat organizational structure around professions and dividing tasks within sub-teams. In this section, employees’ stories on job crafting, as outlined in the previous section, will be analysed based on this structural perspective.

From the interviews with the general manager and a former middle manager of this department it became clear the organizational structure of the AMD of the Radboudumc has changed. More specifically, the middle management layer between the different teams of professionals and the

general manager has been removed, creating a flatter structure and hierarchy. When relating this to de Sitters socio technical design principles it could be said that hereby the level of separation of operational and regulatory transformations in tasks is lowered (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2009). Throughout the interviews with the employees it appeared that this way of organizing enables them to take ownership in their work, as teams are made self-responsible for their own content, which makes sense from the socio-technical perspective on job design (de Sitter, 2000; de Sitter et al., 1994). When talking about their freedom to change one's task boundaries, like Paul in his quote on redesigning tasks, employees refer to themselves as experts who feel judged 'solely' on the final results they deliver by patients, clients or team colleagues instead of by someone higher in the hierarchy. The absence of middle managers who are involved in the same profession, makes employees (Mirjam for instance) feel less "oppressed" with regard to making changes.

"Yes, that [*the organizational structure*] has changed in some way. But, it was oppressing for me I believe, and yes I still did my own thing, but I felt way more controlled. So, maybe you try to do the same, but the feeling is different, when you constantly have to justify yourself. And now, ehm, with this way of organizing the work and supervising, I feel more freedom. I really believe you achieve more in this way." (Interview 10 Mirjam, note 60).

Within the team-based structure of this department the division of tasks becomes an important responsibility for teams and illustrates their self-managing character (Van Amelsvoort & Benders, 1996). Moreover, organizing work around subdivisions enables (individual) team members to pick up particular projects or specializations that are in line with their own interests, qualities or ambitions, but also to transfer particular demanding tasks, as explained by Kiki and Gerard in their quotes on dropping tasks. However, it may also limit individuals in crafting their jobs, as some tasks for instance are already being occupied or as one's vision does not match with particular shared visions or agreements. To summarize, teams tend to have substantial latitude in how they allocate tasks among themselves, providing opportunities and limitations for individuals employees to craft their jobs.

Another interesting angle on this matter relates to crafting jobs together and the role of negotiation and developing a shared vision, as for instance found in the sections on redesigning and emphasizing tasks, but not covered in the theoretical framework of this study. Jolanda provides an example of such a group-process.

"Yes, lately we had a sparring session with the environmental group on how we could align our advising role with each other and actually we have only, ehm shared with each other who we were, where we came from and how we see our jobs. A lot of people in that group just did not know each other." (Interview 2 Jolanda, note 240).

This theoretical angle was already brought to attention by other authors, namely Ghitulescu (2007) and Leana et al., (2009). They believe it is reasonable to expect that employees may collaboratively craft task boundaries (e.g., making agreements on how work processes can be changed) and that job crafting is an “ongoing and implicit process whereby work practice is developed and shared informally among workers” (Leana et al., 2009, p. 1173). These assumptions seem logical from a socio-technical systems perspective, as adding (external non-routine) regulatory potential includes the potential for experimenting and learning, which are essential for innovation (Achterbergh & Vriens, 2009). This will be discussed more closely in the next section. Concluding, the way work is organized within this department invites employees to initiate changes individually and together.

4.2.1.3 Task characteristics

A third sub-theme considered by employees during the interviews involves the nature of employees’ jobs, namely some particular ‘task characteristics’, that explicitly or implicitly came to the fore when talking about employees’ job crafting behaviour and the opportunities or challenges they perceive for crafting their jobs.

Task interdependence

In the theoretical assumptions of this study, task interdependence was assumed to ‘inhibit’ employees’ opportunities to craft the task and relational boundaries, as employees depend more on others to complete their work and as it determines to a certain degree which individuals have to work together, making them feel less in control and altering their autonomy (Wageman, 1995; Wrześniewski et al., 2001; Ghitulescu, 2007). Throughout the interviews it appeared that employees in this case indeed recognize that there is some interdependence built into their jobs and that this may limit the opportunities for job crafting. More specifically, being involved in joint projects, having coordinating or supporting responsibilities and organizing work around teams automatically brings along some levels of interdependency. During the interviews, employees for instance explained that it becomes more difficult for them to redesign tasks or change work procedures individually or to pick up particular roles, as they have to take into account the behaviour of others and the present division of tasks. This can be seen as a logical consequence, as the work is designed or structured in such a way that jobs become a network of tasks and relationships (e.g., de Sitter et al., 2000).

A finding that was not covered in the theoretical framework of this study, is related to interdependencies facilitating collaborative ways of job crafting, as already mentioned in the

stories on job crafting and in the previous section on the organization of work. Moreover, designing work around teams may invite team members to develop ‘joint routines’, to solve problems or to organize the work by collaborative negotiation over how work should be done. The regular team consultations, peer meetings and ‘open’ discussions in the sub-divisions illustrate that teams within the AMD of the Radboudumc find ways to craft work together, for instance when dividing tasks or when developing shared visions. In this way, task interdependence does not solely ‘restrict’ employees in crafting their jobs, but invites them to explore task- and (and to a lesser extent) relational boundaries together.

Furthermore, as theoretically assumed, task interdependence may determine to a certain degree with whom employees have relationships, reducing the need for employees to engage in relational crafting. However, employees in this case explain they do feel free and able to establish new relationships, often based on what they believe is best for performing one’s tasks or projects. This can be explained by the high levels of (professional) autonomy employees experience in making decisions on what is best content-wise.

Task variety

Throughout their personal stories on job crafting, task variety came to the fore when discussing why employees of this department decide to engage in job crafting. It appeared that most employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc associate their jobs with high levels of task variety, which provides them the opportunity to use a broad range of their skills and competencies, whereas others feel they have less task variety in their jobs, establishing a need for job crafting. Although personal needs were not the main focus of this study, it appeared that having more or less variety in one’s job tasks may be related to whether an employee is more likely to engage in more or less job crafting and to proactively search for more opportunities to explore task and relational boundaries. The presence of high variation in tasks and contacts (for instance when working on different projects or being involved in a large network) may explain why some employees interpret adding tasks or building new relationships as inherent part of their jobs. Likewise, task variety could also lower the need for employees to engage in one of these job crafting techniques and make job crafting less applicable in this case. With regard to cognitive crafting, task variety may help employees in minimizing the role of particular (side-)tasks they do not perceive as meaningful, as explained in the section on focusing perceptions. However, a clear link between cognitive crafting and the different forms of cognitive crafting was hard to see in this case study.

Task identity and task significance

When discussing the cognitive job technique expanding perceptions, a link was found between this technique and the task characteristics task identity and task significance. More specifically, as employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc mainly have supportive functions for two large organizations and employees are often involved in ‘large projects’ from the beginning to the end, this allows them to put their jobs ‘in perspective’ in different ways. On the one hand employees are able to be involved in larger projects and see themselves as part of large processes such as developing a better safety policy within the Radboudumc. This can make the outcomes of their job more visible or meaningful and ‘expanded’ to the level of the organization or society. On the other hand, employees can also see themselves as ‘small cogs in the wheel’, and emphasize the impact of discrete tasks. With regard to task identity in this case, a connection can be seen with a low level of operational differentiation as discussed in organizational design literature (Galbraith, 1974; de Sitter, 1994; Achterbergh & Vriens, 2009). More specifically, employees within the autonomous teams in this case are mostly feel involved in all operational activities around particular tasks or projects. This allows them to expand their perceptions in a way and seems to facilitate cognitive crafting. However, as these features are already present, it may also lower the need to deliberately change perceptions.

4.2.2 Relational features

Next to the structural features as discussed above, within the theoretical framework of this study relational features were also assumed to influence job crafting of employees. More specifically, a selective outline has been provided based on particular theoretical assumptions (e.g., Ghitulescu, 2007; Berg et al., 2008; Demerouti, 2014; Wang, 2016). Throughout the stories of the interviewees, particular relational features came to the fore when discussing how employees craft their jobs. Hereafter, the two most striking features found will be elaborated on, which are the organizational culture (4.2.2.1) and the role of the supervisor (4.2.2.2).

4.2.2.1 Organizational culture and climate

Characteristics of the organizational culture (and climate) at the AMD of the Radboudumc appeared to be an important sub-theme related to job crafting of employees in this case study. More specifically, throughout the interviews employees often referred to perceived social support and to an open, safe and helping work climate at the department in which most employees feel comfortable in crafting their jobs, which is in line with theoretical assumptions of this study. Furthermore, by means of these practices employees can develop ‘the right’ job

crafting mind-set together, in which employees believe that job crafting is possible and that they have agency (Berg et al., 2013). However, most of them already feel they have agency. Furthermore, some side notes regarding a 'safe culture' and perceived openness were also mentioned during the interviews. In this section, employees' stories on job crafting, as outlined in the previous section, will be interpreted in light of this relational feature.

From the interviews it can be derived that most employees in this department perceive support of others when thinking about particular initiatives or when making actual changes, for instance when transferring particular tasks (Gerard and Kiki), when taking on projects outside the organization (Paul and Harrie), when introducing new or better ways of working (Hanneke and Kiki) or adapting flexible work methods (John and Anna). Moreover, in line with the quote of Cees in the reframing and adapting relationships section, Anna also resolutely explains she can always ask for help and that she feels free to discuss particular complex matters or new ideas with other professionals, illustrating the supportive interpersonal work climate present at this department.

“Yes, you can definitely go to other people over here, you can always step by if needed”. (...) I think it is a very social and 'flat' department, (...) where the doors are always open (...). For me it is a very pleasant department to work for.” (Interview 5 Anna, notes 117, 182; 184).

Likewise, employees also describe they perceive the AMD of the Radboudumc as warm, safe equal and open (to a certain degree). Because of these relational properties, it becomes easier for employees to express themselves and to address particular ideas or issues. In this way, employees can more easily link aspects of themselves, such as their passions, to their jobs and share these with others. Furthermore, most employees feel free to give each other feedback and to approach others for help, making them feel comfortable at the department. This may facilitate a job crafting mind-set of employees and support job crafting. Within most subdivisions for instance, time is scheduled for joint reflection and for sharing personal matters and content related issues, such as the brainstorm sessions of the biorisk professionals as Marc explained. Moreover, a link could be made with literature on psychological safety in groups and organizational change (e.g., Schein & Bennis, 1965; Vera & Crossan, 2004). These authors explain that employees feel more comfortable and safe in trying new things so that change, learning and creativity and in this case job crafting may be fostered. It is difficult to state whether these relational features directly result in job crafting of employees this case study and if they are really 'crucial' in these processes. However, as these features are often mentioned by the interviewees, it does illustrate the importance of the comfortable atmosphere in this

department and the fact that employees are by all means not ‘judged’ for making changes to their jobs.

Although employees mainly feel comfortable at the department and the openness is growing, a small side note regarding this safe culture can be made. Some employees (Hanneke, Jolanda and Kiki) and the general manager (Rene) for instance explain that some people in this department linger in old fashioned working routines and work attitudes as having a lot of autonomy is combined with a prevailing safe culture in this case. In some situations, with regard to employees who already work at the AMD of the Radboudumc for a long time for instance, it is still difficult to address specific issues, to enthuse them for new ideas or to make them more involved in being critical. Rene tries to situate this.

“It feels like a ‘warm bad’ for people here, but there is a down-side as well. There is also a feeling, it must be ‘warm bad’, but that is also making it more difficult to be critical or to say what you would like to see different, because maybe than it is not cosy anymore. We really have to take some steps to get there (..), so you dare to take initiative and to be more critical and say to others you did not do that well. (..) Warm must not be accompanied with not naming things anymore” (Interview 8 Rene, note 87).

It appeared that the balance between a warm and safe culture and an open climate in which there is room for discussing initiatives, but also for criticism, is still developing itself within this department. However, this does not seem to withhold employees from engaging in job crafting, but illustrates some differences among peoples’ mind-sets with regard to change in general instead. Responding to this, shared believes on professional identity are paid attention to more deliberately and can be seen back in the prevailing culture and norms of this department. More specifically, a large group of the interviewees explicitly mentioned seeing themselves as professionals in the lead. This triggers the development of a shared identity within this department.

4.2.2.2 Role of the supervisor

Throughout the interviews it became clear that most interviewees in this department strongly believe that a manager or supervisor should facilitate employees in executing their jobs and not interfere too much with regard to the content of the jobs of professionals. More specifically, as can be expected from highly educated professionals executing complex and rich jobs, they have particular expectations with regard to the role of their supervisor. Moreover, these expectations appeared to be related to their ideas on job crafting or job crafting behaviour, as will be illustrated in this section.

Within the theoretical section of this study the role of leadership in employees' job crafting processes was described as paradoxical, as job crafting should 'essentially' be initiated by employees themselves rather than instructed by managers. However, throughout the interviews with the employees it appeared that the supervisor of this department, who sticks to facilitating leadership, is involved in job crafting processes in several ways. First, the supervisor provides the employees with space and freedom to develop themselves and to give shape to their own jobs. In this way, opportunities are created for employees to engage in job crafting activities. More specifically, the supervisor is not involved too much with for instance employees picking up particular tasks, redesigning work procedures or joining network activities, as he really believes that professionals and the related sub divisions are 'in the lead' and are likely to know best how to execute their jobs. Cees illustrates this by explaining that his supervisor really has a 'background' role in his experience.

"Haha well yes he [*the supervisor*] has to make sure I have a good desk. And he has some questions as well. That is certainly true." (Preliminary interview 1 Cees, note 50).

Likewise, Gerard for instance explains that the attitude of the supervisor really makes him aware of that he is the one responsible for his own job and that employees are the ones who know best.

"His attitude plays an important role in that sense. He has the attitude, and not only the attitude or appearance, but he really says to us I am not going to interfere with the content of your jobs. He does not do that consistently. This attitude raises awareness regarding if we do not do it, than nobody else does. We cannot ask him to take care of things content-wise." (Interview 9 Gerard, note 96).

Second, from the interviews with the employees it also became clear that it is important that the supervisor has a 'supportive' role and that he or she is easy approachable and gives advice or feedback on personal and work-related matters when necessary. Moreover, some employees (Anna, Jolanda, Helma and Hanneke) for instance explain they really value the (regular) conversations or 'spontaneous' sparring sessions with the supervisor on their job responsibilities and personal development. This gives them inspiration to take certain steps in their jobs or in their careers, such as choosing to follow a particular training or crafting outside the organizational boundaries. Besides supporting employees to take actual steps, the supervisor also invites employees to reflect on their own job and their personal goals and helps them doing so, which is likely to facilitate cognitive crafting of employees.

Lastly, the supervisor describes his own role with core concepts such as 'stimulating', 'enthusing' and 'supporting' employees within the AMD of the Radboudumc.

"Ehm, well, I think that the people really made some steps in the context of what we think is important, that professional in the lead. And that we are ready for the next step, it is never done. And that is exciting

for some people and exciting for me as a supervisor as well. My role shifts a bit from stimulating and enthusing to supporting of how can you do such things.” (Interviewee 8 Rene, note 41)

Other employees also explain that their supervisor does not only provide them with freedom to engage in job crafting, he also tries to portray his vision and to ‘trigger’ a certain mind-set of employees to really use the autonomy and freedom they have to get the best out of themselves and to think about their professional identity. This is in line with literature on other proactive constructs. Strauss, Griffin and Rafferty (2009) for instance found that transformational leadership influences employees’ commitment and in turn their proactivity. In their research, vision has been identified as a key element of transformational leadership for proactivity. Moreover, employees in this department may get inspired and feel supported to take initiative in making changes, by the attitude and vision of the supervisor.

4.3.1 Answer to sub-question 1

Sub-question 1: “How do organizational features influence task crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”.

With regard to the task crafting technique adding tasks, it can be concluded that all employees in this case feel they have the possibility and the freedom to add certain tasks or projects to one’s regular job responsibilities. In this way, employees can redesign their own jobs and make them more in line with their own preferences, skills or ambitions. Throughout the interviews, professional autonomy on the job appeared to be an important facilitator or enabler for this job crafting technique. However, as this technique is often closely connected with behaviour on a daily basis or seen as inherent part of the job, capturing actual job crafting behaviour becomes more difficult, a finding that was not yet present in literature. Furthermore, if task variety within one’s job is already perceived ‘high’ or is in line with the employees’ expectations, this could lower the need or amount of adding tasks or its intensity. With regard to the second task crafting technique, dropping tasks, most employees describe that they are able to transfer tasks if needed by means of their own decision latitude and that social support of others (e.g., willingness or flexible attitude regarding transferring tasks) is important in doing so. With regard to emphasizing tasks, employees in this case explain that the way work is organized at this department and related task interdependence sometimes challenge them to make changes individually, but also open up opportunities to specialize oneself or to craft work together, as is not paid much attention to in present literature on job crafting. In this way, employees can take advantage of existing task divisions and of the regulatory power of teams within this department. As there is an open and helping climate within this department, negotiations and

discussions within teams are fostered. With regard to the last task crafting technique, redesigning tasks, a similar conclusion can be made. Although employees will always be bounded to a certain extent in how tasks are carried out, professional autonomy and enough decisions latitude enable professional workers in this case to make changes to how work is carried out individually or together and strengthens their professional identity. The supportive attitude and inspiring vision of the supervisor seem to amplify these features and trigger them in doing so. Moreover, employees experience they have the freedom to make certain changes and to give their own twist in carrying out tasks or projects. Concluding, all four task crafting techniques are used by employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc and are mostly being facilitated or (to a lesser degree) challenged by structural features and supported by relational features in different ways, as summarized in the table below.

4.3.2 Answer to sub-question 2

Sub-question 2: “How do organizational features influence relational crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”.

With regard to the relational crafting technique building relationships, it can be concluded that employees in this department are able to forge relationships with others and that they often have work related motives to do so (e.g., getting the job done). Throughout the interviews it also appeared that the addition of new relationships is often seen as a ‘result’ of being involved in new tasks or projects. In this way, the nature of their jobs (e.g., varied job tasks and interdependencies) facilitates employees to build their networks on the one hand, but reduces the need to proactively engage in this technique on the other hand. With regard to the second relational crafting technique altering the extent of relationships, it was found that employees in this case nurture particular existing relationships on their own initiative, based on personal reasons as well as on what they think is best for performing one’s job. The prevailing open and warm culture at this department makes it more easy for employees to engage in this job crafting technique. With regard to the last two relational crafting techniques, reframing and adapting relationships, it can be concluded that these do not occur the same way as described in the literature (Berg et al., 2013). Moreover, because the culture and climate of this department are perceived as open, safe, supportive and equal, helping each other when possible is seen as part of the job or perceived as ‘normal’. So, as providing help is already seen as part of the job and employees easily approach each other, it could be explained why the interviewees do not see themselves adapting relationships deliberately or do not feel the need to do so. Concluding, it can be said that both relational features (e.g., organizational culture) and structural features

(e.g., autonomy and task characteristics) facilitate or support employees to build high-quality relationships with others at work, as summarized in the table below. However, their presence makes some techniques less ‘needed’ or applicable for employees at the same time. These mechanisms are also displayed in the table below.

4.3.3 Answer to sub-question 3

Sub-question 3: “How do organizational features influence cognitive crafting by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”.

With regard to the cognitive crafting technique expanding perceptions, it can be concluded that employees in this case can interpret the impact of their jobs differently, in ways that make their work more meaningful. Moreover, perceived task identity and task significance that are part of the nature of employees’ jobs enable employees in this case to either ‘see’ the broader impact of their work or to put their own roles into perspective. This is in line with theoretical assumptions of this study, in which it was assumed that cognitive crafting allows employees to appreciate the broader effects of their jobs and to recognize the value of their own role (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013). However, it could also be said that as these features are ‘already’ high, it becomes less necessary to deliberately emphasize the larger impact of one’s job to for instance increase the meaningfulness of one’s job (Berg et al., 2013). With regard to the second cognitive crafting technique focusing perceptions, it was found that this technique was not really applicable for employees of this department. This finding can be related to the fact that employees in this case perceive high levels of freedom and the ability to make ‘actual’ changes to their sets of tasks (as illustrated in the task crafting section). Furthermore, when employees would have less opportunities to make those changes, this cognitive way of crafting would probably become more important or likely to occur. With regard to the last cognitive crafting technique linking perceptions, it can be concluded that employees in this case are able to link personal interests or passions or aspects of their (professional) identity to their work. It appeared to be important that there is an open and inspiring work climate in which there is room for initiative and for sharing thoughts. The inspiring attitude and vision of the general manager seem to foster or strengthen this climate and consequently, influence a certain mind-set of employees. Concluding, as employees are able to engage in task and relational crafting, changing perceptions with regard to work becomes less relevant. However, in addition to present literature on job crafting, cognitive crafting techniques can also give rise to ‘physical’ job crafting behaviour, and may be facilitated or supported by organizational features as summarized in the table below.

Table 4.1: Summary of the findings of this case study on the relationship between different organizational features and forms of job crafting.

		Task crafting				Relational crafting			Cognitive crafting			Collaborative crafting
		Add. tasks	Drop. tasks	Emph. tasks	Red. tasks	Build. rel.	Alt. ext. rel.	Refr. & adap. rel.	Exp. perc.	Foc. Perc.	Link. Perc.	
Structural features	Autonomy	<i>Facilitator</i> ¹⁶	<i>Facilitator</i>		<i>Facilitator</i>	<i>Facilitator</i>	<i>Facilitator</i>			<i>Lowers need</i>		
	Organization of work	<i>Facilitator</i>		<i>Facilitator / Challenge</i>	<i>Facilitator / Challenge</i>							<i>Facilitator</i>
	Task interdependence			<i>Facilitator / Challenge</i> ³	<i>Facilitator / Challenge</i>							<i>Facilitator</i> ⁴
	Task variety	<i>Lowers need</i> ²				<i>Facilitator</i> <i>Lowers need</i>						
	Task significance and identity								<i>Facilitator /</i> <i>Lowers need</i>			
Relational features	Organizational culture		<i>Support</i>				<i>Support</i>	<i>Lowers need</i>			<i>Support</i>	
	Role of the supervisor	<i>Facilitator</i> <i>Support</i> ⁵			<i>Support</i>	<i>Support</i>			<i>Support</i>			

¹ If autonomy is present or high than adding tasks by employees in this case study as a form of job crafting is facilitated.

² If task variety is present or high than the need for adding tasks by employees in this case study as a form of job crafting is lowered.

³ If task interdependence is present or high than emphasizing tasks individually by employees in this case study as a form of job crafting is challenged.

⁴ If task interdependence is present or high than collaborative forms of job crafting by employees in this case study are facilitated.

⁵ The supervisor in this department may support or stimulate employees in this case study to add tasks as a form of job crafting.

⁶ The relationship between autonomy and adding tasks as a form of job crafting may be mediated by the role of the supervisor.

Chapter 5. Conclusion and Discussion

Within this concluding chapter, section 5.1, an answer will be provided to the research question of this study. Within the discussion of this study, section 5.2, the researcher will reflect on the methodological choices made in this research and will explain the limitations of this study. Lastly, the theoretical contributions and the practical implications of this study, as well as the recommendations for further research will be discussed.

5.1 Conclusion

The research question of this study is defined as “how do organizational features influence job crafting processes by employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc?”. In the previous chapter the three sub-questions of the study were answered, in which more insight is gained in how three different job crafting techniques are used in practice by employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc and how different organizational features influence these processes. In this conclusion section, the focus will be on this relationship on a more abstract level and on mechanisms found to be important in explaining this relationship.

First of all, when comparing this case study to other cases studied in most previous research on job crafting, it can be concluded that an interesting case has been looked at in this study, especially with regard to studying the role of organizational features. More specifically, as already discussed in the second chapter of this study, employees working at the AMD of the Radboudumc are mainly highly educated professionals with complex, dynamic and non-routine jobs (in comparison to more ‘simple’ jobs look at in most literature) and touch upon the trends as described in the introduction of this study, such as working in autonomous teams. It must also be noted that the AMD of the Radboudumc consists of a variety of professional knowledge workers, ranging from sustainability consultants to occupational health physicians. The different job crafting techniques that are looked at in this study were not all used by employees of this department and if so, often in different ways (e.g., radical changes or detailed alterations in one’s job) and for different reasons. However, it can be concluded that jobs are altered in such ways that aspects of employees’ jobs become more in line with one’s personal expectations towards work, preferences, interests and/or ambitions. In the case of employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc, job crafting is also partly seen as an inherent part of the job. More specifically, employees altered their tasks or relations mostly in ways or for reasons they perceive are in line with what is best for performing one’s job. In this way, personal preferences

often seem to be ‘intertwined’ with beliefs on ‘doing a good job’. This may also be related to employees ‘living up’ to a shared professional identity or the reduced need for job crafting. What also became clear is that some job crafting techniques were used more or less intensively than others. With regard to cognitive crafting for instance, employees barely used focussing and linking perceptions. It could be that this is because employees in this department have the ability to make actual changes, making this job crafting techniques less needed or applicable. Furthermore, this also illustrates the ‘specialness’ of the case looked at, when comparing it to cases in most other literature in which employees often have less opportunities to make actual changes.

Related to the main question of this study, it was important to explore which organizational features are related to job crafting of employees and how they influence the process of employees engaging in job crafting (or not). First of all, all employees in this department, also the less highly educated employees (secretary functions), explain they feel free and able to make alterations to their jobs. The autonomy and decision latitude ‘built into’ employees’ jobs in this department are largely explained by the freedom and opportunity employees experience for making particular alterations, especially with regard to changing the task and relational boundaries of one’s job. Furthermore, when looking at this aspect of the job designs of employees, it can be said that the way jobs are designed at this department opens up opportunities for employees to engage in job crafting and supports and/or facilitates them in actually doing so. Moreover, it seems that the jobs of employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc are jobs in which a proactive attitude with regard to making decisions and alterations in work are more or less expected. This corresponds to the growing expectations on employees’ proactivity nowadays as suggested in the introduction of this study. Its implications for the concept of job crafting will be discussed in more depth in the discussion section of this chapter.

Another finding of this study is that employees in this case highly value the prevailing culture and the role of their supervisor when it comes to job crafting. As the perceived opportunity and the ability for job crafting activities are for a large part explained by the autonomy of professional workers in this case, these two relational features mainly seem related to supporting employees to make changes to their jobs. More specifically, the ‘supportive’ culture at the AMD of the Radboudumc appeared to support employees in engaging in different job crafting activities, as they feel supported by others in the department when initiating or making changes to one’s job. Likewise, employees also feel supported by their supervisor and indicate that they feel free to approach their supervisor and to discuss what they would like to change in

their jobs. Throughout their stories it became clear that these features also stimulate a certain mind-set of employees regarding being a professional in the lead. An open climate (in which there is room for discussion and sharing thoughts) and shared beliefs on being ‘a professional in the lead’ for instance may strengthen one’s feelings of ‘being in the drivers’ seat’ of one’s job and encourages employees to take more initiative. As employees are provided with enough freedom to craft their jobs already, it could be that these features are not ‘crucial’ in the ability to engage in job crafting in this case, but influence the intensity or quantity of the behaviour. Another mechanism found regarding the relationship between organizational features and job crafting of employees in this case relates to some structural features ‘challenging’ job crafting of employees. Although professional workers at this department are foremost independently operating (except for employees doing project-based work or employees with secretary functions for instance), they are all part of autonomously operating teams of professionals. This way of organizing brings along particular interdependencies and results in some limitations for individuals in making ‘radical’ changes to one’s job, especially related to changing ways of working or picking up particular roles. However, employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc do not feel ‘totally’ restricted by these features to engage in job crafting as they have the opportunity to negotiate on for instance new ways of working or the division of tasks within colleagues or their supervisor. Likewise, it also became clear that some ‘present’ structural or relational characteristics make particular job crafting techniques less needed for employees in this case, such as already meeting many different people makes building relationships less applicable or already having varied tasks lowers the need for adding tasks. However, this does not keep employees in this department from making adaptations or being proactive when they believe that is necessary for themselves or for the organization.

What can be concluded is that all employees of the AMD of the Radboudumc are able to engage in job crafting and that jobs are altered in different ways. In this way, jobs can become more in line with employees’ own preferences or with what is perceived necessary for performing the job. With regard to the main question of this study it can be concluded that organizational features influence job crafting of employees in this department in several ways that sometimes differ from theoretical assumptions of this study. Structural features such as autonomy and decision latitude seem to enable or facilitate professional workers to make changes to one’s work, whereas relational features such as an open and helping culture and a supportive and inspiring supervisor support job crafting of employees and stimulate a certain mind-set for job crafting. Possible challenges that are for instance related to the built-in task interdependence seem to be ‘outweighed’ by perceived opportunities of employees for negotiation with others

on making particular changes. A final remark is that some particular job crafting techniques in case of the AMD of the Radboudumc are less needed. It could be that jobs of most employees are already in line with one's personal expectations or preferences regarding for instance variety or challenge in work, which could be a consequence of the present organizational features or the ability to craft their jobs. It could also be that jobs in this department are designed in such a way that being proactive becomes inherent to performing one's job. This has some interesting consequences for the concept of job crafting, as will be discussed in the next section.

5.2 Discussion

Looking back at this study, some methodological choices may had implications for the conclusions of this study, as will be reflected on in section 5.2.1. This is followed by a short personal reflection on the research process in section 5.2.1.1. In section 5.2.2, the theoretical contributions of this study for literature on job crafting will be discussed, followed by some recommendations for further research in section 5.2.3. Hereafter, the practical implications of this study will be discussed in section 5.2.4, which is followed by some recommendations for practices in the last section, namely 5.2.5.

5.2.1 Methodological reflection

In the methodology chapter of this study it was explained which methodologic choices were made in order to study the formulated research question. Moreover, in the introduction of this study it was stated that qualitative research methods were found most suitable for studying job crafting in general. However, it was also questioned whether a qualitative research approach was also suitable with regard to studying the role of organizational features in job crafting processes. Looking back at this study, it can be concluded that this qualitative approach indeed contributed to a detailed description of how employees engage in job crafting and (although to a lesser extent) how they experience the influence of organizational features on their job crafting behaviour. However, some 'measurement' issues were also presenting themselves during this study.

From a methodological point of view, the qualitative research methods made it possible to gain an in-depth insight in job crafting experiences and explanations of employees in this case study, to provide an answer to the 'how' question of this study and to raise some interesting conceptual questions. However, job crafting appeared to be a difficult theme to study, especially because interpreting job crafting is a highly subjective and individual-level experience. By including three main themes derived from former literature (Berg et al., 2010b; 2013) on job crafting in

a deductive way, it became more easy to talk about specific job crafting activities. However, it was still hard for interviewees to think about particular themes such as cognitive crafting or adapting relationships and to imagine events in which they ‘used’ these techniques and to think about surrounding mechanisms, as these job crafting techniques often happen ‘unconscious’. As employees in this particular case study perceive much freedom to alter aspects of their jobs on a daily basis, it also became more difficult for them to distinguish job crafting behaviour from regular daily behaviour. Former researchers (e.g., Petrou et al., 2012; Tims et al., 2013; Vanbelle, 2017) also acknowledged this struggle and pointed at the between-person differences involved in job crafting and the complex and dynamic nature of job crafting and its potential mechanisms. What is important to take into account is that since this study has an explorative character (exploring how organizational features influence job crafting processes of employees in a particular case study), an open and qualitative approach was necessary to find (new) interesting themes or mechanisms. In this way, this study can serve as a starting point for more qualitative and quantitative research on this subject. More specifically, more qualitative (and quantitative) research could be used in exploring the role of organizational features in similar organizational settings and to get a more in depth understanding of present mechanisms. Moreover, interesting hypotheses can be developed based on a explorative research. In addition, a next step could be testing these hypotheses by means of quantitative research methods, such as conducting surveys. In a quantitative research design, a selection can be made regarding which organizational features and job crafting techniques to involve and to test whether these are related or for instance interrelated and to what degree.

In this study, semi structured interviews with open-ended questions were used as a means of data gathering. Due to the methodological difficulties described above, probing was sometimes necessary to steer interviewees into the right ‘direction’. More specifically, it sometimes seemed like interviewees were having a hard time thinking about what the researcher was asking of them. In these cases probing was necessary to ‘help’ employees come up with particular stories. For instance, when asking interviewees about how they perceive the influence of organizational features on their cognitive crafting attempts. Another difficulty with regard to semi-structured interviews is that interviewees are often inclined to provide answers to questions and do not always dare to say when they for instance do not make use of a particular job crafting technique or when they do not know something instantly (e.g., Symon & Cassell, 2012). So, maybe some kind of social desirable answers were provided during the interviews. However, as the researcher continued to conduct interviews until saturation for this case was reached, the consequences of these two difficulties were minimized as much as possible.

Lastly, because one single case study (at one specific department) has been conducted in this study, the transferability of the results of this study are automatically low, as explained in the third chapter of this study. However, throughout the interviews and during the data analysis of this study detailed descriptions, stories and results were collected. Because of these detailed descriptions of the collected data, readers of this study and other researchers are able to judge whether other specific organizational contexts could be informed by the findings of this study. The findings of this study might for instance be transferable to organizations (such as knowledge intensive one's), or departments of organizations, where employees have similar jobs. This could be case studies with professional (knowledge) workers for instance or cases in which employees work in similar autonomous teams, or both. It must also be noted that the case study looked at in this research consists of a variety of professionals with different jobs and needs. More specifically, some employees in this department have jobs that are based on project-work for instance (such as sustainability consultants), whereas others have less 'varied' jobs (such as occupational health physicians).

Concluding, despite some present methodological issues, the qualitative approach indeed appeared to be a suited research method to study the formulated research question and to explore the relationship between job crafting and organizational features in a particular case study. Furthermore, the findings of this qualitative study invite other researchers to study this relationship in more depth.

5.2.1.1 Personal reflection on the research process

In this paragraph some additional methodological implications will be discussed by means of a short personal reflection of the researcher on challenges encountered during the research process. During the research process there were many moments in which it became clear that doing a qualitative research is described as an iterative process for a good reason. More specifically, throughout all phases of this research cognitive shifts were present when making sense of the theories involved, methodological consequences and when collecting and analysing the data. These cognitive shifts were often fuelled by a quest for additional theories and perspectives to better understand and interpret job crafting and to best study and analyse job crafting and its relationship with organizational features. Especially as there are so many interesting perspectives and possibilities for exploring job crafting, it was no surprise that the biggest challenge within this research process relates to the delineation of what to include and what not. For this reason, the researcher continuously made slight and more radical alterations in several constructs during the whole research process. This also fits the explorative character

of this study. More specifically, in exploratory research aspects of the research are altered and adapted when new findings require this, thus reflecting the intuitive nature of exploratory case studies. By keeping track of new ideas and by explaining why and how particular changes were made in notebooks and by discussing them with her supervisor and other students, the researcher was able to structure her thoughts. These thoughts and explanations could also be helpful for future researchers who have similar struggles when studying job crafting.

5.2.2 Theoretical contributions of the study

As stated in the first chapter of this study, little empirical research has looked at the influence of organizational features on job crafting of employees. Furthermore, it was also stated that most former literature on job crafting involves cases of employees with more ‘simple’ jobs and that there is a need for more insights on job crafting of employees with more ‘complex’ jobs, especially with regard to the role of organizational features. Therefore, the contribution of this study to existing literature is that this study empirically looked at the relationship between organizational features and job crafting in a particular case study involving professional workers in a knowledge intensive department of one organization. This study has looked at how job crafting is used by employees in a qualitative way, so that insights are gained on how these job crafting processes take place in practice and how they are influenced by organizational features. Four contributions found most striking will be discussed hereafter.

At first, with regard to the mechanisms found when looking at the relationship between job crafting of employees and relational features within the AMD of the Radboudumc, it became clear the nature and the design of jobs (such as complex jobs of professional workers in this case) influence whether employees are able to craft their jobs and feel the need to craft their jobs. Furthermore, looking at this specific department it can be concluded that particular relational features support employees in making changes or stimulate a certain mind-set of employees with regard to job crafting, which influences how and to what extent employees craft their jobs. Moreover, it appeared that job crafting of employees in this case is an ‘interplay’ between personal needs and expectations regarding work and provided opportunities. Organizational features can ‘directly’ influence job crafting of employees, by providing employees the opportunity to change their jobs themselves, based on their personal needs or expectations, for instance by giving them enough autonomy or opportunities to be proactive. This makes sense from a socio-technical perspective, as employees are given the regulatory potential to deal with things, to experiment and to make changes (e.g., Achterbergh & Vriens, 2009). However, organizational features can also reduce the need for job crafting by designing

jobs or creating a social environment that are already close to employees' expectations. This can be interpreted from the perspective of de Sitter (1994) who looks at values of specific parameters in organizational structures. In the latter case, it seems logical that crafting one's job is more about changing particular details. It must be said that individual differences, and thus personal needs of employees were not the main focus of this study, as explained in the second chapter of this research. However, it is reasonable to expect that expectations towards work of employees in this case differ from employees with more simple jobs. What can be concluded is that the relationship between job crafting and organizational features is more complex and dynamic than suggested in former literature of Berg et al., (2010b; 2013).

Second, with regard to the 'separate' job crafting techniques as conceptualized by Wrzeñniewski and Dutton (2001) and Berg et al., (2010b; 2013), it can be concluded that the different forms of job crafting are not as separate as displayed in the model, but are related to each other instead. For instance, what was frequently noticed in this case study was that building new relationships or contacts is often a consequence of task crafting techniques (such as adding tasks or joining new projects or workgroups). More specifically, when employees start to change the task boundaries of their jobs, this is often accompanied by changing relational boundaries. Another interesting finding relates to the relationship between cognitive crafting and the 'physical' forms of job crafting. On the one hand, the ability of making actual changes makes changing perceptions less necessary for employees in a way. On the other hand, cognitive crafting and reflecting on aspects of one's job can also give rise to or go hand in glove with making actual changes. So, although it is understandable that these concepts are separated in the literature to make them more clear, it is also reasonable to expect that those concepts are more closely related in practice.

The third theoretical contribution of this study is related to the appearance of 'collaborative' or 'collective' forms of job crafting. When looking at initial reasoning's, it makes sense that job crafting is explained as an individual activity in traditional literature (e.g., Wrzeñniewski & Dutton, 2001), as it reflects proactive behaviour initiated by employees themselves to better match their own needs to their jobs and to shape their own work identities. However, as work in this department is organized around mainly autonomous teams of professionals it also seems logical to expect that members jointly negotiate on how work is carried out. In this case study it became clear that working in teams and related (task) interdependency may challenge individuals job crafting (for instance redesigning tasks) in a way, but opens up opportunities to craft jobs together. Although this form of job crafting was already noticed by Ghitulesscu (2007) and Leana et al., (2009) and described as a consequence of (complex) jobs becoming more

socially embedded, it has received little attention within literature so far. When looking at other literature (e.g., Orr 1996) it could be that this behaviour can either be discreet (e.g., deliberate negotiation on who will pick up particular tasks) or more implicit (e.g., whereby work practices are developed and shared on an ongoing basis). Furthermore, in this case study individual job crafting attempts (e.g., choosing to join a particular work group) and collaborative job crafting (e.g., developing new ways of working together) do not seem mutually exclusive and employees can engage in both.

The last contribution discussed in this section relates to defining the concept of job crafting as elaborated on in the second chapter of this study. In the analysis of this study it appeared that some findings raise interesting questions on the concept of job crafting. At first, most employees in this case see proactivity as inherent part of their jobs, which may call into question whether their behaviour still captures the proactivity as intended in the conceptualization of job crafting (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001; Grant & Parker, 2009). Moreover, as already mentioned above, job crafting is not always solely initiated or performed by the self, but is often negotiated with the supervisor or with colleagues instead. In this way, job crafting in this case becomes more closely related to other redesign perspectives such as role negotiation and task revision than was expected in the first place. However, Berg et al., (2013) already noticed that employees always need 'lines' in the first place to be able to engage in job crafting. In this case, this reasoning can be understood as employees making use of opportunities they are given (e.g., autonomy) and features within the organizational context that are already there (e.g., a supportive supervisor) in a proactive way, in order to meet personal valued outcomes that can also be related to beliefs on doing a good job or contributing to the organization.

5.2.3 Recommendations for future research

When considering the methodological and theoretical implications of this study, some recommendations for future research on job crafting and the relationship between job crafting and organizational features can be made. First of all, more research should be conducted on how organizational features influence job crafting of employees in cases in which employees have similar jobs. More specifically, research should be conducted at organizations, or departments of organizations, in which employees also have complex, dynamic and non-routinized tasks and in which work is organized around autonomous teams. These insights are relevant because there is a growing number of knowledge-intensive organizations and expectations towards work are rising (e.g., Grant & Parker, 2009; Peeters et al., 2014), both in terms of how jobs are designed and regarding proactivity. On the contrary, it would also be

interesting to conduct research in organizational contexts where employees have completely other jobs or when work is organized in other ways, to see whether other job crafting techniques, facilitators, challenges and mechanisms come to the fore.

When looking at the sub-conclusions of this study with regard to the influence of organizational features on the three different forms of job crafting, it appeared that no clear conclusions could be drawn with regard to all job crafting techniques. Moreover, cognitive crafting and particular forms of relational crafting (adapting and reframing relationships for instance) were difficult for interviewees to tell about and to connect with particular organizational features. More qualitative research on the role of these job crafting techniques for employees in similar circumstances, for instance regarding the ability of making changes to one's job, and similar needs are necessary to draw more clear conclusions. In addition, more quantitative research can provide insights in 'how much' or 'to what extent' questions with regard to the relationship between particular job crafting techniques and specific organizational features and can draw conclusions on their applicability. Quantitative research can also be used to investigate the reciprocal relationship between particular job crafting techniques and the interplay between selected organizational features. It could be an interesting option for future research to use both qualitative and quantitative research methods in one research (mixed methods), so insights are gained on how job crafting processes take place and are being influenced by organizational features and also on the extent to which organization features influence job crafting of employees (or not).

Another suggestion for further research is related to the appearance of collaborative forms of job crafting. As this is a particularly new concept in literature on job crafting, more research should explore how processes of collaborative job crafting take place in different organizational settings and how they are influenced by for instance shared identities or beliefs, and group decision making processes and organizational structures. Furthermore, further research could also explore how individual job crafting is related to collaborative forms of job crafting and whether they are really separated constructs or reinforce each other.

In the theoretical part of this study it was mentioned that besides organizational features, individual differences are also related to whether and how employees engage in job crafting. It was also explained that these individual differences were not part of the main focus of this study, due to the scope of this master thesis. However, as became clear in this study, job crafting hovers at the interface between personal needs and expectations, and present organizational features, that in turn influence the opportunity for job crafting and the need for job crafting. It would be interesting to further investigate the role of particular individual differences in job

crafting processes and to study the interplay with organizational features. Theoretical frameworks of other individual job redesign or proactive behaviour constructs may be used for doing so. It would be interesting for instance, to study employees with different expectations towards work or different personalities (for instance with regard to their proactivity) in the same organizational context having similar opportunities for job crafting.

A last suggestion for further research is related to an ‘issue’ that was mentioned in the methodology section of this research. It was stated that some interesting additional (sub)themes were found during the analysis of the data, that were not related directly to answering the main question of this study. For this reason, they were not displayed in the templates of this study. However, these topics, that can be found in the data-set of this study, could be interesting for other research directions on job crafting. More specifically, topics related to for instance ‘learning’ and ‘identity’ were often mentioned by employees during the interviews in this case study and seemed to be important for them when talking about job crafting. It could be interesting to study the role of these two concepts in more depth and to explore how they are related to job crafting of employees in particular contexts.

Concluding, this study opens up plenty of interesting opportunities for studying job crafting in general and for looking at issues related to these job crafting processes and the role of organizational features. Moreover, further research should pay attention to establishing a more comprehensive view of ‘job crafting processes’, and to implications for the concept of job crafting and for the theoretical framework regarding this concept. In this way, researchers can develop a more overarching approach for studying job crafting.

5.2.4 Practical implications

As explained in the introduction and in the theoretical chapter of this study, job crafting is associated with many potential benefits for employees as well as for organizations, as employees can optimize their own functioning in terms of their well-being (e.g., work engagement and meaningfulness), work attitude (e.g., person-job fit and employability) and behaviour (e.g., work performance) by means of crafting their jobs (e.g., Leana et al., 2009; Tims et al., 2012; Nielsen & Abildgaard, 2012; Petrou et al., 2012). Therefore, it was stated that insights in how job crafting of employees is influenced by organizational features, is something that can be beneficial for organizations. Although elaborating on current literature on job crafting was the main focus of this study, additional light is shed on practical implications as well. More specifically, this study sheds light on three practical implications, namely the

importance of traditional top-down job (re)design as a base for job crafting, the important role of supervisors and the interplay of personal needs, job crafting and top-down initiatives.

What can be concluded from this case study is that there are some necessary ingredients in the organizational context for employees to craft their jobs. So, even though scholars (e.g., Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001) have traditionally assumed that every employee in every work context would be able to engage in job crafting and job crafting is explained as an individual-level construct, organizational features are essential in facilitating or in supporting employees to craft their jobs. Moreover, the findings of this study indeed emphasize the complementary role of job crafting next to other top-down redesign approaches, as already suggested in the theoretical chapter of this study. More specifically, top-down (re)design approaches and thus organizational features may provide a 'fundamental base' for job crafting of employees. In this case study, autonomy, a sense of freedom and the decision latitude employees experience in their job are found to be important antecedents for job crafting of professional knowledge workers, as this shapes their perceived opportunity to engage in job crafting. Traditional top-down (re)design methods, such as providing employees with enough regulatory potential or organizing work around self-managing teams, do not only indicate the boundaries which can be altered to colour 'outside the lines', as assumed by Wrześniewski & Dutton (2001) and Berg et al., (2013), but enlarge the opportunity for employees to colour 'inside the lines' of their job by means of job crafting. Furthermore, creating a supportive and open organizational culture or climate was also found to support or stimulate employees to make changes to their jobs. In case of the AMD of the Radboudumc, employees feel able and triggered to initiate changes and to discuss these with others at the department, which could facilitate or stimulate them in crafting their jobs.

In addition, supervisors or managers might play an essential role in creating such a supportive culture or in designing jobs that foster employees to engage in job crafting, as already suggested in former literature (e.g., Demerouti, 2014). In this case study, the supervisor for instance strengthened employees feelings of autonomy and decision latitude by creating a 'flatter' organizational structure within the department that is based on autonomous teams of professionals. In this way, the supervisor invites professional workers to use their own regulatory potential more intensively, to lean on their professional knowledge and skills and to arrange and discuss work methods together, which shapes their opportunity to engage in individual and collaborative forms of job crafting. Moreover, emphasizing a particular belief (professional in the lead) and stimulating employees to reflect on their jobs and careers were

also found important in supporting employees to take initiative. In the next section, it will be discussed in more depth how job crafting can find its way to practitioners.

Lastly, in this case study it also became clear that organizational features might ‘reduce the need’ for employees to engage in job crafting. More specifically, it can be noted that the need for job crafting of employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc seems particularly low, which can be a consequence of personal differences (i.e. personality or work orientation), former job crafting activities, but more likely of present organizational features (i.e. how jobs are designed and facilitating leadership) that live up to employees’ expectations, or a combination of the three. This illustrates the interplay between personal needs, job crafting and top-down regulation, in which both job (re)design initiatives of employees and the organization are mutually reinforced. Job crafting seems to be about stimulating employees to take advantage of personal characteristics and of actively responding to features provided within the organizational context.

5.2.5 Job crafting: a challenge for the supervisor

Throughout this study it became clear that job crafting processes of employees at the AMD of the Radboudumc are facilitated or supported by present structural and relational features in different ways and that a manager or supervisor can play an important role in shaping these organizational features and in supporting employees’ job crafting behaviour. Instead of focusing on recommendations at the level of the individual employee, this section takes a different approach by highlighting job crafting from the perspective of the supervisor. Moreover, ideas will be provided regarding how managers or supervisors can shape their own role and responsibilities in job crafting processes of employees.

At first, it is important for supervisors to create more awareness among employees on what job crafting is, what forms it can take and what opportunities employees have to engage in job crafting and to make changes themselves. Moreover, stimulating reflection and awareness on both the current work situation of the employee (i.e. doing a task analysis) and on personal ambitions, interests or competencies (i.e. personal goal setting) might help employees to envision what they would like to change and might enhance their proactivity, as was already suggested by Parker et al., (2010). Employees might be coached in this way in exploring their needs and opportunities to craft. Furthermore, by stressing the importance of self-regulation and proactivity and by giving feedback and advice in doing so, supervisors seem to inspire and motivate employees to engage in job crafting. Next to coaching, inspiring and supporting employees, supervisors can also play an important role in ‘installing’ a supportive environment

or in designing jobs that facilitate job crafting, for instance by stimulating employees to have day-to-day interactions on their (job crafting) experiences with others in the department or by providing them with enough autonomy to give shape to their jobs on a daily basis, as was elaborated on in the previous section. So, even though supervisors are not always able to affect when and to what extent job crafting occurs (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001), they might enhance organizational features that enlarge the opportunity for employees to engage in job crafting as well as making employees more comfortable or motivated in doing so.

Although the outcomes of job crafting by employees were not the main focus of this study, it is interesting for organizations to get more insights in the relationship between particular top-down ‘interventions’, job crafting of employees and outcomes at the level of the organization. As already stated in the theoretical section of this study, optimizing organizational goals or contributing to organizational performance are not the primary target of job crafting behaviour, but can be seen as a ‘by-product’ instead (Demerouti, 2014). It might be the case that stimulating collaborative forms of job crafting (for instance by means of designing autonomous teams) is more beneficial for the organization than encouraging employees to craft jobs individually, as employees are invited to think about their performance together and to make changes that are beneficial for the overall team. In this way, job crafting might have more ‘direct’ value for the overall organization. Exploring this interplay would be interesting for practitioners and for future researchers.

Concluding, although job crafting happens “all around us” (Wrześniewski & Dutton, 2001, p. 180), not all employees may feel inclined or able to make changes to their job. Therefore, it is essential for the supervisor to address what type of employees are involved in the organization and to talk about their preferences and needs. In case of the AMD of the Radboudumc professional workers explain that it is important for them that the supervisor should not interfere too much with the content of their work and that this should be left to the professional, as they highly value their professional autonomy. Moreover, it seems logical that needs or ways of job crafting of employees with less complex and more routinized jobs are different. To this end, it is important for supervisors to discuss personal needs, to recognize that the employee is the person who knows the job best and to think about where there is room for improvement in organizational features or for job crafting of the employee in a way that fits them and the organization better.

Literature

- Achterbergh, J., & Vriens, D. (2009). *Organizations: social systems conducting experiments*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Alvesson, M., & Lee Ashcraft, K. (2012). Interviews. In *Qualitative Organizational Research* (pp. 239-257). London, England: Sage.
- Ashforth, B., & Pratt, M. (2003). Institutionalized spirituality. In *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 93-107).
- Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (83-104). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human resource management, 43*(1).
- Bakker, A., Tims, M., & Derks, D. (2012). Proactive personality and job performance: The role of job crafting and work engagement. *Human relations, 65*(10), 1359-1378.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American psychologist, 37*(2), 122.
- Barley, S., & Kunda, G. (2001). Bringing work back in. *Organization science, 12*(1), 76-95.
- Berg, J., Dutton, J., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2008). What is job crafting and why does it matter. Retrieved from the website of *Positive Organizational Scholarship*. Opgeroepen op Oktober 23, 2017
- Berg, J., Dutton, J., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2013). Job crafting and meaningful work. *Purpose and meaning in the workplace, 81-104*.
- Berg, J., Grant, A., & Johnson, V. (2010a). When callings are calling: Crafting work and leisure in pursuit of unanswered occupational callings. *Organizational Science, 21*(5), 973-994.
- Berg, J., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. (2010b). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 32*(2), 158-186.
- Bleijenbergh, I. (2013). *Kwalitatief onderzoek in organisaties*. Den Haag: Boom Lemma.
- Boeije, H. (2012). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek*. The Hague: Boom Lemma.

- Brenninkmeijer, V., & Hekkert-Koning, M. (2015). To craft or not to craft: The relationships between regulatory focus, job crafting and work outcomes. *Career Development International*, 20(2), 147-162.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Campion, M., & McClelland, C. (1993). Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(3), 339.
- Chen, C., Yen, C., & Tsai, F. (2014). Job crafting and job engagement: the mediating role of person-job fit. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 21-28.
- Chiaburu, D., & Harrison, D. (2008). *Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCB's and performance*.
- Clegg, C., & Spencer, C. (2007). A circular and dynamic model of the process of job design. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(2), 321-339.
- Crant, J. (2000). Proactive behaviour in organizations. *Journal of management*, 26(3), 435-462.
- Cummings, T., & Worley, C. (2009). *Organization development and change*. Cengage learning.
- Cunha, M., Cunha, J., & Kamoche, K. (1993). Organizational improvisation: What, when, how and why. *International journal of management reviews*, 1(3), 299-341.
- de Sitter, L. (2000). *Synergetisch produceren*. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- de Sitter, L., Dankbaar, B., & den Hertog, F. (1994). *Designing simple organizations and complex jobs*.
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of research in personality*, 19(2), 109-134.
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your own job through job crafting. *European Psychologist*, 19, pp. 237-247.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. (2014). Job crafting. *An introduction to contemporary work psychology*, 1, 414-433.
- Denzin, N. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80-88.
- Dutton, J., & Heaphy, E. (2009). The power of high-quality connections. *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*, 3, 263-278.

- Easterby-Smith, M., Golden-Biddle, K., & Locke, K. (2008). Working with pluralism: Determining quality in qualitative research. *Organizational Research Methods, 11*(3), 419-429.
- Edmondson, A., & McManus, S. (2007). Methodological fit in management field research. *Academy of management review, 32*(4), 1246-1264.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Agency theory: An assessment and review. *Academy of management review, 14*(1), 57-74.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review, 14*(4), 532-550.
- Eisenhardt, K., & Graebner, M. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of management journal, 50*(1), 25-32.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in organization behaviour, 23*, 133-187.
- Frese, M., Fay, D., Hilburger, T., Leng, K., & Tag, A. (1997). The concept of personal initiative: Operationalization, reliability and validity in two German samples. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 70*(2), 139-161.
- Fried, Y., Grant, A.M., Levi, A., Hadani, M., & SLOWIK, L. (2007). Job design in temporal context: A career dynamics perspective. *Journal of Organizational behaviour, 28*(7), 911-927.
- Ghitulescu, B. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of job crafting*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Grant, A., & Ashford, S. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in organizational behaviour, 28*, 2-34.
- Grant, A., & Parker, S. (2009). 7 Redesigning work design theories: the rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management annuals, 3*(1), 317-375.
- Grant, A., Parker, S., & Collins, C. (2009). Getting credit for proactive behaviour: Supervisor reactions depend on what you value and how you feel. *Personnel Psychology, 62*(1), 31-55.

- Griffin, M., Neal, A., & Parker, S. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behaviour in uncertain and interdependent context. *Academy of management journal*, 50(2), 327-347.
- Griffin, R. (1987). Toward an integrated theory of job design. *Research in Organization Behavior*, 9, 79-120.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
- Hacker, W. (2003). Action regulation theory: A practical tool for the design of modern work processes? *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 12(2), 105-130.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behaviour and human performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision processes*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading: MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading: MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Heaphy, E., & Dutton, J. (2008). Positive social interactions and the human body at work: Linking organizations and psychology. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 137-162.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and nature of man*. New York: World.
- Holt, R. (2012). Ethical research practice. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell, *Qualitative Organizational Research* (pp. 90-108). London, England: Sage.
- Hornung, S., Rousseau, D., & Glaser, J. (2008). Creating flexible work arrangements through idiosyncratic deals. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 655.
- Humphrey, S., Nahrgang, J., & Morgeson, F. (2007). Integrating motivational, social and contextual work design features: a meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. 10.
- Ilgen, D., & Hollenbeck, J. (1992). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M. Dunette, & L. Hough, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 165-207). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

- Kanten, P. (2014). The antecedents of job crafting: Perceived organizational support, job characteristics and self-efficacy. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3, 113-128.
- King, N. (2013). Doing template analysis. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell, *Qualitative Organizational Research* (pp. 426-450). London, England: Sage.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Labuschagne, A. (2003). Qualitative research-airy fairy or fundamental? *The qualitative report*, 8(1), 100-103.
- Langfred, C., & Rockmann, K. (2016). The push and pull of autonomy: the tension between individual autonomy and organizational control in knowledge work. *Group & Organization Management*, 41(5), 629-657.
- Langley, A., & Abdallah, C. (2011). Templates and turns in qualitative studies of strategy and management. In *Building methodological bridges* (pp. 201-235). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Le Blanc, P., Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., Fraccaroli, F., & Sverke, M. (2017). How can I shape my job to suit me better? Job crafting for sustainable employees and organizations. In *An Introduction to Work and Organizational Psychology: An International Perspective* (pp. 48-63).
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuck, 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(1), 25-36.
- McClelland, G., Leach, D., Clegg, C., & McGowan, W. (2014). Collaborative crafting in call centre teams. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(3), 464-486.
- Miller, V., Johnson, J., Hart, Z., & Peterson, D. (1999). *A test of antecedents and outcomes of employee role negotiation ability*.

- Nielsen, K., & Abildgaard, J. (2012). The development and validation of a job crafting measure for use with blue-collar workers. *Work & Stress, 26*(4), 365-384.
- Niessen, C., Weseler, D., & Kostova, P. (2016). When and why do individual craft their jobs? The role of individual motivation and work characteristics for job crafting. *Human relations, 69*(6), 1287-1313.
- Noor, K. (2008). Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American Journal of applied sciences, 5*(11), 1602-1604.
- Ogawa, R., & Malen, B. (1991). Towards rigor in reviews of multivocal literatures: Applying the exploratory case study method. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(3), 265-286.
- Oldham, G., & Fried, Y. (2016). Job design research and theory: Past present and future. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 136*, pp. 20-35.
- Parker, S., & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating jobs. In *Work motivation: Past, present and future* (pp. 233-284).
- Parker, S., Williams, H., & Turner, N. (2006). Modelling the antecedents of proactive behaviour at work. *Journal of applied psychology, 91*(3), 636.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks CA:Sage.
- Peeters, M., De Jonge, J., & Taris, T. (2013). *An introduction to contemporary work psychology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Petrou, P. (2013). *Crafting the change: The role of job crafting and regulatory focus in adaptation to organizational change*. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Petrou, P., & Demerouti, E. (2015). Trait-level and week-level regulatory focus as a motivation to craft a job. *Career Development International, 20*(2), 102-118.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2015). Job crafting in changing organizations: Antecedents and implications for exhaustion and performance. *Journal of occupational health psychology, 20*(4), 470-480.
- Petrou, P., Demerouti, E., Peeters, M., Schaufeli, W., & Hetland, J. (2012). Crafting a job on a daily basis: Contextual correlates and the link to work engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 33*(8), 1120-1141.

- Rosso, B., Dekas, K., & Wrześniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 30, 91-127.
- Rowley, J. (2002). Using case studies in research. *Management research news*, 25(1), 16-27.
- Saunders, M. (2012). Choosing research participants. In G. Symon, & C. Cassell, *Qualitative Organizational Research* (pp. 35-52). London, England: Sage.
- Schein, E. (1971). The individual, the organization and the career: A conceptual scheme. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 7(4), 401-426.
- Schein, E., & Bennis, W. (1965). *Personal and organizational change through group methods: The laboratory approach*. New York: Wiley.
- Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative inquire*, 5(4), 465-478.
- Siggelkow, N. (2007). Persuasion with case studies. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 20-24.
- Slemp, G., & Vella-Brodrick, D. (2013). The Job Crafting Questionnaire: A new scale to measure the extent to which employees engage in job crafting. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 3(2).
- Spreitzer, G. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement and validation. *Academy of management journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Staw, B., & Boettger, R. (1990). Task revision: A neglected form of work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(3), 534-559.
- Symon, G., & Cassell, C. (2012). *Qualitative organizational research: core methods and current challenges*. Sage.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(2), 1-9.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A., & Derks, D. (2012). Development and validation of the job crafting scale. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 80(1), 173-186.
- Tims, M., Bakker, A., & Derks, K. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 18(2), 230.
- Trist, E. (1981). The evolution of socio-technical systems. *Occasional paper*, 2.

- Twenge, J. (2006). *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled - and more miserable than ever before.* . New York: NY: Free Press.
- Van Amelsvoort, P., & Benders, J. (1996). Team time: a model for developing self-directed work teams. *International Journal of operations and production*, 16(2), 159-170.
- Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviours: Evidence of construct and predicitive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
- Vanbelle, E. (2017). *Job crafting: An Overarching Approach.*
- Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of management review*, 29(2), 222-240.
- Wageman, R. (1995). Interdependence and group effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 145-180.
- Wang, H. (2017). *Leadership, job crafting and work outcomes: can leaders cultivate well-performing job crafters?* Technische Universiteit Eindhoven: Doctoral dissertation.
- Wang, H., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. (2016). A review of job crafting research: The role of leader behaviours in cultivating successful job crafting. *Proactivity at work*.
- Wong, S.I., Škerlavaj, M., & Cerne, M. (2017). Build coalitions to Fit: Autonomy Expectations, Competence Mobilization, and Job craftign. *Human Resource Management*, 56(5), 785-801.
- Wrześniewski , A., & Dutton, J. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of management review*, 26(2), 179-201.
- Wrześniewski , A., LoBuglio, N., Dutton, J., & Berg, J. (2013). Job crafting and cultivating positive meaning and identity in work. In *Advances in positive organizational psychology* (pp. 281-302). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Wrześniewski, A., Dutton, J., & Debebe, G. (2003). Interpersonal sensemaking and the meaning of work. *Research in organizational behaviour*, 25, 93-135.
- Yin, R. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills: Calif: Sage publications.

Appendix A - Interview Guide

Dutch version

Datum	--/--/2017
Tijd	--:--
Afdeling geïnterviewde	
Functie geïnterviewde	

Introductie

Hallo, ik ben Josan de Gouw, een master student Bedrijfskunde aan de Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Allereerst wil ik u bedanken voor uw deelname aan dit interview. Dit interview is een onderdeel van mijn afstudeeronderzoek en gaat over de relatie tussen 'job crafting' en organisatorische kenmerken. Er bestaat geen Nederlandse term voor 'job crafting', maar kort gezegd gaat dit over veranderingen die medewerkers zelf aanbrengen in hun werk of baan, bijvoorbeeld om hun werk meer zinvol, meer eigen of uitdagender te maken. Enkele voorbeelden kunnen zijn het toevoegen van nieuwe taken binnen uw baan (uiteenlopend van het organiseren tot bedrijfsuitjes tot het verdiepen in nieuwe systemen of het initiëren van een extra project), het geven van extra ondersteuning of coaching aan een collega of cliënt, of het anders gaan denken over bepaalde taken of werkrelaties. Bij organisatorische kenmerken kunt u denken aan kenmerken van uw baan, kenmerken van de AMD, de sociale omgeving, samenwerkingen, de cultuur, organisatiestructuur en bepaalde werk policies. Het interview zal gaan over job crafting en de relatie tussen organisatorische kenmerken, en vooral wat u als hulpmiddel of belemmering/uitdaging hebt ervaren. Door middel van dit interview wil ik graag leren hoe u dingen ziet, ervaart en hoe u zich daarbij voelt. Ik heb wat vragen voorbereid, maar deze zijn erg open van aard.

Met uw toestemming maak ik graag een audio-opname van dit interview, zodat ik het na afloop kan uitwerken. Uiteraard is alles wat gezegd wordt tijdens dit interview vertrouwelijk en alleen ik en mijn begeleider vanuit de Universiteit zijn op de hoogte van de inhoud van dit gesprek. Alle namen en verwijfbare informatie worden geanonimiseerd in zowel de uitwerking van dit interview als het uiteindelijke onderzoeksverslag. Dan wil ik nu graag overgaan op het daadwerkelijke interview. Ik verwacht dat deze ongeveer een uur zal duren. Als er een vraag tussendoor onduidelijk is kunt u altijd om extra uitleg vragen. Neem ook gerust de tijd om na te denken over een antwoord. We starten met een algemeen onderdeel over u en uw functie binnen het AMD. Vervolgens gaan we dieper in op uw 'job crafting' ervaringen en tot slot besteden we nog aandacht aan uw werkomgeving. Heeft u nog vragen voordat we beginnen?

Persoon en functie (aan het einde van het interview invullen)

- Geslacht:
- Leeftijd:
- Hoogst genoten opleiding:
- Aantal jaren werkzaam in het AMD:
- Aantal jaren werkzaam binnen huidige functie:

1. Algemene vragen

- Kunt u zichzelf kort voorstellen?
- Wat is uw huidige functie?

- c. Kunt u samen met mij eens een voor u reguliere werkdag doorlopen, hoe ziet zo'n dag eruit? *Doorvragen naar taken, projecten en samenwerkingen.*
- d. Hoe worden deze taken en/of projecten binnen uw functie vastgesteld? *Doorvragen: formele taakomschrijving, van bovenaf bepaald of eigen inbreng.*

2.1 Interviewee als job crafter - task crafting

Vaak definiëren organisaties, of meer specifiek leidinggevenden, de taken en verantwoordelijkheden van werknemers. Echter, soms bepalen werknemers ook zelf welke taken en/of projecten ze uitvoeren of op wat voor een manier. Daarnaast besluit je ook wel eens op eigen initiatief iets extra's of iets geheel anders op je te nemen, zoals het organiseren van een bedrijfsuitje of het volgen van een extra cursus. Hier hebben de volgende vragen betrekking op.

- a. Kunt u zich een situatie voor de geest halen waarin u besloot iets te veranderen in uw takenpakket of in uw dagelijkse werklevens? Bijvoorbeeld wanneer u besloot een taak of project toe te voegen? Kunt u deze situatie beschrijven? Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *[adding tasks]*
- b. Heeft u ooit wel eens besloten een taak of project te laten vallen? Bijvoorbeeld iets te delegeren? Kunt u deze situatie beschrijven? Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *[dropping tasks]*
- c. Welke eigenschappen van uw werk of van de organisatie hebben volgens u bijgedragen aan het doorvoeren van deze verandering(en)? Hoe speelden deze een rol? Wat of wie heeft u geholpen? *Eventueel doorvragen naar kenmerken van de organisatie, gevoel van autonomie, manier waarop taken gestructureerd zijn, interdependencies, job complexity, rol van leidinggevende, support van collega's, werk policies, feedback, teamwork etc. [facilitators]*
- d. Heeft u ooit een verandering door willen voeren of doorgevoerd waarin u op een bepaalde manier weerstand of uitdagingen ervaarde? Kunt u zo'n situatie beschrijven? Welke features hebben u belemmerd of ervaarde u als een obstakel? *Eventueel doorvragen naar bovenstaande features. [challenges]*
- e. Kunt u beschrijven of u wel eens bepaalde taken of delen van u werkt extra benadrukt, bijvoorbeeld door meer tijd en energie hierin te steken of er aandacht aan te besteden? Of juist minder? Zo ja, hoe deed u dit? Waarom deed u dit? *[emphasizing tasks]*
- f. Hoe speelden volgens u eigenschappen van uw werk of de organisatie hierbij een rol? *Eventueel doorvragen naar bovenstaande features [facilitators/challenges]*
- g. Kunt u beschrijven of en hoe u uw huidige taken en/of projecten zich wel eens eigen maakt door er bijvoorbeeld een eigen twist aan te geven? *[redesigning tasks]*
- h. Hoe speelden volgens u features van uw werk of de organisatie hierbij een rol? *Eventueel doorvragen naar bovenstaande features [facilitators/challenges]*

2.2 Interviewee als job crafter - relational crafting

Binnen je werk onderhoud je of heb je op verschillende manieren contact met anderen, dus je werkrelaties. In sommige gevallen maken werknemers zelf de keuze om relaties of interacties met anderen aan te gaan of op een bepaalde manier anders vorm te geven. Anders vormgeven kan bijvoorbeeld door contact te intensiveren of verminderen, het doel van het contact te veranderen, bepaalde contacten anders in te zetten of bepaalde werkrelaties anders te benaderen. Relaties kunnen betrekking hebben op bijvoorbeeld het contact met collega's, met cliënten, met studenten, leidinggevenden of externe partijen. Redenen voor deze vorm van job crafting kunnen zijn dat u bepaalde relaties wilt voeden om je netwerk te vergroten, opdrachten binnen te halen, kennis op wilt doen, voor de gezelligheid, om door te groeien binnen de organisatie, om betrokkenheid met anderen te voelen, om een project te laten

slagen, expertise binnen te halen of het verbeteren van contact met externen. De volgende vragen hebben hier betrekking op.

- a. Kunt u allereerst kort iets vertellen over de huidige contacten/relaties die u nu tijdens uw werk heeft en wat voor rol deze voor u spelen?
- b. Bent u wel eens bewust een nieuwe samenwerking aangegegaan? Zo ja, hoe deed u dit? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *Proactief in het benaderen van collega's? [building/adding relationships]*
- c. Heeft u ooit bewust een werkrelatie geïntensiveerd of juist in contact verminderd? Zo ja, hoe deed u dit? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *[building/adding relationships]*
- d. Welke features in uw werkomgeving hebben volgens u bijgedragen aan het doorvoeren van de verandering? Hoe speelden deze een rol? *Eventueel doorvragen naar kenmerken van de organisatie, gevoel van autonomie, manier waarop taken gestructureerd zijn, interdependencies, job complexity, rol van leidinggevende, support van collega's, werk policies, feedback, teamwork etc. [facilitators]*
- e. Heeft u ooit een verandering door willen voeren of doorgevoerd waarin u op een bepaalde manier weerstand of uitdagingen ervaarde? Kunt u zo'n situatie beschrijven? Welke features hebben u belemmerd of ervaarde u als een obstakel? Hoe? *Eventueel doorvragen naar bovenstaande features. [challenges]*
- f. Heeft u ooit het doel van een bestaande werkrelatie of de vorm hiervan veranderd? Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *[reframing relationships]*
- g. Hoe speelden volgens u eigenschappen van uw werk of de organisatie hierbij een rol? *Doorvragen naar bovenstaande features, afhankelijk van bovenstaande antwoorden. [facilitators/challenges]*
- h. Heeft u ooit een bestaande werkrelatie veranderd door bijvoorbeeld intensiever hulp en ondersteuning te bieden aan anderen? Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? Heeft dit geleid tot een sterkere of meer diepgaande relatie? *[adapting relationships]*
- i. Hoe speelden volgens u eigenschappen van uw werk of de organisatie hierbij een rol? *Doorvragen naar bovenstaande features, afhankelijk van bovenstaande antwoorden. [facilitators/challenges]*

2.3 Interviewee als job crafter - cognitive crafting

Naast de concrete veranderingen in taken of werkrelaties heeft job crafting ook betrekking op het veranderen van de manier waarop u tegen uw baan, bepaalde taken of relaties binnen uw werk, uw rol binnen de organisatie aankijkt of uw persoonlijke visie. De volgende vragen hebben hier betrekking op.

- a. Kunt u allereerst kort omschrijven wat voor rol uw werk in uw leven heeft?
- b. Hoe ziet u de impact of het algehele doel van uw baan? Kijkt u wel eens naar uw baan als geheel of juist als losse taken en relaties?
- c. Heeft u deze denkwijze, mind-set of mentaliteit, ooit op een bepaalde manier veranderd? Zo ja, hoe heeft u dit gedaan? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *Eventueel doorvragen naar in- en uitzoomen, in een ander perspectief plaatsen en langere termijn of korte termijn visie. [expanding perceptions]*
- d. Richt u uw aandacht of energie wel eens op specifieke taken of werkrelaties welke u als meest belangrijk of waardevol beschouwt? Zo ja, hoe doet u dit? Waarom richt u zich op deze specifieke taken of werk relaties? *[focusing perceptions]*
- e. Verbindt u wel eens bepaalde taken of relaties in uw werk aan persoonlijke interesses, passies, aspecten van uzelf of doelen die u belangrijk vindt? Zo ja, hoe deed u dit? Waarom heeft u dit gedaan? *[linking perceptions]*

f. Wanneer u kijkt naar deze veranderingen in perspectief, wat voor rol hebben eigenschappen van uw werk of de organisatie hierbij dan gespeeld? Faciliterend of belemmerend? Zo ja, hoe hebben deze een rol gespeeld? *Doorvragen naar features zoals eigenschappen van de organisatie, gevoel van autonomie, manier waarop taken gestructureerd zijn, interdependencies, job complexity, rol van leidinggevende, support of weerstand van collega's, werk policies, feedback, teamwork etc. [facilitators/challenges]*

3. Werkcontext algemeen

Tot slot volgen nog enkele vragen over hoe u uw werkomgeving ervaart.

- a. Hoe zou u deze organisatie en de afdeling waarvoor u werkt beschrijven? Wat zijn volgens u belangrijke kenmerken?
- b. Hoe worden uw en andere medewerkers binnen deze werkomgeving gestimuleerd om nieuwe manieren van werken uit te proberen?
- c. Op wat voor manier wordt er aandacht besteed aan continu veranderen, verbeteren en ontwikkelen?
- d. Op wat voor manier wordt er aandacht besteed aan de (informele) werksfeer?
- e. Op wat voor manier verhouden deze kenmerken zich volgens u tot het maken van proactieve veranderingen binnen uw werk?

Debriefing

Dit waren al mijn vragen. Ik wil u hartelijk danken voor al uw antwoorden tijdens dit interview. Heeft u op dit moment toevoegingen, vragen en/of opmerkingen? Wat vond u van het interview?

Wanneer het interview is uitgewerkt zal ik u de uitgewerkte versie toesturen. U kunt deze doorlezen en eventuele opmerkingen of toevoegingen doorgeven via de e-mail. U kunt op deze manier aangeven welke delen in de tekst u niet herleidbaar vindt naar uzelf en welke u anders zou willen zien. Stelt u het op prijs om ook het uiteindelijke onderzoeksrapport, wat in het Engels is geschreven, of een korte samenvatting in het Nederlands te ontvangen?

Mocht u in de tussentijd nog vragen hebben dan kunt u mij altijd bereiken via de e-mail.

Zou u het informatieformulier nog willen invullen? Nogmaals hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking aan dit interview en mijn master thesis.

Appendix B - Initial Template

1. Job crafting

1.1 Task crafting

- 1.1.1 Adding tasks
- 1.1.2 Dropping tasks
- 1.1.3 Emphasizing tasks
- 1.1.4 Redesigning tasks

1.2 Relational crafting

- 1.2.1 Building relationships
- 1.2.2 Altering extent of existing relationships
- 1.2.3 Reframing relationships
- 1.2.4 Adapting relationships

1.3 Cognitive crafting

- 1.3.1 Expanding perceptions
- 1.3.2 Focusing perceptions
- 1.3.3 Linking perceptions

2. Organizational features influencing job crafting

2.1 Structural features

- 2.1.1 Autonomy
- 2.1.2 Task interdependence
- 2.1.3 Task complexity
- 2.1.4 Additional structural features

2.2 Relational features

- 2.2.1 Leadership
- 2.2.2 Organizational culture
- 2.2.3 Social support
- 2.2.4 Additional relational features

2.3 Additional organizational features

3. How organizational features influence job crafting processes

3.1 Perceived challenges for job crafting

- 3.1.1 Structural features challenging job crafting
- 3.1.2 Relational features challenging job crafting

3.2 Perceived facilitators for job crafting

- 3.2.1 Structural features facilitating job crafting
- 3.2.2 Relational features facilitating job crafting

Appendix C - Final Template

JOB CRAFTING

1. Job crafting processes by employees

1.1 Individual forms of job crafting

1.1.1 Task crafting

1.1.1.1 Adding tasks

- (a) Addition of tasks or projects*
- (b) Addition of new job responsibilities*
- (c) Attend work-related trainings or work groups*
- (d) Addition of tasks or projects outside organizational boundaries*
- (e) Addition of tasks inherent part of the job*

1.1.1.2 Dropping tasks

- (a) Transfer tasks to colleagues*
- (b) Spending less time to tasks*

1.1.1.2 Emphasizing tasks

- (a) Spending more time to tasks*
- (b) Role of fixed aspects in job*
- (c) Specializing oneself*

1.1.1.3 Redesigning tasks

- (a) Redesign (minor) work procedures*
- (b) Own twist in carrying out tasks*
- (c) Redesigning tasks for work-related goals*

1.1.2 Relational crafting

1.1.2.1 Building relationships

- (a) Building new relationships for work-related goals*
- (b) Building relationships inherent to new tasks or projects*
- (c) Establishing a network*
- (d) Join or organize social events*

1.1.2.2 Altering the extent of existing relationships

- (a) Nurture existing relationships*

1.1.2.2 Reframing and adapting relationships

- (a) Supportive and proactive approaching*
- (b) Getting to know colleagues better*
- (c) Providing help is part of the job*
- (d) Embedded in culture*

1.1.3 Cognitive crafting

1.1.3.1 Expanding perceptions

- (a) Put impact of own work into perspective*
- (b) Looking at long-term outcomes of work*
- (c) Looking at outcomes of work for organization*

1.1.3.2 Focusing perceptions

- (a) Ability to make actual changes*

1.1.3.3 Linking perceptions

- (a) Apply personal values, lifestyles, interests or qualities into work*

(b) Share and discuss personal beliefs or experiences with others

(c) Professional identity

1.2 Collaborative forms of job crafting

1.2.1 Dividing tasks and responsibilities together

1.2.2 Developing a shared vision

ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES

2. Organizational features influencing job crafting processes

2.1 Structural features

2.1.1 Professional autonomy

2.1.1.1 Nature of the job

2.1.1.2 Freedom of a professional

2.1.1.3 Decision latitude

2.1.1.4 Scheduling own working days

2.1.2 Organizational structure

2.1.2.1 Flat hierarchy

2.1.2.2 Autonomous teams of professionals

2.1.3 Task characteristics

2.1.3.1 Task interdependence

2.1.3.2 Task variety

2.1.3.3 Task significance and task identity

2.2 Relational features

2.2.1 Organizational culture

2.2.1.1 Safe culture

2.2.1.2 Supportive, open and inspiring work climate

2.2.1.3 Shared beliefs and norms on professional identity

2.2.2 Role of the supervisor

2.2.2.1 Facilitating leadership

2.2.2.2 Approachable and supportive supervisor

2.2.2.3 Inspiring vision of supervisor

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB CRAFTING AND ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES

3. How organizational features influence job crafting processes

3.1 Different mechanisms

3.1.1 Organizational features enabling and/or facilitating job crafting

3.1.2 Organizational features supporting job crafting

3.1.3 Organizational features challenging job crafting

3.1.4 Organizational features lower the need for job crafting

3.1.5 Organizational features not influencing job crafting

3.1.6 Interrelatedness of organizational features

3.2 Additional features related to job crafting processes

3.2.1 Individual differences

3.2.1.1 Personal needs and expectations

3.2.1.2 Personality

3.2.1.3 Personal orientation towards work

3.2.2 Individual differences influencing job crafting

3.2.3 Interrelatedness of organizational features and individual differences

Appendix D – Code List

1. 'Professional in the lead' way of thinking
2. Ability to create own job description
3. Ability to empathize
4. Ability to emphasize specific parts of the job
5. Ability to take on additional tasks
6. Abstract annual plan
7. Abstract division of tasks
8. Abstract job description
9. Abstract work policies
10. Accept more superficial relationships
11. Accepting pro-activity
12. Accepting role of supervisor when transferring task
13. Acting on mutual trust
14. Activating pro-activity
15. Adapting relationships
16. Add new task or project
17. Add new task or project that suit one's own skills or interest
18. Added value of the physical work environment
19. Adjust expectations regarding the reach of one's responsibilities
20. Adjusting expectations of potential to craft job
21. Adjusting expectations regarding the role of own job
22. Aging workforce
23. Align way of working with colleagues
24. Ambiguous role expectation
25. Appearance of the organization
26. Applying personal values in work
27. Appreciation for assertiveness
28. Approach each other on an equal footing
29. Approachability of colleagues and other departments
30. Approachable supervisor
31. Asking for feedback
32. Assertiveness of employee
33. Atmosphere of being in this together
34. Attention for informal aspects of work
35. Attention for personal growth and development
36. Autonomy as precondition
37. Autonomy as precondition for functioning
38. Autonomy on the job
39. Background role of supervisor
40. Balance between structure and freedom
41. Balancing between different roles
42. Bear consequences of shaping own job
43. Blind spot within organization
44. Bore-out
45. Bound to fixed working procedures
46. Building a sense of team spirit
47. Building relationships for work-related goals
48. Building relationships inherent to development in own role
49. Building self-confidence
50. Career opportunities
51. Challenge for crafting job outside organization
52. Challenge for emphasizing tasks
53. Challenge for relational crafting
54. Challenge for transferring tasks
55. Challenge regarding autonomy of professional
56. Change (minor) work procedures that are not perceived relevant
57. Change (minor) work procedures that fit own believes
58. Change in organizational structure
59. Change specific work task or work procedure
60. Change the way tasks are carried out to make it more enjoyable
61. Changing interpretation of role of professional
62. Changing strategy of organization
63. Changing values in organization
64. Choose to coach colleagues (officially or unofficially)

- | | | | |
|------|---|------|---|
| 65. | Choose to take on additional responsibility | 102. | Division of task as group responsibility |
| 66. | Combination of reframing and adapting relationships | 103. | Division of tasks |
| 67. | Comfortable atmosphere | 104. | Division of tasks enables employees to focus on specific parts of the job |
| 68. | Commitment to the organization | 105. | Doing a 'good job' |
| 69. | Communicating own qualities | 106. | Down-side of informal work atmosphere |
| 70. | Completion of projects or tasks | 107. | Dropping task that is perceived as less meaningful or challenging |
| 71. | Complex nature of tasks | 108. | Dynamic organization |
| 72. | Concentrate on task that is perceived as meaningful | 109. | Educational background |
| 73. | Conservative attitudes of coworkers | 110. | Emphasizing learning opportunities |
| 74. | Conservative departments | 111. | Emphasizing tasks |
| 75. | Consultation with different disciplines | 112. | Empowering leadership |
| 76. | Contributing to the organization | 113. | Encourage job crafting moves |
| 77. | Contribution of education for personal development | 114. | Engage in network activities |
| 78. | Control over work | 115. | Engage in networking to establish relationships, new projects and knowledge |
| 79. | Coping with workload | 116. | Equality within department |
| 80. | Crafting job automatically or unconsciously | 117. | Establish relationships with others |
| 81. | Creating boundary conditions | 118. | Expanding perceptions |
| 82. | Creativity in work | 119. | Expectation pattern |
| 83. | Dealing with feedback | 120. | Facilitating leadership |
| 84. | Dealing with own problem | 121. | Facilitator for approaching others |
| 85. | Deciding the extent and scope of interactions | 122. | Fear of stepping on others' toes |
| 86. | Decision-making control | 123. | Feedback from colleagues |
| 87. | Dedication to help others | 124. | Feeling appreciated |
| 88. | Dedication to own profession | 125. | Finding own purpose |
| 89. | Demonstrating 'good' behavior | 126. | Fitting one's job with own work preferences |
| 90. | Dependencies within team | 127. | Fixed job tasks |
| 91. | Depth in work | 128. | Flat hierarchy and structure within organization |
| 92. | Develop new skills and competencies | 129. | Flexible work attitude |
| 93. | Develop own work procedures | 130. | Focus on part of the job that gives one energy |
| 94. | Developing own focus area in work | 131. | Focus on tasks or projects on which one has a sense of control |
| 95. | Differences between professionals | 132. | Focusing on personal interests |
| 96. | Difficulties with initiatives within department | 133. | Forced to prioritize tasks |
| 97. | Difficulty of managing own work load | | |
| 98. | Difficulty to change | | |
| 99. | Discuss personal goals with supervisor | | |
| 100. | Diverse contacts at work | | |
| 101. | Diverse workforce within department | | |

- | | | | |
|------|--|------|--|
| 134. | Forced to take on work tasks and projects that are not taken already | 166. | Interplay between organizational and personal features |
| 135. | Freedom of professional | 167. | Interpretation of job crafting |
| 136. | Getting the opportunity to grow in own profession | 168. | Introduce new ideas |
| 137. | Getting to know new people within the organization | 169. | Invest in network to seize opportunities for job crafting |
| 138. | Give personal advice to others | 170. | Invest in relationship with colleagues with mutual interests |
| 139. | Give preference to do task(s) that suit ones skills or interests | 171. | Invest in relationship with students for work-related goal |
| 140. | Give preference to perform tasks in particular sequence | 172. | Invest in relationship with supervisor |
| 141. | Give preference to perform tasks of projects in specific ways | 173. | Invest in relationship with supervisor for work related goal |
| 142. | Going outside organizational boundaries to craft job | 174. | Invest in relationships with colleagues |
| 143. | Group level thinking | 175. | Invest in relationships with students |
| 144. | Growing need for group level thinking | 176. | Invitation to engage in job crafting |
| 145. | Guard autonomy of professional | 177. | Isolated team structure |
| 146. | Guard own task crafting opportunities | 178. | Job crafting and optimizing organizational performance |
| 147. | Hard to declare own limits | 179. | Job crafting as function of different aspects |
| 148. | Hard to set priorities | 180. | Job crafting in teams |
| 149. | Having final authority and responsibility | 181. | Job resources |
| 150. | Help of external coach | 182. | Job responsibilities |
| 151. | Helping culture | 183. | Job tasks |
| 152. | Identification with values of organization | 184. | Joining a professional association |
| 153. | Importance of job crafting | 185. | Joining a work group |
| 154. | Importance of ownership in work | 186. | Joining an informal committee |
| 155. | Importance of relationships with colleagues | 187. | Joining work related committee |
| 156. | Importance of showing initiative | 188. | Joining work related training |
| 157. | Importance of taking initiative in education | 189. | Knowledge intensive department |
| 158. | Importance of work for the broader organization | 190. | Lack of resources |
| 159. | Improve ways of working | 191. | Learning from network |
| 160. | Independence of employee(s) | 192. | Learning on the job |
| 161. | Informal work climate | 193. | Learning own qualities |
| 162. | Innovative work environment | 194. | Limit time spend to task or activity perceived less meaningful |
| 163. | Inspiring others | 195. | Linking own core values to job responsibilities |
| 164. | Inspiring role of supervisor | | |
| 165. | Interdependencies with external parties | | |

- | | | | |
|------|--|------|---|
| 196. | Linking own qualities | 228. | No blue print of how job should be carried out |
| 197. | Linking own qualities or preferences to work | 229. | No clearly defined general vision |
| 198. | Linking perceptions | 230. | No clearly defined job profile |
| 199. | Linking personal interests to work | 231. | No clearly defined job responsibilities per function |
| 200. | Linking personal values or capacities in work | 232. | No fear of encroaching on others roles and responsibilities |
| 201. | Look for opportunities to learn from people in network | 233. | No resistance of colleagues |
| 202. | Look for opportunities to work together with all kinds of people | 234. | No specified policy plan |
| 203. | Looking at outcomes of work on an organizational level | 235. | No structural barriers in contact with others |
| 204. | Looking at the larger impact of work | 236. | Non-profit organization |
| 205. | Looking at the significance of work for the broader community | 237. | Not feeling happy at work |
| 206. | Lunch walk | 238. | Not focusing perceptions |
| 207. | Make an effort to get to know people well at work | 239. | Obstacles for older employees |
| 208. | Make work more enjoyable | 240. | Old fashioned work environment |
| 209. | Making job your own | 241. | Open culture at department |
| 210. | Making subjects negotiable | 242. | Open door policy |
| 211. | Maximizing performance at work | 243. | Open mind-set of colleagues |
| 212. | Meaningful impact of the job | 244. | Opportunity for relational crafting |
| 213. | Mixed responses on doing external projects | 245. | Opportunity for task crafting |
| 214. | Monotones work | 246. | Opportunity to shape own work tasks |
| 215. | Motive to choose specific department | 247. | Oppressive culture |
| 216. | Motive to choose specific organization | 248. | Oppressive feeling |
| 217. | Motive to craft job | 249. | Organize special event in the work place |
| 218. | Movement within organizational norms of professional | 250. | Organizational culture |
| 219. | Narrow scope of tasks | 251. | Organizational identity |
| 220. | Need for boundary conditions | 252. | Organizational structure |
| 221. | Need for collaboration to perform tasks | 253. | Orientation towards relationships at work |
| 222. | Need for communication skills | 254. | Own twist or style in carrying out tasks or work |
| 223. | Need for new competencies and skills | 255. | Perceived workload |
| 224. | Need for own work space | 256. | Perceived workload of others |
| 225. | Network relationships | 257. | Person-job fit |
| 226. | New ways of working within organization | 258. | Person-job misfit |
| 227. | New ways of working within profession | 259. | Person-organization fit |
| | | 260. | Person-organization misfit |
| | | 261. | Personal ambition |
| | | 262. | Personal development is own responsibility |
| | | 263. | Personal goal setting |

- | | | | |
|------|---|------|--|
| 264. | Personal motivation | 299. | Relational interdependencies with other colleagues |
| 265. | Personal need for challenge and variety in work | 300. | Relieving colleagues |
| 266. | Personal orientation towards relationships at work | 301. | Relocation |
| 267. | Personal way in approaching colleagues | 302. | Resistance to job crafting attempts |
| 268. | Personal way of dealing with interdependencies | 303. | Restricting job resources |
| 269. | Personal way of working | 304. | Restrictions in education opportunities |
| 270. | Phases in change process | 305. | Risk of an increasing workload |
| 271. | Physical complaints | 306. | Risk of autonomous professionals |
| 272. | Physical distance | 307. | Risk of creating "one size fits all approach" |
| 273. | Pitfall of 'restricting' work environment | 308. | Risk of having too much freedom |
| 274. | Pitfall of employee | 309. | Role definition |
| 275. | Plan meetings in open air | 310. | Role development |
| 276. | Pleasant work environment | 311. | Role of fixed tasks |
| 277. | Portray vision of organization | 312. | Role of job in life |
| 278. | Possibilities for education and learning | 313. | Role of reflection |
| 279. | Preference for working on a more structured way | 314. | Role of supervisor |
| 280. | Preparing employees for organizational change | 315. | Role of supervisor as precondition for functioning |
| 281. | Prioritizing tasks | 316. | Safe culture |
| 282. | Proactive attitude of supervisor | 317. | Scheduling own working days |
| 283. | Proactively approaching others | 318. | See opportunities for job crafting |
| 284. | Professional 'island culture' within department | 319. | Seeking own projects |
| 285. | Professional identity | 320. | Seizing opportunities to take on additional projects |
| 286. | Providing help | 321. | Self-understanding |
| 287. | Putting emphasis on specific roles or tasks one enjoys | 322. | Sense of team spirit |
| 288. | Qualities of employee | 323. | Set up work groups |
| 289. | Realize the impact of your own job on others | 324. | Share personal lessons or interests with others |
| 290. | Realizing the role of own work within bigger project | 325. | Shared vision |
| 291. | Reason for job crafting | 326. | Shared vision and focusing perceptions |
| 292. | Recognizing role of work | 327. | Sharing workload |
| 293. | Reflect on overall function of work | 328. | Small talk with supervisor |
| 294. | Reflect on the role of own job for overall organization | 329. | Social support within department |
| 295. | Reflecting on image | 330. | Sparring with colleagues |
| 296. | Reflecting on person-job fit | 331. | Sparring with supervisor |
| 297. | Reflection on overall work performance | 332. | Sportive at work |
| 298. | Reframed relationship | 333. | Stimulate to engage in networking |
| | | 334. | Structural boundaries for job crafting |
| | | 335. | Supportive culture at department |

336. Supportive supervisor
337. Take on an additional role
338. Taking initiative part of job responsibilities
339. Taking part in a work group
340. Target specific others to maintain opportunity to craft job
341. Task complexity
342. Task identity
343. Task interdependency
344. Task significance
345. Task variety
346. Team consultations
347. Team structure
348. Thinking about the impact of work
349. Thriving in work
350. Time strain on employees
351. Top-down organizational change
352. Transferring (heavy or less meaningful) task to colleague

353. Transformational leadership
354. Transparent and equivalent culture at department
355. Trying to accept the reality
356. Uncertainty in work
357. Use new tool in carrying out the job
358. Using previous work experience
359. Variety of contacts at work
360. Variety of job tasks
361. Visibility of work
362. Vitality at work
363. Vocational (re)training
364. Warm culture
365. Work-life balance
366. Work climate
367. Work experience
368. Work identity
369. Working from home
370. Working with protocols