

Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity

JUSTIN M. BERG^{1,2}, AMY WRZESNIEWSKI^{3*} AND JANE E. DUTTON¹

¹University of Michigan, U.S.A.

²University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

³Yale University, U.S.A.

Summary

We utilize a qualitative study of 33 employees in for-profit and non-profit organizations to elaborate theory on job crafting. We specifically focus on how employees at different ranks describe perceiving and adapting to challenges in the execution of job crafting. Elaborating the challenges employees perceive in job crafting and their responses to them details the adaptive action that may be necessary for job crafting to occur. Specifically, our findings suggest that higher-rank employees tend to see the challenges they face in job crafting as located in their own expectations of how they and others should spend their time, while lower-rank employees tend to see their challenges as located in their prescribed jobs and others' expectations of them. The nature of each group's perceived challenges is related to the adaptive moves that they make to overcome them, such that higher-rank employees adapt their own expectations and behaviors to make do with perceived opportunities to job craft at work, while lower-rank employees adapt others' expectations and behaviors to create opportunities to job craft. Our elaborated theory presents a socially embedded account of job crafting as a proactive and adaptive process that is shaped by employees' structural location in the organization. Copyright © 2010 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Introduction

For decades, scholars have used the design of jobs as a starting place to examine how employees experience work in organizations. Traditionally, job design theory and research focused on the top-down process of managers designing jobs for employees (Campion & McClelland, 1993; Hackman & Oldham, 1980). However, more recently, scholars have recognized the role that employees play in the design of their jobs (e.g., Black & Ashford, 1995; Miner, 1987), highlighting the proactivity of their efforts (e.g., Grant & Ashford, 2008). Specifically, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) have complemented classic top-down views of job design with the concept of “job crafting,” defined as “the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work” (p. 179), which directs attention to the proactive, bottom-up ways in which employees alter the

* Correspondence to: Amy Wrzesniewski, Yale School of Management, 135 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511, U.S.A.
E-mail: amy.wrzesniewski@yale.edu

task, relational, and cognitive boundaries of their jobs. Whereas job design addresses structural features of jobs that are created and enforced by managers, job crafting focuses on the proactive changes employees make to their own job boundaries.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) outline a typology of job crafting forms and provide examples of these from a range of empirical studies (e.g., Benner, Tanner, & Chesla, 1996; Cohen & Sutton, 1998; Fine, 1996; Fletcher, 1998; Star & Strauss, 1999; Jacques, 1993). In addition, more recent studies have established job crafting as a form of employee proactivity among child care educators (Leana, Appelbaum, & Shevchuk, in press), special education teachers (Ghitulescu, 2007), nurse midwives (Caza, 2007), and salespersons (Lyons, 2008). Despite this evidence that job crafting is a common and widespread phenomenon, little theory has been developed around this form of proactivity, particularly how employees perceive and adapt to the inevitable challenges involved in job crafting.

Although job crafting is a form of proactive behavior—i.e., actions that initiate and create change (Griffin, Neal, & Parker, 2007)—job crafting occurs in the context of employees' prescribed jobs, which are marked by prescribed tasks, expectations, and positions in the organizational hierarchy; thus, any of these features may limit employees' perceptions of their opportunities to proactively change their jobs. Indeed, Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001) theorize that contextual factors may limit employees' perceived opportunities to craft their jobs, including, for example, task interdependence and closeness of monitoring and supervision. However, their model treats perceived opportunities to craft as fixed limits on the possibilities for job crafting as defined by the work environment. In addition, job crafting theory makes the assumption that if the opportunities are present, employees proactively seize them to craft their jobs. However, it is likely that the process is more complicated than this model implies.

Job crafting may be a more continuous process involving adjustments and change, shaped in part by the perceived challenges that limit the opportunities employees see for job crafting. We define challenges broadly 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. In response to such challenges, employees must discern ways to overcome (or not) the limits they perceive and the obstacles they encounter. This may require efforts to adapt on their part (Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000), particularly engaging in creative problem solving “to bring complex matters or situations to their desired end or develop creative solutions to novel, difficult problems” (p. 613) in order to work with or get around the challenges they face in proactively crafting their jobs. Whereas Griffin *et al.* (2007) define proactivity and adaptivity as separate forms of behavior, we treat them as interrelated processes, in which efforts to initiate or create change (proactivity) can shape and be shaped by responses to perceived challenges to making such change (adaptivity). For example, consider an employee who wishes to *proactively* add a task to his job but faces resistance from his supervisor, which motivates him to *adapt* his supervisor's expectations by winning her trust, thus enabling him to overcome the challenge and take on the extra task.

The adaptive efforts employees make in response to the challenges they perceive in crafting their jobs may vary depending on their structural locations in the organization. We designed our study to focus on two features of employees' structural locations—levels of formal power and autonomy—because both have long been associated with a sense of agency to shape (or attempt to shape) one's environment and others' behaviors (see Keltner, Gruenfeld, & Anderson, 2003 for a review). Power and autonomy have also been theorized as important predictors of the opportunity to craft a job (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) and to execute proactive behaviors more generally (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Following Ragins and Sundstrom (1989), we define power as “influence by one person over others, stemming from a position in an organization. . .” (p. 51). Although power can come from many sources (French & Raven, 1959), formal power most often accrues to those who hold positions in the

organization that reflect higher rank or position in the organization (Magee & Galinsky, 2008; Mechanic, 1962), thus suggesting that rank is likely to reflect the general level of formal power enjoyed by employees in organizations. In addition, employees at higher ranks typically enjoy more formal autonomy, or freedom to act and freedom from influence (Berlin, 1969), in their jobs relative to lower-rank employees (e.g., Dill, 1958; Mechanic, 1962). Thus, rank is likely to represent an imperfect yet parsimonious proxy for the level of influence employees have over others (power) as well as the freedom from others' influence and freedom to act (autonomy) that is formally endowed to them, both of which are likely related to their experiences of the challenges they face in proactively changing the task, relational, and cognitive boundaries of their jobs.

In this paper our primary goal is to deepen understanding of the adaptive actions that are part of the job crafting process, with a secondary focus on how employees at different ranks perceive and adapt to challenges in job crafting differently. More specifically, our study focuses on two key questions: (1) How do employees perceive and respond to challenges involved in job crafting?; and (2) How do these perceptions and responses differ for employees at relatively higher or lower ranks in their organizations? Because our goal is to elaborate job crafting theory by revealing more complex patterns of employees' subjective appraisals (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) of the challenges in job crafting and their adaptive responses to them, it seems fitting to address our research questions with a qualitative study of accounts offered by employees about their perceptions and experiences of job crafting (Orbuch, 1997).

Our study suggests that job crafting is more complex than previously suggested by the job crafting literature. In particular, we present a socially embedded model of job crafting as a proactive and adaptive process, in which 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. By comparing how employees at different ranks describe the challenges they face in job crafting and their responses to them, we reveal the often invisible work of adapting to challenges in job crafting, including some of the adaptive actions that enable employees to carry out this form of proactivity. This adaptive work is unrecognized by researchers when they assume job crafting is a discrete event arising from clear or known opportunities to craft. Taken together, our findings suggest that employees' perceptions of the freedom they have to adapt to challenges in job crafting do not necessarily reflect their level of formally endowed autonomy and power. Rather, our results suggest that employees at lower ranks occupy positions in which they find it relatively easier to adapt their work environments to create more opportunities to job craft, while higher-rank employees feel more constrained despite being in positions of greater formal autonomy and power. We draw on existing social-psychological theories and research to help explain and elaborate the patterns uncovered in our study.

Methods

We entered our study with two main assumptions that focused our data collection and analysis on the theoretical constructs relevant to our research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). First, since our goal was to elaborate theory around the forms of job crafting as defined by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), we used their original framework to focus and guide our data collection and analysis. As described by Lee, Mitchell, and Sablinski (1999) and used by others (e.g., Elsbach & Kramer, 2003), theory elaboration is most helpful when "preexisting conceptual ideas or a preliminary model drives the study's design" (p. 164). Second, since hierarchical rank has been suggested as a proxy for levels of formal autonomy (e.g., Dill, 1958; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Mechanic, 1962) and power (Magee &

Galinsky, 2008; Mechanic, 1962), we assumed that dividing participants into two groups according to hierarchical rank would allow comparison of how employees with relatively higher or lower levels of formal autonomy and power in their organizations describe perceptions and experiences of job crafting.

Organization and participant selection

We conducted interviews with 33 employees from two different organizations: 20 from a for-profit manufacturing firm and 13 from a non-profit political advocacy organization. At the time of the study, the manufacturing company consisted of approximately 400 employees and was a leader in the natural personal care product industry. The non-profit organization's mission was to advocate for the economic advancement of women and consisted of 17 female employees. Together, the two organizations feature a diverse collection of occupations and jobs in terms of the nature of the work and the social context in which it is done. The manufacturing company is significantly larger and focuses on the production, distribution, and marketing of tangible products. In contrast, the political advocacy organization is significantly smaller and focuses on long-term, intangible goals through what could be considered "knowledge work" (Burton-Jones, 1999).

Although the selection of these two organizations was based primarily on convenience, we used theoretical sampling procedures within each site to ensure that our sample at both sites included participants in a variety of occupations and jobs who held positions of relatively higher or lower rank in an effort to facilitate maximum variation (Miles & Huberman, 1994) on employees' levels of formal autonomy and power. The structure and size of the non-profit organization lent itself well to these criteria, as the 17-member organization included five distinct departments of two to four employees (development, policy, programming, communications, and finance), each of which performed different kinds of work. At the same time, when discussing the design of the study with the Executive Director, she used the depiction of the organizational chart—which included the formal job descriptions for all the types of employees—to explain that their organization was structured into two distinct hierarchical ranks, the lower of which had considerably less formal autonomy and power than the higher level. The lower-rank group consisted of nine employees who served as coordinators and associates and were assigned mostly administrative, logistical, and routine tasks, while the higher-rank group consisted of eight employees who served as directors or senior associates/managers and were responsible for tasks related to strategy, innovation, and management of lower-rank employees. To recruit participants, the Executive Director announced at an all-staff meeting that university researchers were seeking hour-long interviews "exploring how employees actively shape their lives at work." A sign-up sheet was circulated, and all eight higher-rank and five of nine lower-rank employees volunteered to participate.

At the manufacturing company, we worked with the Vice President of Human Resources to select a sample that was diverse with respect to occupations and jobs held by participants who occupied positions of higher or lower rank in the organization. We were explicit in our request to interview employees who, as a result of their high or low rank, are endowed with significantly more or less autonomy and power relative to others in the organization, and were given a list of job types (with corresponding job descriptions) by the Vice President of Human Resources that met these criteria. We chose five groups that spanned across the organizational hierarchy (from lowest to highest rank): Maintenance technicians, compounders (employees who mix bulk ingredients), customer service representatives, marketing brand managers, and supervisors. To avoid differences in levels of formal autonomy and power within the same group, we made sure that employees within each of the five groups shared the same job title, job description, and hierarchical rank with all the other members in the group. Because we intended to use rank as a proxy for autonomy and power, we had several

conversations with the Vice President of Human Resources, used official documents of the participants' formal job descriptions, and engaged in approximately 10 hours of observation of employees at work in order to determine a division of the five groups into two groups according to rank. We placed the compounders, maintenance technicians, and customer service employees in the lower-rank group ($n = 12$), because they had considerably less formal autonomy and power in how and when they conduct their work as a result of being situated lower in the organizational hierarchy than marketing brand managers and supervisors, who we placed in the higher-rank group ($n = 8$). Once our purposive sampling of groups at different ranks was set, we randomly drew four names from each of the five groups and invited them to participate through a request made via email or in person. Though we chose names randomly at the request of the organization, the resulting sample should still reflect the criteria of different occupations and ranks on which we were sampling. Of these original 20 invitations, two declined, so we drew replacements and they both accepted. The final sample of 20 participants consisted of seven females and 13 males. Table 1 lists the job titles, summaries of the formal job descriptions, and our approximation of the relative ranks for all the types of jobs held by participants included in the study.

Table 1. Participants' job titles, formal job descriptions, and relative ranks

Job title (No. of participants out of 33)	Formal job description
From highest to lowest rank	Summarized from official documents provided by the two organizations
Higher-rank group	
Non-profit directors (6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategizing • Business/resource management • Change management
Non-profit senior managers/associates (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People management and development • Setting direction • Analytical thinking
For-profit supervisors (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People and systems management • Training and coaching • Enforcing safety regulations
For-profit brand managers (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market analysis • Designing and communicating brands • Creating and implementing marketing strategies
Lower-rank group	
Non-profit coordinators and associates (5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling • Database maintenance • Responding to requests for information/research
For-profit customer service employees (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responding to customer calls, emails, or faxes • Setting-up new accounts in database • Data entry
For-profit maintenance technicians (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining and repairing machinery • Performing daily clean-up procedures • Observing problems with equipment and alerting supervisor of any problems
For-profit compounders (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixing raw materials per instructions and specifications • Keeping accurate log of work • Following safety regulations and alerting supervisor of any problems

Data collection

We created an interview protocol to serve as a semi-structured framework for exploring how employees describe their perceptions of and experiences with job crafting (see Appendix for a detailed description of our interview protocol). The first author conducted the interviews. In addition to the standard protocol questions, the interviewer asked follow-up questions to encourage participants to expand on relevant responses. First, the interviewer probed for participants' accounts that met Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) definition of job crafting. The interviewer was careful to pose these questions in a general way to invite description of how they perceived their job crafting efforts (e.g., Has your job changed since you started it? If so, how has it changed?), and then if a participant needed more clarification, the interviewer gave general examples of job crafting (e.g., Have you ever, for example, added tasks to your job, dropped tasks, or changed the way you perform tasks?). The interviewer probed for both job crafting efforts that participants claimed they had already undertaken and those that they would like to undertake. When a participant mentioned a behavior or thought that potentially fit our definition of job crafting, the interviewer posed follow-up questions, probing (1) *motives*: The participant's reasons for wanting to engage in the behavior or thought; (2) *outcomes*: The individual or organizational effects that the participant attributed to the behavior or thought; (3) *facilitators*: Who or what helped make the behavior or thought possible; and (4) *challenges*: Who or what limited or still limits the participant's ability to enact the behavior or thought. In this way, the interviewer used each mention of a job crafting effort as a starting place for asking more detailed follow-up questions to elaborate how employees thought about the particulars of job crafting. A typical interview consisted of many cycles of this question process. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and averaged approximately 52 minutes in length, ranging from 25 to 85 minutes. A subset of these data were used in a separate but related study on job crafting in pursuit of unanswered occupational callings (see Berg, Grant, & Johnson, 2009).

Data analysis

Our data analysis occurred in two main phases. The first phase involved identifying and organizing participants' accounts of job crafting efforts. The second phase involved identifying themes and patterns within and between higher- and lower-rank participants' accounts of job crafting.

In the first phase, we sought to identify and organize participants' accounts of job crafting. We define an account as an explanation and interpretation of an event (Orbuch, 1997). Job crafting accounts were defined as participants' descriptions of a proactive change to the formal task, relational, or cognitive boundaries of their job and the perceptions and experiences that they associate with this change. We began by extracting all quotes in which participants described job crafting efforts that they had already undertaken or wanted to undertake, as well as any accompanying descriptions of the perceptions and experiences that participants associated with each behavior (e.g., their reasons for wanting to engage in the behavior or the general and specific challenges they faced in enacting the behavior). To facilitate our analysis, we organized the accounts into a spreadsheet that captured the aspects of the account that fit the categories that we focused on in the interview protocol (i.e., the job crafting effort itself, as well as any motives, outcomes, facilitators, and challenges the participant associated with the effort). Through weekly meetings over the course of several weeks, the authors discussed which accounts fit Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) definition of job crafting, omitting any accounts of job changes that were not explicitly described as resulting from changes initiated by the participant (e.g., being assigned a new task by a manager) or proactive efforts that did not involve changes to job boundaries (e.g., selling an issue to management), which resulted in the identification of 166 accounts of job crafting.

In the second phase, for each organization separately, we searched for themes and patterns within and between the higher- and lower-rank groups' job crafting accounts. We noted several initial observations, including that participants in both groups described a variety of job crafting forms, challenges involved in job crafting, and responses to these challenges, and explored each of these general observations with further analysis. First, to compare the types of job crafting described by higher- and lower-rank participants, we searched for common themes among each group's descriptions of job crafting efforts. We engaged in several iterations of coding and discussion until no new themes emerged and we had a stable set of codes for the different categories of job crafting that each group described (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Through this process, we found that the higher- and lower-rank groups at both organizations described the same set of six job crafting forms.

Second, we returned to the fuller accounts of job crafting and looked for patterns within and between the higher- and lower-rank groups' descriptions of the challenges they faced in crafting their jobs. In order to better understand the pattern of these differences, we searched for and identified themes from participants' accounts that described challenges in job crafting. We included challenges that employees perceived as general limits on the opportunities available to them to craft their jobs, as well as limits they reported encountering as they attempted to craft their jobs. We again engaged in several iterative cycles of coding and discussion, which revealed that the higher- and lower-rank groups both discussed facing challenges in job crafting that are related to the kinds of obligations prescribed by their formal job designs and the need for others to accommodate their job crafting, but that the two groups described these challenges differently.

Third, we again revisited all accounts of job crafting to extract quotes in which participants described responding (or not) to perceived challenges in job crafting. Several iterative cycles of coding and discussion of the patterns and themes among these quotes revealed that the higher- and lower-rank groups described employing different kinds of responses, which we call "adaptive moves," to help them overcome the challenges they perceived in job crafting. We build on Dutton, Ashford, O'Neill and Lawrence's (2001) use of the term "move," originally borrowed from Goffman (1981) and Pentland (1992) to capture the elements in an employee's job crafting account where an employee described creating "new situations from existing situations to achieve desired ends (Pentland, 1992)" (Dutton *et al.*, 2001, p. 718). While Dutton and colleagues used moves as a unit of analysis for parsing employees' accounts of actions taken in issue selling, we use this unit to parse the thoughts and behaviors that employees describe as adaptive responses to challenges encountered in job crafting.

Finally, we went back through the transcripts to make sure no relevant codes were missed. Because the higher- and lower-rank groups from both organizations described the same forms of job crafting, perceived challenges, and adaptive moves as the corresponding group in the other organization (either higher- or lower-rank), we combined the data across sites to form two groups—a higher-rank group of 16 participants from both organizations and a lower-rank group of 17 participants from both organizations. Each of the 33 participants described at least two instances of job crafting, over 80% of the participants described at least one perceived challenge, and over 75% of the participants described at least one adaptive move.

Job Crafting As a Proactive and Adaptive Process

In the sections that follow, we present our findings and explain how we used them to build a model of how employees in higher- and lower-rank jobs engage in the process of perceiving and adapting to challenges in job crafting. We first present the six forms of proactive job crafting that participants described, followed by the two types of challenges that participants expressed as limits to their actual or desired job crafting, highlighting how the higher- and lower-rank groups described these challenges

differently. Next, we explain how each group described the adaptive moves they undertook to overcome these perceived challenges. The discussion section uses existing theory and research to develop theoretical arguments about how perceived challenges relate to the adaptive moves employees describe as a way to elaborate theory around job crafting.

Forms of proactive job crafting

Our findings reveal a set of six different proactive job crafting efforts described by both higher- and lower-rank participants that map onto Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) framework of job crafting. These six forms, which are defined and illustrated in Table 2, represent the main ways in which participants described self-initiated changes made to the formal task, relational, or cognitive boundaries of their jobs. In the task domain, participants described making proactive behavioral or physical changes to their set of assigned job activities—adjusting the scope or nature of tasks involved in their job or taking on additional tasks. In the relational domain, participants described making proactive behavioral changes to the interpersonal architectures of their jobs—altering the extent or nature of their relationships with others with whom they were connected in the course of their work as well as creating additional relationships. We found that participants did not describe task and relational crafting as mutually exclusive occurrences; on the contrary, they often described task and relational crafting as occurring in conjunction with or giving rise to one another (for an illustration, see the quote from Customer Service Representative #4 in Table 2—her addition of new work relationships led to changes in how she performs tasks). In the cognitive domain, participants described making proactive psychological changes to their perceptions of their jobs—redefining what they see as the type or nature of the tasks or relationships that are involved in their job, as well as reframing their job to see it as a meaningful whole that positively impacts others rather than a collection of separate tasks.

Wrzesniewski and Dutton define cognitive crafting as altering how employees see their job “by changing the way they think about relationships among job tasks, and what their job is relationally” (2001, p. 180) and propose that cognitive crafting can lead to behavioral changes in the way employees conduct their jobs. Our findings suggest that this is the case, as participants often described how cognitive crafting gave rise to task or relational crafting (for an illustration, see the quote from Maintenance Technician #4 in Table 2—he describes how his redefined cognitive vision of the kinds of tasks involved in his job leads him to take on additional tasks). Although our findings do not speak directly to this, it is plausible that task and relational crafting can also give rise to cognitive crafting (e.g., adding a new, creative task may have prompted Brand Manager #3 to think about her job in the way she describes in Table 2). In sum, our findings provide initial evidence that the three different types of job crafting—task, relational, and cognitive—despite occurring in different domains, do not operate in isolation, but rather, are interrelated and can trigger or be triggered by one another.

Perceived challenges in job crafting

Our findings reveal that higher- and lower-rank participants both described challenges stemming from the obligations that they associate with their job designs as well as the need to get others to comply with or accommodate their job crafting intentions. However, each group described different perceptions and experiences of these two types of challenges based on how they made sense of the expectations that they associate with their job designs and corresponding social positions. In general, the higher-rank group described challenges as stemming from their own expectations of how they and others should spend time at work, whereas the lower-rank group described feeling limited by expectations imposed on them by others. While participants described each of the challenges as distinct types of limits on

Table 2. Forms of job crafting

Form	Illustrations
Task crafting	
Altering the scope or nature of tasks	<p>I really enjoy online tools and Internet things . . . So I've really tailored that aspect of the written job description, and really "upped" it, because I enjoy it. I spend hours exploring what else we're paying for with this service . . . So it gives me an opportunity to play around and explore with tools and web applications, and I get to learn, which is one of my favorite things to do. (Associate/Coordinator #3, Non-Profit)</p> <p>I'm finding more and more that as I'm doing my research, I am thinking about marketing opportunities that involve not just [my program], but [the organization] as a whole and specifically, the 35th anniversary. . . . So some of the meetings that I've had with individuals and the contacts who I've brought in to talk to some of my supervisors, what we end up talking about is really in marketing and communications, and I have nothing to do with that, but I'm just interested in it. So I guess that's another deviation from job description. (Associate/Coordinator #2, Non-Profit)</p>
Taking on additional tasks	<p>When I first came here, we started using the new higher-speed equipment. Then lots of new guys came in. So I started helping them learn the job. . . . Now it's just expected that I train the new guys. . . . I like it because I'm able to help and work with guys from different backgrounds. (Maintenance Technician #2, For-Profit)</p> <p>We have an annual luncheon, and I have become the person who runs the registration table. It would normally be something that a coordinator would do and was before I got here . . . but I've taken it on myself because I'm good at it and like the challenge and like being able to control it. I could have just as easily set it up, and removed myself, but instead, I stay much more actively involved. (Director #3, Non-Profit)</p>
Relational crafting	
Altering the extent or nature of relationships	<p>I'm really interested in working with younger people, like college students, and kind of bringing them alongside and fostering their passion for social justice. . . . So I've gone out of my way to make sure that whenever I meet with my intern, at least half of the meeting is just me explaining what we're doing, why, what are the techniques we're using, what are the challenges we're facing, because there's so many aspects of our work that would probably be important for her to learn. I just really enjoy it, and it makes me feel like I'm fulfilling a little bit of that part of my other passion for teaching young people. . . . It's a relationship I already had but I've . . . changed it . . . to feed into that passion. (Senior Manager/Associate #2, Non-Profit)</p> <p>I've tried to limit some interaction with my supervisor because sometimes she wants a really high level of . . . kind of pre-work. For example, we've had meetings before where it was literally . . . like a 2 or 3 hour meeting for something that I think we could have discussed really in a half an hour. . . . I enjoy working with her overall and we can have fun together, but there are certain types of interactions that I try to limit. Like for instance, sometimes if it's a meeting that I know could be much shorter, and I know it will go longer, I may schedule another meeting like an hour after that meeting starts so that we have to finish it up. (Senior Manager/Associate #2)</p>
Creating additional relationships	<p>We have our own group here that literally has built equipment from scratch, and I think it's just brilliant work. I was interested. So I got involved with the maintenance crew, seeing how they do it from the ground up. You just learn so much about the equipment that you'd never know if you were just pressing a button. (Compounder #2, For-Profit)</p> <p>I have taken initiative to form relationships with some of the folks who fulfill orders. . . . That's not my area, but I was really interested in how that worked and wanted to learn. . . . I have learned a lot from them, and that's helped me in my job. I know more about how the ordering process goes so now I can explain it upfront to customers. (Customer Service Representative #4, For-Profit)</p>

(Continues)

Table 2. (Continued)

Form	Illustrations
Cognitive crafting	
Redefining perception of the type or nature of tasks or relationships involved in one's job	<p>If I had the ideal job description for about the next four years, all I would want to do is just improve what we have, make it better. . . . And personally, I feel like that's part of my job, to find better ways to use less and do more. . . . That really isn't in my job description. . . .but that's just how I think about my job here. . . . Like on Friday, I filled out the paperwork for a deviation through Quality so I could run this study to help conserve energy. What I did was find the optimal amount of energy usage with the most amount of production, and then I showed my research to the production supervisor. . . . It makes me feel more valuable, more like I'm a part of the team. (Maintenance Technician #4, For-Profit)</p> <p>I'm also passionate about beauty. I love it . . . because in marketing, you can try to influence the way people think about beauty. You can have people think about it differently, because there's more than one standard of beauty. For example, I might ask, "Well, is that all that's beautiful or are there some other images that we can think of that are beautiful?" . . . I see it as a chance to change the way people think about beauty. (Brand Manager #3, For-Profit)</p>
Reframing perception of job as a meaningful whole that positively impacts others rather than a collection of separate tasks	<p>One of my big motivators is being . . . at a job that is effecting positive change for women. And that is something that I'm constantly reminding myself when I'm doing something that I don't like. I've had a couple different kinds of rough transitions here from position to position. And so if I'm going through a two month stretch where I sort of actively dislike what I'm doing on a daily basis, then I would say I have to actively sort of get myself in a mindset where I could access this idea of what I'm doing here is I am working to promote the economic advancement of women. So it's just closer to the front of my mind all the time because if I let it sort of slip too far back in my thinking, I can sort of get wrapped up in what I'm doing on a day to day basis, and then I'm like, "Man, I really don't want to do this, that, and the other thing." (Associate/Coordinator #5, Non-Profit)</p> <p>I'm passionate about . . . just doing a good job and doing my job well and going above and beyond what basic thing that I can do, not just giving an average phone call, going above and treating the customer well. . . . Technically, [my job is] putting in orders, entering orders, but really I see it as providing our customers with an enjoyable experience, a positive experience, which is a lot more meaningful to me than entering numbers. (Customer Service Representative #1, For-Profit)</p>

their perceived opportunity to job craft, most participants discussed how both challenges operated in conjunction with and mutually reinforced one another. Also, although participants rarely associated a challenge directly with cognitive crafting, those who engaged in cognitive crafting occasionally described these challenges in crafting their tasks and relationships to align with their reframed perception—e.g., Maintenance Technician #4 (see his quote in Table 2) described feeling that he lacked the autonomy and power to take on more work to improve procedures. By comparing the two groups' descriptions of these challenges, we shed light on how higher- and lower-rank employees make sense of challenges in job crafting differently, and later, we discuss how the nature of each group's perceived challenges may be related to the repertoire of adaptive moves they make in response to them.

Challenges from obligations associated with job design

The challenge of having a job design with only general end goals (higher-rank)

Although both higher- and lower-rank participants mentioned instances in which the obligations prescribed by their job designs challenged their ability to engage in job crafting, participants in each

group described different forms of obligations associated with their job designs. Higher-rank participants discussed having job designs that obligated them to ensure certain general outcomes were accomplished but did not prescribe how to go about pursuing those end goals, while lower-rank participants described having job designs that obligated them to perform an assigned set of tasks in a prescribed way. Higher-rank participants tended to talk about how the nature of their job designs allowed them to job craft to a certain extent, but not to the degree they would like, because they felt constrained by the responsibility of deciding how to use their time and energy to work toward their prescribed end goals. For example, a director at the non-profit organization explained how even though she is formally endowed with sufficient autonomy to engage in job crafting, she still feels limited by her inability to find time to move beyond the tasks that she sees as important to meeting her prescribed goals as a leader of the organization:

I think that the whole issue of how you shape your job is a constant sort of tension between moving forward on things that have to get done and trying to think about what would be the best use of chief executive time in an organization in terms of ultimate impact. . . . I think for me at the end of my career, it'd be a very good thing to try to have a more conscious process about what should be the content of my job. That probably would have been good for that to be the case all the way through, but lots of times I think you feel that the pressures of the day-to-day keep you from doing it. . . . I end up doing the transactional tasks that need to get done for the organization to run, and that stops me from doing what I really want to be doing, even though someone else could really be doing most of [those tasks]. (Director #1, Non-Profit)

Similarly, a supervisor at the manufacturing company explained that despite having plenty of formal autonomy to craft his job, he still feels limited by the obligation to continually ensure he is working toward his prescribed end goals:

To tell you the truth, I've never seen my job description. So I can't tell you what tasks are up there that I've shied away from or what's [formally] expected of me. Same for the previous supervisor position that I was in as well. It's kind of you know what's expected of you, and you take on those tasks. You have your goals and objectives for the year . . . [and] as new projects come or new tasks come, you decide what to do. So I have a lot of freedom to make my job my own . . . I just need to make sure I meet my goals. . . . Because there's only so much time, it can be difficult to fit all that I want to on my plate. . . . There are projects I would like to do but just don't have time for . . . without dropping something important. (Supervisor #3, For-Profit)

These two examples illustrate how higher-rank participants discussed the notion that their job designs only outline general end goals, leaving them to decide how they should use their time and energy to meet these goals. As a result, they are faced with the ongoing challenge of deciding what tasks and relationships should be included in their jobs, which limits their perceived opportunity to job craft because they feel the constant "tension," as the non-profit director said above, between their job crafting intentions and the work that they feel is important for achieving their end goals. Thus, this challenge is essentially a continuous struggle between higher-rank employees' own expectations of how they should spend their time versus how they would ideally like to spend their time.

The challenge of having a job design with specific means and ends (lower-rank)

Unlike the higher-rank participants, who described their formal job designs as focusing more on the ends they must accomplish and not as much on the means through which they accomplish them, lower-rank participants tended to describe having relatively less autonomy to craft their jobs due to how formal job designs prescribed ends as well as the means for how to do their work. For example, consider

this quote from a customer service representative at the manufacturing company, who discussed feeling limited in her capacity to engage in job crafting:

I would add more like projects and stuff to kind of break the monotony of the day-to-day . . . [but] there's not really a lot of opportunity to do it because it's essentially very much an entry-level position. So it's kind of hard since there's such like a set job description of this is what you're going to be doing day in, day out . . . it's kind of hard to really change that or add anything else. (Customer Service Representative #1, For-Profit)

An associate/coordinator at the non-profit organization gave another example of how lower-rank participants described the lack of autonomy to job craft afforded by their job designs:

I like to do online researching, creating databases, finding new stuff that's out there, and I tend to want to spend more time on these things. Making phone calls, setting up appointments, setting up board meetings is not really what I enjoy doing, and so that stuff does get slacked off on . . . but I can't just drop those things from my job. So it's something that I'm trying to balance, and understand that while I might not like all the aspects of the way my job description is written, I need to do those or otherwise I can be great at everything else, but I'm still not a very good employee. So that's difficult, balancing that. (Associate/Coordinator #3, Non-Profit)

These two quotes illustrate how lower-rank participants described the way that their job designs prescribed specifically how they should be spending much of their time and energy at work, limiting their perceived opportunity to job craft. In contrast to higher-rank participants, who described feeling limited by the ongoing need to form their own expectations of how they should be spending time in order to meet their end goals, lower-rank participants attributed the challenge to expectations imposed on them by others that demand that they use their time and energy at work in a more structured and restricted way.

Challenges associated with getting others to comply with or accommodate job crafting

The challenge of not encroaching on others (higher-rank)

When participants' job crafting intentions relied on the support of others, higher- and lower-rank participants described different challenges associated with getting others to comply with or accommodate their job crafting. Higher-rank participants tended to describe the challenge of not encroaching on others' roles and responsibilities—in a basic sense, they were concerned about the possibility of “stepping on others' toes,” while lower-rank participants tended to describe lacking the power to get others to enable their job crafting. An example of the higher-rank participants' challenge was given by this brand manager who explained the reason why she could not get another employee to accommodate her job crafting intentions:

I have made efforts to take more ownership of the face line . . . I sent a note to the website person, “Hey, it looks like we might have some money. What do you think about doing some ideas? Why don't you think about doing maybe like an online sweepstakes, online contest to promote this radiance face care line?” And I mean, she didn't really push back, I just don't think she had time because she was already focused on re-launching the website. So it really was an idea that I thought, “Hey, we could do this. We have some extra money. We could use it to create this program.” But it was a situation where the person who would have had to execute it already had her

responsibilities. . . . I wouldn't want to step on her toes . . . [since] she's just doing her job. (Brand Manager #3, For-Profit)

This participant interpreted the other employee's non-response as resulting from her not having enough time given her responsibilities and explained how she wanted to be careful not to impinge on her job. A different brand manager illustrated how higher-rank participants usually talked about this challenge. She discussed how adding certain desired tasks into her job was limited by the challenge of avoiding encroaching on her colleagues' responsibilities:

For me personally, just based on my background and my interests, I would love to focus more . . . on concept creation and strategy. . . . For two of the categories that I manage, I've had an opportunity to do that. I just really enjoy it and I find it fulfilling to see something from the very beginning stage and then follow it through to launch where you have a product, the fruits of your labor, tangible, sitting on a shelf. . . . But there's really not an opportunity to make it broader than what I own without stepping into someone else's realm . . . I could ask if I could help, but other people don't really have the time or capacity to include me in their categories . . . [and] I can't expect them to not do their own responsibilities. (Brand Manager #2, For-Profit)

These examples illustrate how higher-rank participants described this challenge as rooted in their own expectations of how others should be spending their time and energy at work—which made them concerned about not encroaching on others' roles and responsibilities—thus limiting their perceived opportunity to get others to comply with or accommodate their job crafting intentions.

The challenge of lacking formal power (lower-rank)

In contrast to higher-rank participants, who were concerned about imposing on others, lower-rank participants usually described how others' expectations imposed limits on their power to get others to enable their job crafting intentions. For example, an associate/coordinator at the non-profit organization explained how her dynamic with her supervisor restricts her from job crafting:

A lot of what's difficult about my job is that I get a lot of things in the communications department that is grunt work. I wish I could take that out of my job description . . . then I could do more writing work . . . but I don't have the power to do that. Sometimes I think [my supervisor] just gives me the work she doesn't want to do. . . . If my supervisor were someone who was not sharp-tongued or if she was more lax, I would feel better about saying that this is what I would like my responsibilities to be like, or if I felt like she supported me in shaping my job like that, then I could do more of what I want to do, and it would be better. (Associate/Coordinator #4, Non-Profit)

This lower-rank participant feels that her supervisor's expectations of their relationship limit her power to get her supervisor to accommodate her job crafting intentions. Another associate/coordinator, who was highlighted earlier for her strong interest in Internet technology, described how her lack of formal power often limits her from being able to incorporate more online tools into her job:

It's frustrating though, because while I may be really excited about some things, not everybody else is always really excited about those same things. And so not everything that I come across I'm able to take all the way through. . . . I don't really have the power to make all my ideas happen. If I was in charge, I could say, "Hey, we're using this tool now." But I don't have that sort of power. (Associate/Coordinator #3, Non-Profit)

These two quotes illustrate how lower-rank participants made sense of this challenge as others' expectations imposing limits on their power, thus constraining their ability to get others to facilitate their job crafting intentions. In other words, higher-rank participants—from their positions of having relatively more power—discussed this challenge in terms of not wanting to encroach on others' roles and responsibilities, while lower-rank participants focused on how having relatively less power limited their opportunity to convince, or sometimes even ask, others to enable their job crafting.

Adaptive moves in response to perceived challenges in job crafting

We define adaptive moves as cognitive or behavioral responses that employees make to help overcome challenges they perceive in job crafting within their work environment. Whereas proactive job crafting efforts involve initiating and creating changes to the task, relational, and cognitive boundaries of their jobs, adaptive moves involve creative problem solving (Pulakos *et al.*, 2000) in response to perceived challenges to making such proactive changes. By examining participants' accounts of their perceptions and experiences that they associate with carrying out job crafting, our findings uncovered six different adaptive moves as integral parts of the job crafting process. Adopting Pulakos *et al.*'s (2000) conceptualization of creative problem solving as a form of adaptivity, we define these adaptive moves as efforts “to bring complex matters or situations to their desired end or develop creative solutions to novel, difficult problems” (p. 613). More specifically, the adaptive moves are pieces of participants' accounts that describe how they cognitively or behaviorally responded to their environments in order to work with or get around the challenges they perceive in enacting the six forms of job crafting displayed in Table 2.

We found that higher- and lower-rank participants described using different repertoires comprised of three adaptive moves each in response to challenges perceived in proactively changing their jobs. The set of adaptive moves for each group tends to align with how they perceived the challenges in job crafting. In response to feeling limited by their own expectations of how they and others should spend time at work, higher-rank participants described adaptive moves that changed their own expectations and behaviors to make do with the limited opportunity to job craft that they believed they had at work. On the other hand, in response to feeling limited by others' expectations, lower-rank participants described adaptive moves that changed others' expectations and behaviors to create more opportunity to job craft. Below, we explain the distinct sets of three adaptive moves described by each group, which are also defined and illustrated in Table 3, and how they differed for higher- and lower-rank participants.

Higher-rank participants' adaptive moves: Changing their own expectations and behaviors

Highlighting endowed opportunity to job craft

The first adaptive move described by higher-rank participants involved focusing on the many opportunities for job crafting that they do have. Higher-rank participants discussed how highlighting the formally endowed autonomy and power with which they can job craft helped them deal with not being able to craft to the extent that they desired, due to their own expectations of their time constraints or not wanting to encroach on others. For example, a higher-rank participant at the non-profit organization explained that although she would ideally like to proactively add more student outreach work into her job, she does not have the time to do so, but her realization that she has ample opportunity to job craft helps her avoid frustration over not having more time:

Table 3. Adaptive moves in response to perceived challenges made by employees at higher and lower ranks

Adaptive move	Illustration
Higher-rank participants	
Highlighting endowed opportunity to job craft	We hired an Associate below me in the department, and I was able to delegate a lot of my grunt work to her, which has freed me up to do some things that I didn't have time to do before and that I really enjoy. I have given her what I can . . . [But] I'm still busy and can't take on as much as I'd like, but I wouldn't really have had the time to take any new work on if it wasn't for that. I mean, I'm sure that I would have taken on pieces of what I'm doing now, but I wouldn't have been able to do the big projects. I would've only been able to take a little piece of it here and there. [So] right now, I'm not frustrated that I can't do more, because I'm just glad that I have been able to delegate. (Director #5, Non-Profit)
Adjusting expectations of potential to job craft	I think the ideal job for me would be to head the scheduling-slash-planner group. . . . Even though I want to do it, I don't devote a lot of my attention to it because I have no control over it at this point in this position, so there's no need for me to, I guess, bother myself with that. (Supervisor #1, For-Profit)
Going outside work boundaries to job craft	I volunteer through an initiative here—volunteering is an important part of my personal value system and priorities. I'm on the committee and participate in the events as well. . . . I think that the scope is appropriate right now because any more would be too time consuming. Anything more, really, I choose to do that outside of work. (Brand Manager #2, For-Profit)
Lower-rank participants	
Deploying strengths to seize and maintain opportunities to job craft	I'm always up for a challenge and once I've learned that challenge and I've become experienced in that and I've mastered it, I'm ready to move on to something different, or just a change or something to add onto that just to broaden my experiences . . . The orders come first, but when there are no orders, if I haven't already been given something to do, I will look for an opportunity to do a project or something . . . and I always try to a good job so they know they can count on me the next time something comes up. . . . Like I [had] an opportunity to go to a trade show in January in New York, which I really enjoyed and learned a lot from. (Customer Care Rep #1, For-Profit)
Targeting specific others who can provide opportunities to job craft	I talk to people who are at the same level as me in the organization before I talk to the supervisor because then we can figure out strategies to get what we think that we want, sort of across to them. So you know, I was talking to [two of my peers] about the process and whether they think that it's the best way to do things, and if there could be some re-shifting of our roles or some enhancing or some role somewhere. I feel like we kind of figured out that would be something that they were both amenable to and that would sort of help me out, and so then you just take it the boss. If you come with a proposal and show them how it will work, then it's easier to get a yes out. (Associate/Coordinator #1, Non-Profit)
Building trust to gain opportunities to job craft	I've been answering the phones for three years, and I don't want to be on the phones as much as I have been . . . I want to be doing more with my computer background. So when I heard about this website committee, I spoke up. I said, "I'd like to help." Since I had built up their trust, I was invited to come to that. I think being trusted is the main thing. I mean, it just helps my confidence and makes me feel like I can offer something here and anywhere really. (Customer Service Representative #4, For-Profit)

I would like to do more student outreach, but I don't really have the time to take on any more. . . . But I'm not really frustrated about that, because I realize that . . . I have a certain amount of autonomy over what we focus on in our work. . . . I'm actually the one who often will kind of bring the data to our team and give suggestions for what I think we should be working on. So I actually have quite a

bit of influence over the direction we go in our work and what we, and ultimately I, spend our time on . . . It makes me feel good to have that sense of control . . . and to realize that even though I can't control all aspects of my job, I do have a lot of say in what I do here. (Senior Associate/Manager #2, Non-Profit)

By drawing attention to the opportunity to job craft that she does perceive, this higher-rank participant adapts her expectations to help overcome the challenge of not having enough time. A director at the non-profit organization provides another example of this adaptive move. She discussed how thinking about the autonomy and power she has to craft her job helps her be content with the time constraints that limit her opportunity to job craft:

Everything I do every day is because I choose to do it in that order or prioritize it in that way. I decide what's important. I think the general outlines of my job are pretty clear. Someone needs to do X, Y, and Z, right? But I decide how much time I spend, how much I assign to other people. I have great control over the actual work that I do. So I've been able to make it my own because a) I have people who work for me, so I can I assign it to them, and b) I can decide how much each job is worth, how much of my time. Sometimes I'll say to [the Executive Director], "I want to do this" . . . or I can just take it up and do it on my own. It's funny—it doesn't work the other way. When there's work I don't like and I feel it needs to be done and I need to do it, I don't ever make a case for not doing it. . . . So there are limits to it, because I only have so much time . . . but that is okay with me because when I think about it, overall . . . I'm pretty happy with how much I'm able to make my job my own. (Director #2, Non-Profit)

These examples illustrate how higher-rank participants described highlighting their many opportunities to job craft, which helped them to overcome the perceived challenges of feeling limited by their expectations of how they and others should spend their time and energy at work.

Adjusting expectations of potential to job craft

The second adaptive move described by higher-rank participants involved reframing their perception of how much job crafting is possible given their perceived challenges. Higher-rank participants described how adjusting their expectations in this way helped them settle for less job crafting than they would otherwise desire. For example, the brand manager who was quoted above with respect to her perception that her colleague in charge of the website did not have enough time to enable her job crafting intentions described how framing this issue as out of her control helped her avoid disappointment:

So it really was an idea that I thought, "Hey, we could do this. We have some extra money. We could use it to create this program." But it was a situation where the person who would have had to execute it already had her responsibilities. . . . I can't really change that . . . so I wasn't upset about it or anything, because there's just not much I could do there. (Brand Manager #3, For-Profit)

In response to perceived limits on her opportunity to proactively add a new task into her job, this participant adapted her expectations to settle for the opportunity to craft that she did recognize, thus helping her overcome this challenge. A director at the manufacturing company provided another example of this adaptive move. She described how adjusting her perception of how much extra HR work is possible for her to take on helps her deal with not having more opportunity to job craft:

One of the things that I would be doing, which has nothing to do with marketing, would be HR-related things. And I have actually gotten myself on as many of those teams as possible. But in addition to the marketing, I really, really like doing recruiting and hiring and all of that kind of stuff.

So it has really nothing to do with my job description. . . . I mean, I don't have the time to actually be an HR person here, but these committees are fun for me. . . . But I think I'm kind of already doing the extent that I can do here. We're not hiring people every single day, so it's sort of just the circumstances of it. . . . So I just do it whenever I can, and that is just fine with me. (Director #5, Non-Profit)

These two examples illustrate how higher-rank participants described the way that reframing their expectations of what type or how much proactive job crafting is possible helped them come to terms with their perceived challenges of dealing with a finite amount of time at work.

Going outside work boundaries to job craft

The third adaptive move described by higher-rank participants involved pursuing their job crafting intentions outside of the workplace, which helped them deal with their perception that they have limited time to job craft within their work context. A brand manager at the manufacturing company discussed how he occasionally adapts to his time limitations at work by directing his proactive efforts to take on more tasks in his leisure time:

It's tough when I know I have your laundry list of to-dos that aren't going to push out because I take on this work . . . [that] I don't need to do but want to do for my own benefit. So that's a realization that you know you're going to have to put in some more hours and more work from home, but it's . . . positive for me because, not only is it going to help me in the long run, because ultimately I'm doing more for the company . . . but it also gives me instant gratification . . . since I like to improve our practices and develop new ideas. (Brand Manager #1, For-Profit)

Similarly, a director at the non-profit organization described her sense that she sometimes has to carry out her proactive efforts to take on certain tasks outside of the workplace because her time at work is subject to interruptions due to what she sees as her job responsibilities:

The one thing I would like to actually do that I don't have time to do is just a little bit more quiet time for reading and thinking. And sometimes I feel like I have to do that outside the office because of the interactions that go on that are part of office life. . . . You want people to be able to walk in and bring something up, and that's part of being a supervisor . . . but it also makes me feel like I never can be sure that I'm actually going to be able to have some time to just read something and think about it. And so when I want to do that, I often end up working at home. (Director #6, Non-Profit)

These two examples illustrate how higher-rank participants described pursuing job crafting outside of work to help them get around their perceived challenge that they lack the time to job craft within their work context.

Lower-rank participants' adaptive moves: Changing others' expectations and behaviors

In response to their perceived challenges, which they attributed to the imposition caused by others' expectations, lower-rank participants described using three different adaptive moves to alter their work environments—particularly others' expectations and behaviors—to create more opportunity for job crafting. Whereas higher-rank participants described adaptive moves that helped them make do with the opportunity they perceived to job craft within their work contexts, lower-rank participants' adaptive moves were aimed at creating more opportunity to job craft. Specifically, these three adaptive moves

represent the ways in which lower-rank participants described strategically directing their proactive job crafting efforts—in response to the challenges and opportunities they perceived in their environments—to help them garner others' support for their job crafting intentions, thus creating greater opportunity to job craft.

Deploying strengths to seize and maintain opportunities to job craft

The first adaptive move described by lower-rank participants involved finding and exploiting occasions for using their strengths in ways that were valuable to others, which they perceived as keeping opportunities to job craft open or generating new ones. According to their accounts, deploying strengths in this way helped lower-rank participants seize moments in the midst of engaging in prescribed tasks and relationships at work to create opportunities to job craft. For example, a lower-rank participant from the non-profit organization discussed how she tries to utilize every opportunity to collaborate with her colleagues, making sure that they see these collaborations as valuable, which helps sustain and create opportunities for job crafting:

I enjoy the collaborative process, so I like going to a meeting and sort of seeing what everybody has to say and summarizing that and sort of synthesizing that information into something that is useful. I think that that's an interesting process to kind of bring people together about different perspectives and get their feedback and come out with something that we can all use. And it happens to be something that I'm good at, so I try to do it as often as I can, as my job allows me. So any time there is an opportunity presented by a member of one of the other teams to get my feedback or to add a certain perspective from my area into that, I'm always willing to do that. . . . I also try to really look at the processes of any given area that I'm working on and find out if there are ways for other people to sort of be involved, that would a) help us meet the overall goal, and b) be enriching for them. And that opens up a lot of collaborations for me. (Associate/Coordinator #1, Non-Profit)

By strategically leveraging her strengths to provide value to others, this lower-rank participant used elements in her prescribed tasks and relationships to adapt others' expectations and behaviors in ways that generate opportunities to job craft. Similarly, a customer service representative at the manufacturing firm explained how he utilized his computer expertise in order to become the person his colleagues go to when they need help, which has enabled him to proactively add desirable tasks into his job:

I studied management science and information systems in college. I have some computer background, so I'm interested in it, and I'm versed in it. . . . There are a lot of technical parts of our job that sometimes we have to go through the IS department to get done, and I've become quite good at just realizing and recognizing what I can do and what I don't need to ask other people to do. And I've become the go-to person in a lot of those scenarios, like we can fax from our computers now and that's something that I helped get everyone trained on. So a lot of the like minor IS issues I can handle. I think, in that way, my job is a little bit different than everyone else's. (Customer Service Representative # 4, For-Profit)

These two examples illustrate how lower-rank participants described strategically deploying their strengths through existing components of their jobs in ways that adapt their work environments to help create more opportunities to job craft.

Targeting specific others who can provide opportunities to job craft

The second adaptive move described by lower-rank participants involved directing communication toward others who were likely to comply with or accommodate their job crafting intentions. Lower-

rank participants discussed creating opportunities to job craft by directing efforts toward an individual or group that they believed would enable their job crafting. For example, a lower-rank participant at the non-profit organization, quoted above with respect to her desire to balance the web-related tasks that she wants to do with the logistical tasks she must do, explained her attempts to target the person she thought would give her the best opportunity to pursue her job crafting intentions:

It's frustrating though because while I may be really excited about some things, not everybody else is always really excited about those same things. And so not everything that I come across I'm able to take all the way through. . . . I try and go to the person that I think would be most willing to listen to my idea, figuring that out. Like, who's the person that's going to say "yes" to me or is going to at least hear me out or going to have the answer to my question regardless of maybe if that's their department. So that helps. (Associate/Coordinator #3, Non-Profit)

According to her account, this adaptive move has helped her create opportunities to job craft by guiding her to the person who was most likely to support the change she sought. In a different example, a maintenance technician at the manufacturing company described his strategic targeting of a specific colleague who he expected would be willing to provide him the training he desired and how this has helped enable him to proactively add a valuable relationship to his job (i.e., relational crafting) and engage in task crafting:

In order to do what I want to do as far as improving procedures and saving energy, I need to know a lot about the machines. . . . [But] when I first started, I was assigned a trainer who told me he did not want to be a trainer and basically gave me yes/no answers to everything. . . . So I've reached out to [a co-worker] in the engineering department and go to him all the time. I went to him because I knew he'd be willing to talk with me. We have a lot in common. . . . He rides a Harley; I ride a Harley. I have a kayak; he has a kayak. We have a lot of the same interests, so. . . . he's just an easy guy for me to talk to. . . . I try to pick his brain on mechanical aspects of the machines, how they are built, give him feedback of what I've seen work or not work. I use him basically as a vendor sometimes too. . . . He helps me learn. . . . so I can improve things. (Maintenance Technician #4, For-Profit)

These two examples illustrate how lower-rank participants described responding to perceived challenges by targeting specific others, strategically directing their efforts toward those who were most likely to comply with or accommodate their job crafting intentions, which thus helped them create opportunities for job crafting.

Building trust to gain opportunities to job craft

The third adaptive move described by lower-rank participants involved cultivating support from others to help enable job crafting. Lower-rank participants discussed how building others' trust helped them exercise autonomy and power with which they were not previously endowed, thus changing others' expectations and behaviors in ways that create opportunities to job craft. For example, a lower-rank participant at the non-profit organization explained how building trust with others, primarily her supervisor, enabled her to significantly craft her job:

When I first started, [my job] was. . . . facilitation, data entry, systems management, record keeping, acknowledgements processing. Now, the majority of my work is spent in the cultivation, prospecting, stewardship; it's on a much higher level. . . . not just me coming to meetings and taking notes. So I was able to change my job quite a bit since I started. . . . I think part of it's experience and trust. . . . once I was able to develop the relationships with [my supervisor] and show through. . . . the level of work that I could do and the increased level of responsibility, she began to trust me and see

that I had good judgment and that I was able to develop the relationships and that people thought highly of me and of the work that I did and that other people trusted me. So I think that's a big piece of why I was able to change my job how I wanted. (Associate/Coordinator #5, Non-Profit)

In her account, trust provided this participant with greater freedom to act, which unlocked opportunities to craft her job.

A compounder at the manufacturing firm discussed how building trust first started with the move of targeting specific others. He explained how he first directed his efforts to forge relationships outside of his formal job boundaries toward managers in other departments. By his telling, this eventually helped him build trust among his peers:

When I came here, it felt like I was inside walls and each department had their own barriers, and getting through those barriers was much easier on the management side than it was with employees, my peers. And once I bridged the gap with management, just going up and talking to them, not necessarily about anything other than just, "How are you doing?", it bridged a gap with the peers as well. They realized that there's a lot of communication going on, a lot of people they didn't necessarily talk with, but now they can or now they do. I feel like branching out to management, and them understanding why [Compounder #2] is over there, worked out a lot better because they would tell their employees, "Oh, talk with him. He's fine. There's nothing wrong. He's not looking out after you. He's not going to tell on you. He's just out there communicating." . . . I've gotten to know a lot of good people quick. Having those walls just really bothered me. So I had to do something about it, just for myself. (Compounder #2, For-Profit)

According to his description, because this participant ultimately built trust with his peers, he opened up opportunities to achieve his goal of proactively forming relationships with employees in other departments. These two examples illustrate how lower-rank participants described adapting their work environments by building the trust of others, thus providing themselves with autonomy and/or power that they would otherwise not have had, which ultimately helped them overcome the challenges they perceived in crafting their jobs.

In sum, while making sense of the ways they adapted to their perceived challenges, higher-rank participants were more self-focused and inwardly-directed, describing challenges rooted in their own expectations and adaptive moves aimed at changing their *own* expectations and behaviors to make do with the opportunities to job craft that they perceived within their work environments. In contrast, lower-rank participants were more other-focused and outwardly-directed, describing challenges rooted in the imposition caused by others' expectations and adaptive moves aimed at changing *others'* expectations and behaviors to shape their work environments in ways that create opportunity to job craft.

Discussion

Our study of job crafting revealed accounts of proactive and adaptive efforts by employees in higher- and lower-rank positions to change the task, relational, and cognitive boundaries of their jobs. While employee rank was not related to the prevalence or type of proactive job crafting efforts described in our findings, rank was related to the way employees described the nature of the challenges they encountered in job crafting and the adaptive moves they described making to help overcome these

challenges. For employees in lower-rank jobs, the challenges in job crafting were largely made sense of as limits imposed on them by others in their environment, attributing the challenges to others not granting them the necessary autonomy or power to craft their jobs. In response to this depiction of challenges in job crafting, lower-rank employees reported engaging in a set of adaptive moves that focused on recognizing and acting on openings to win others' support for their job crafting intentions, thus creating and seizing new opportunities to job craft. In contrast, employees at higher ranks made sense of the challenges in job crafting as largely located in the self, as they attributed the challenges to their own expectations of how they and others should spend time at work. Having depicted the nature of the challenges in this way, employees in higher-rank jobs reported engaging in adaptive moves that focused on adjusting their own expectations and behaviors to make do with the limited opportunity to job craft that they did perceive in their jobs. Below, we consider possible explanations for our findings and the relationships between them, and in so doing, propose several important implications for theory and research on job crafting and proactive and adaptive behavior at work.

The interplay between proactivity and adaptivity: The case of job crafting

Establishing the adaptivity involved in the proactive behavior of job crafting is a main contribution of our study. By examining job crafting through a more process-oriented lens, our study revealed the adaptive actions that employees describe undertaking when proactively changing their jobs. Scholars have previously treated proactivity and adaptivity as separate processes (e.g., Griffin *et al.*, 2007), but our findings shed light on their interplay, suggesting that proactive efforts may both require and trigger adaptive efforts and vice-versa. Thus, our study suggests that job crafting is a proactive process that is associated with adaptive action, raising questions about when and why proactivity requires adaptivity. Although our findings do not directly address these questions, the “against the grain” nature of job crafting—which often runs counter to firmly established norms, expectations, and scripts in the job (Gioia & Poole, 1984)—seems to hint that proactive behaviors may require more or less adaptive efforts depending on how counter-normative they are. Indeed, the lower-rank employees in our study, whose job designs prescribed less proactivity than higher-rank employees, often described having to put in considerably more effort to adapt their environments in order to craft their jobs, while higher-rank employees tended to describe being able to craft their jobs, at least to a certain extent, with relatively less adaptive effort. In all, our results suggest that scholars of proactive behavior in organizations would benefit from attending to the adaptive action required to effectively lay the groundwork for proactive action to occur.

In addition, our study sheds initial light on how employees' perceptions of the challenges they face in executing proactive behavior may shape the repertoire of adaptive moves they use to work with or overcome these challenges. Consistent with Bandura's (1982, 1989) theory of individual agency, which indicates that individuals direct their actions toward domains in which they feel they have efficacy and control over their success, we found that higher- and lower-rank employees described adaptive moves directed toward aspects of their work (or home) where they felt they had more efficacy and control. Self-efficacy stems from assessments of the complexity of the situation as well as judgments of one's ability to meet the challenge (Bandura, 1982). In our study, higher-rank employees described challenges and adaptive moves that focused on themselves, while lower-rank employees described challenges and adaptive moves that focused on others. Our findings suggest that the way employees make sense of the challenges they face in undertaking proactive behavior may shape the form of adaptivity they enact in the process, such that employees' adaptive moves are directed inward (as with the higher rank) or outward (as with the lower rank) according to whether they construe the challenges as limits located in themselves or others respectively.

Our study provides preliminary evidence that carrying out proactive behaviors that are counter-normative, as job crafting often is, may involve—and sometimes even require—adaptive efforts to prepare the way for proactive behavior. Such adaptive moves may be enacted *before* a proactive behavior to seed the ground for the desired change (e.g., building trust), *during* the proactive behavior to keep the opportunity open (e.g., deploying strengths), or *after* an attempt (or considered attempt) at the proactive behavior (e.g., adjusting expectations of potential to job craft). We hope that the questions we have raised about the interplay between proactivity and adaptivity prompt future research on the relationship of these two processes over time.

Job crafting as a socially embedded process at higher versus lower ranks

In addition to highlighting the adaptivity in job crafting, elaborating theory around job crafting as a socially embedded process is another main contribution of our study. We used rank in our study to serve as a proxy for levels of formal power and autonomy (Mechanic, 1962), both of which have long been associated with perceived agency to shape (or attempt to shape) one's environment, and have also been theorized as important predictors of both the opportunity to craft a job (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001) and to execute proactive behaviors more generally (Grant & Ashford, 2008). That rank may influence how employees perceive challenges in job crafting, and the adaptive moves they report making, is not surprising. However, in contrast to what one might expect, our results suggest that higher-rank employees are more likely to simply “settle” with the opportunities to job craft that they perceive as possible at work (as reflected in their strategy to sometimes simply take work home), while the lower-rank employees are more likely to take a different approach, in which they alter their environments through purposeful efforts to adjust others' expectations and behaviors to create and act upon opportunities to job craft.

This difference is noteworthy and surprising. According to Bandura (1982), “those who have a strong sense of efficacy exert greater effort to master . . . challenges” (p. 123). Thus, although higher-rank employees have more formally endowed power and autonomy to job craft, they seem to experience more psychological constraints than lower-rank employees, who tend to perceive challenges in job crafting as relatively more malleable. There were basic differences in the degree of efficacy and control that higher- and lower-rank employees experienced in this process. Surprisingly, it was the higher-rank employees who described their experiences in ways that suggested lower perceived efficacy in their ability to proactively change their jobs. In this way, our findings suggest that employees' locations in the organizational hierarchy situate them in positions that provide them with different viewpoints and experiences of seeing and acting on opportunities (or lack thereof) to craft their jobs or adapt their environments to do so. Below, we draw on existing theories and research to offer possible explanations for these patterns of how the social-psychological process of perceiving and adapting to challenges in job crafting differs for employees at higher versus lower ranks.

Nature of job responsibilities

The differential pattern between ranks in employees' adaptations to challenges in job crafting may be partially explained by the nature of each group's job responsibilities. Employees at higher ranks described job designs that prescribed only end goals, placing the onus on them to decide how to spend their time working toward these outcomes, ostensibly allowing for plenty of formally endowed autonomy to job craft. However, because they have the ongoing responsibility of choosing which tasks and relationships to include in their jobs, they face a tension between their expectations of how they *should* spend their time and how they would *like* to spend their time. Thus, higher-rank employees may perceive relatively less freedom for adapting to challenges in job crafting because they feel obligated to

focus their efforts on meeting prescribed end goals, dampening their intentions to proactively alter their job boundaries. In contrast, lower-rank employees described job designs that prescribed means and ends, which dictated more specifically how they should spend their time at work. Despite having relatively more constrained job designs, our findings suggest that their more structured set of job responsibilities may be conducive to discerning and using opportunities to job craft than higher-rank employees' less structured jobs. This may be due to lower-rank employees' jobs being more bounded in nature, making it easier to see how and when they can use their time on job crafting and still fulfill their prescribed obligations, while higher-rank employees' jobs are less bounded, making it less clear how they can allocate time and energy to job crafting and still achieve their prescribed end goals (see Merton, 1940).

Interdependence

In addition to the nature of job responsibilities, the interdependence experienced by employees at different ranks may further explain why higher- and lower-rank employees perceive and adapt to challenges in job crafting differently. While we did not explicitly focus on interdependence in our study, it may help to explain differences between the perceived challenges and adaptive moves described by employees at higher and lower ranks. Classic research from Whyte (1943) and more recent work from Lee and Tiedens (2001) suggest that interdependence and independence are critical variables that alter the autonomy and influence of those with power. Indeed, Wrzesniewski and Dutton's (2001) model of job crafting names interdependence as a limiting factor in the opportunity to job craft. Thus, if employees with more power perceive that they are highly interdependent with others as they pursue job crafting, they may respond as the higher-rank employees we studied—construing the challenges they face as fairly insurmountable and thus pursuing adaptive moves aimed at their own work more than that of others. It may be that job crafting is another domain in which asking others to do more to help is more difficult than securing cooperation to do more oneself (Flynn & Bohns Lake, 2008).

Visibility

Behavior of employees at higher ranks in organizations is often more visible than behavior of those at lower ranks (Ortega, 2003; Warren, 1968). Employees are more likely to attend to the behavior of those at higher ranks (Keltner *et al.*, 2003) to discern what matters most to the organization (Etzioni, 1975). As a result, one might expect that employees at higher ranks feel more acutely the constraint of being in the “public organizational eye,” and thus pay more attention to the meanings and messages embedded in their words and behaviors (Weick, 1995). This heightened sensitivity to the public nature of their actions may explain why higher-rank employees described being reluctant to impose on others through their own job crafting or to modify their own use of time in ways that might detract from a focus on achieving the prescribed ends associated with their jobs. At the same time, the relative invisibility of employees situated at lower ranks of the organization may have endowed them with a greater sense of freedom to adapt their situations to create opportunities for job crafting.

Taken together, our findings suggest that higher- and lower-rank employees' perceptions of their freedom to job craft do not align with their respective levels of formally endowed autonomy and power, which suggests that social location may play an influential part in shaping employees' experiences of job crafting. Since job crafting often involves changing or going against established norms and expectations, employees may have to be entrepreneurial in how they engage in job crafting and adapt to challenges throughout the process. Our study suggests that the position of lower-rank employees may make it easier to be entrepreneurial in adapting their work environments to detect, create, and seize opportunities for job crafting. This may be due to their well-defined job designs—which are typically less interdependent with others and less visible in the organization—providing both the level of

structure and discretionary use of time and energy necessary for them to be able to discern and act on meaningful patterns in their work environments that they construe and pursue as opportunities (e.g., Baron & Ensley, 2006; Gaglio, 2004) for job crafting. We hope future research that focuses on the root causes of the different perceptions and reactions to challenges encountered in job crafting for employees embedded in different social locations in organizations will reveal additional relationships among position, perceptions, and job crafting efforts.

Practical implications

Job crafting matters to organizations. At a time when employees are increasingly expected to find proactive ways to meet organizational objectives and contribute the best of their talents to their organizations, managers are more likely than ever to rely on the initiative employees take to job craft (e.g., Crant, 2000; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Frese & Fay, 2001; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). However, given the differences we found in how higher- and lower-rank employees make sense of the challenges they face as they attempt to craft their jobs and the implications of these differences for action, organizations may find that there is more they can offer to facilitate this form of proactivity at work. For example, lower-rank employees report engaging in adaptive moves largely designed to enlist others' support for job crafting. At the same time, higher-rank employees report sensing an outer limit on their ability to engage in job crafting because of the time constraints that they and others face.

To help identify opportunities to meet the job crafting desires of both higher- and lower-rank employees, one possible intervention organizations could offer would involve the facilitation of direct communication between employees and managers about what kinds of changes to their jobs each would want. We suspect that in the default situation, in which employees may feel they are alone in overcoming challenges, organizations may be overlooking opportunities to identify complementary desires of lower-rank employees to take on different tasks (e.g., the maintenance technician in our study who took on process engineering work) and higher-rank employees to delegate parts of their jobs to others so that they can concentrate on aspects of the work that they feel unable to pursue. It may come as a relief for higher-rank employees to learn that their lower-rank colleagues may want to take on some of the duties that they feel overwhelmed by or vice-versa (e.g., the director from the non-profit in our study who prefers to run the check-in table at events herself even though it was previously done by a lower-rank employee). As well, such a practice may help to develop lower-rank employees' skills and abilities by providing them with more opportunities to pursue work that represents a motivating developmental challenge. Facilitating this group-level crafting in the organization would, of course, be an imperfect process, as there are generally more and less popular tasks and types of relationships in any job. But employees at any rank may nonetheless feel supported by processes that aim to remove the challenges they perceive to the job crafting they wish to pursue.

Limitations and future directions

While our study has made progress in elaborating the theory of job crafting across a more diverse set of occupations and contexts, our perspective is limited by our data and study design. First, we only studied two organizations and used rank as a proxy for comparing job crafting across two levels of formal autonomy and power. However, informal sources of autonomy and power, as well as other contextual factors like interdependence, performance expectations, or job characteristics, may also play an important role in job crafting. Future research must investigate forms of job crafting across a wider range of work organizations and use a more finely-grained set of contextual

distinctions to more rigorously test how job crafting unfolds at different levels and in different types of organizations. Also, future research could deepen our understanding of how closely employee rank is linked to formal and informal autonomy and power, as well as trust, status, and other possible covariates.

Second, we conducted single interviews with our participants and were not able to study how they described carrying out job crafting over time. The resulting findings from this study clearly call for more longitudinal investigations of job crafting. Also, since we could only collect participants' retrospective accounts at one point in time, it is possible that some of the descriptions that we classified as job crafting may have actually been the result of top-down decisions not mentioned in the interview and therefore should not have qualified as proactive job crafting. On a related note, our study did not directly address the motivations for and outcomes of job crafting theorized by Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), leaving the door open for future research on the antecedents and consequences of job crafting. In particular, future research could help differentiate job crafting from related concepts, including identity work (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Ibarra, 1999; Pratt, Rockmann, & Kaufman, 2006) and information seeking (Morrison, 1993a,b). These kinds of extensions would help to uncover the role of meaning-making about the job and the self in the process of job crafting, and would link job crafting to other forms of proactivity such as information seeking.

Third, due to our study's focus on how context shapes the way employees make sense of job crafting, we may have overlooked dispositional factors that influence this process. For example, it is possible that differences in personality characteristics could explain why employees in higher- and lower-rank jobs described different types of challenges and adaptive moves, as employees with relatively higher self-evaluations, self-efficacy, and internal loci of control tend to self-select, and be selected for, higher-rank positions (Judge & Hurst, 2008; Sidanius *et al.*, 2004). Future research on the adaptive process of job crafting that includes measures of personality characteristics could shore up this limitation of our study.

Our study raises several other potentially fruitful directions for future research. One factor that is likely to influence how employees make sense of the possibilities for job crafting is their tenure in the organization. It is possible that employees with shorter tenures engage in more job crafting as they proactively shape their jobs to themselves and more readily see where changes could be made, while longer-tenured members may become more habituated to the job and treat it as a fixed entity. Two plausible competing hypotheses could be that longer-tenured members enjoy more authority and support from others in making changes to the job (see Wrzesniewski, Bartel, & Wiesenfeld, 2009) or a better grasp of the opportunities for job crafting available to them thanks to their time spent in the organization. Future research could also focus on the temporal aspect of job crafting challenges and responses. Our research did not focus on locating precisely when employees encounter challenges, instead capturing challenges that marked a general sense of how much they could job craft or were present as they tried to craft their jobs. Yet, when employees perceive challenges may relate to when and how they deploy adaptive moves, a relationship that future research could specify. Another direction for future research on the adaptivity involved in job crafting could be further elaborating the role of group-level processes. Leana *et al.* (in press) have established that job crafting can also be a collective undertaking, in which work groups collaboratively redraw the task and relational boundaries of the job. This suggests that in addition to engaging in job crafting together, employees may perceive and adapt to the challenges in job crafting as a collective group. Quasi-experimental research that uses an intervention in which employees are encouraged to craft their jobs as a group may help shed light on the collective processes through which job crafting becomes (or not) more broadly adopted in the organization.

Conclusion

It is an exciting time to energize job design theory as researchers recognize the value of employees' proactivity at work (Grant & Ashford, 2008). Job crafting theory provides one view of employee proactivity that illuminates the variety of ways that employees shape their jobs from the bottom-up (Grant & Parker, 2009). Our elaborated theory of job crafting highlights the adaptation involved in the proactive redesign of jobs over time and begins to illuminate how employees' contexts shape the contours of the job crafting process. Our study has only scratched the surface of the dynamics that may be involved in a socially embedded, adaptive model of job crafting. As future researchers engage the model and the questions we have raised here, our hope is that their work will deepen understanding of the causes, patterns, and consequences of this important form of employee proactivity.

Acknowledgements

For valuable feedback on previous drafts, the authors thank Adam Grant, three anonymous reviewers, Kathryn Dekas, Felicitas Morhart, Charlotte Fritz, Katherine Lawrence, and Jeffrey Bednar. Authors also thank the participants for their generous contributions and insights, and appreciate financial support from the Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan.

Author biographies

Justin M. Berg is a doctoral student at The Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, and was previously a Research and Development Consultant for the Ross School of Business at the University of Michigan. He received his B.A. from the University of Michigan in Organizational Studies and Psychology. His current research focuses on how employees actively shape their own lives at work, and particularly how individuals craft their jobs and leisure time to pursue unanswered occupational callings (i.e., occupations they feel drawn to pursue other than the one in which they work).

Amy Wrzesniewski is an Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior at the Yale School of Management, Yale University. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in Organizational Psychology. Her research focuses on how people make meaning of their work and the experience of work as a job, career, or calling. Her current research involves studying how employees craft their tasks, interactions and relationships with others in the workplace to change both their work identity and the meaning of the job.

Jane E. Dutton is the Robert L. Kahn Distinguished University Professor of Business Administration and Psychology at the University of Michigan. Jane received her Ph.D from Northwestern University. She is co-director of the Center of Positive Organizational at the Ross School of Business. (<http://www.bus.umich.edu/Positive>) Her research focuses on compassion at work, job crafting, positive identities, and high quality connections.

References

- Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. E. (1999). How can you do it?: Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, *24*, 413–434.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, *37*, 122–147.
- Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 1175–1184.
- Baron, R. A., & Ensley, M. D. (2006). Opportunity recognition as the detection of meaningful patterns: Evidence from comparisons of novice and experienced entrepreneurs. *Management Science*, *52*, 1331–1344.
- Benner, P., Tanner, C. A., & Chesla, C. A. (1996). *Expertise in nursing practice*. New York: Springer.
- Berg, J. M., Grant, A. M., & Johnson, V. (2009). When callings are calling: Crafting work and leisure in pursuit of unanswered occupational callings. *Organization Science*.
- Berlin, I. (1969). *Two concepts of liberty*. In *Four essays on liberty* (pp. 118–172). London: Oxford University Press.
- Black, J. S., & Ashford, S. J. (1995). Fitting in or making jobs fit: Factors affecting mode of adjustment for new hires. *Human Relations*, *48*, 421–437.
- Burton-Jones, A. (1999). *Knowledge capitalism: Business, work, and learning in the new economy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Campion, M. A., & McClelland, C. L. (1993). Follow-up and extension of the interdisciplinary costs and benefits of enlarged jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 339–351.
- Caza, B. B. (2007). *Experiences of adversity at work: Toward an identity-based theory of resilience*. Doctoral Dissertation: University of Michigan.
- Cohen, R. C., & Sutton, R. I. (1998). Clients as a source of enjoyment on the job: How hairstylists shape demeanor and personal disclosures. In J. A. Wagner (Ed.), *Advances in qualitative organization research* (pp. 1–32). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Crant, M. J. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, *26*, 435–462.
- Dill, W. R. (1958). Environment as an influence on managerial autonomy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *2*, 409–443.
- Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'Neill, R. M., & Lawrence, K. A. (2001). Moves that matter: Issue selling and organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, *44*, 716–736.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (2003). Assessing creativity in Hollywood pitch meetings: Evidence for a dual-process model of creativity judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, *46*, 283–301.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Fine, G. A. (1996). Cooks' time: Temporal demands and the experience of work. In *Kitchens: The culture of restaurant work* (pp. 54–79). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fletcher, J. K. (1998). Relational practice: A feminist reconstruction of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *7*, 163–186.
- Flynn, F. J., & Bohns Lake, V. K. (2008). If you need help, just ask: Underestimating compliance with direct requests for help. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 128–143.
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In J. S. Ott (Ed.), *Classic readings in organizational behavior*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. In B. M. Staw, & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 23, pp. 133–187). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Gaglio, C. M. (2004). The role of mental simulations and counterfactual thinking in the opportunity identification process. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, *28*, 533–552.
- Ghitulescu, B. E. (2007). *Shaping tasks and relationships at work: Examining the antecedents and consequences of employee job crafting*. University of Pittsburgh.
- Gioia, D. A., & Poole, P. P. (1984). Scripts in organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 449–459.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 3–34.
- Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, *3*, 273–331.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 327–347.

- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). *Work redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ibarra, H. (1999). Provisional selves: Experimenting with image and identity in professional adaptation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*, 764–791.
- Jacques, R. (1993). Untheorized dimensions of caring work: Caring as structural practice and caring as a way of seeing. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, *17*, 1–10.
- Judge, T. A., & Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 849–863.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, *110*, 265–284.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer.
- Leana, C., Appelbaum, E., & Shevchuk, I. (in press). Work process and quality of care in early childhood education: The role of job crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*.
- Lee, F., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). Is it lonely at the top?: The independence and interdependence of power holders. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *23*, 43–91.
- Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., & Sablinski, C. J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *55*, 161–187.
- Lyons, P. (2008). The crafting of jobs and individual differences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *23*, 25–36.
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of Management Annals*, *2*, 351–398.
- Mechanic, D. (1962). Sources of power of lower participants in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *7*, 349–364.
- Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces*, *18*, 560–568.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Miner, A. S. (1987). Idiosyncratic jobs in formalized organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *32*, 327–351.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993a). Newcomer information seeking: Exploring types, modes, sources, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*, 557–589.
- Morrison, E. W. (1993b). Longitudinal study of the effects of information seeking on newcomer socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 173–183.
- Orbuch, T. L. (1997). People's accounts count: The sociology of accounts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 455–478.
- Ortega, J. (2003). Power in the firm and managerial career concerns. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, *12*, 1–29.
- Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*, 636–652.
- Pentland, B. T. (1992). Organizing moves in software support hot lines. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*, 527–548.
- Pratt, M. G., Rockmann, K. W., & Kaufman, J. (2006). Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*, 235–262.
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 612–624.
- Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, *105*, 51–88.
- Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: Its agenda and method. *Political Psychology*, *25*, 845–880.
- Star, S. L., & Strauss, A. (1999). Layers of silence, arenas of voice: The ecology of visible and invisible work. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work: The Journal of Collaborative Computing*, *8*, 9–30.
- Warren, D. I. (1968). Power, visibility, and conformity in formal organization. *American Sociological Review*, *33*, 951–970.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whyte, W. F. (1943). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wrzesniewski, A., Bartel, C. A., & Wiesenfeld, B. (2009). *Remoteness as a resource: The impact of virtual work on job crafting*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*, 179–201.

Appendix

Interview protocol

Questions probing for instances of job crafting	Follow-up questions posed for each possible instance of job crafting
<p style="text-align: center;">First layer of questioning</p> <p>Job crafting in general Has your job changed since you first started it? If so, how has it changed? Clarifications/probes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What sorts of tasks or projects are involved in your job on a day-to-day basis? How did these tasks become a part of your job? • In what ways, if any, have you made your job your own? <p style="text-align: center;">Second Layer of Questioning (asked after first layer was exhausted)</p> <p>Task crafting While organizations give people job responsibilities that define what it is they should be doing, sometimes people decide that they'll instead define some of these responsibilities for themselves. Have you done this with your job? If so, can you tell me a story of when and how you did this? Clarifications/probes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you taken on additional tasks that were not formally required by your job? Fewer tasks? Different types of tasks? • Have you changed the way you do tasks? • How are the tasks that make up your job now different than when you first started? Are any of these differences the result of your own initiative? <p>Relational crafting Have you actively changed your relationships with others at work? Clarifications/probes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example, sometimes people decide how frequently they wish to interact with others on the job, who they talk with in order to execute their work, or who they define as being involved in their job. Have you shaped your relationships with others in any of these ways? If so, can you tell me a story of when and how you did this? • How have your relationships with others changed since starting your job? Are any of these differences the result of your own initiative? <p>Cognitive crafting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you actively changed the way you think about your work? If so, can you tell me a story of when and how you did this? <p>Clarifications/probes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you feel is the purpose or meaning of your work? How did you arrive at this conclusion? Have your thoughts on this matter changed since you first started your job? 	<p>Motives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did you make this change? • Were there any key events, milestones, or turning points that would be helpful for understanding what led to this change? <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you face challenges or obstacles while making this change? If so, how did you overcome them? • Did anyone restrict you from making this change? • What role did your work environment play in this change? <p>Facilitators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was there anything in particular that you did to help make this change happen? • Did you get assistance from anyone while making this change? • What about your organization enabled you to make this change? • What about you as a person enabled you to make this change? <p>Motives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you want to make this change? <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What, if anything, has stopped you from making this change? <p>Facilitators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would enable you to make this change?
<p style="text-align: center;">Third layer of questioning (used after second layer was exhausted)</p> <p>Desired (but not yet enacted) crafting If you were given the opportunity to create your own job description at this organization, what would your responsibilities be? How would this job be different than your current job?</p>	