This is a draft chapter. The final version will be available in “A Research Agenda for Workplace Innovation: The Challenge of Disruptive Transitions” edited by Peter R.A. Oeij, Steven Dhondt and Adela McMurray, forthcoming 2021, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the authors and publisher, and is for private use only.

Workplace Innovation through Proactivity.

Job Crafting and Work Engagement Dynamics among Remote Workers in Italy.

Arianna Costantini¹ and Serena Rubini^{1,2}

¹Department of Human Sciences, Verona University, Italy.

²Webethical Srl, Vicenza, Italy.

Author Note

Arianna Costantini <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9061-1547>

Serena Rubini <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7147-521X>

We have no conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Arianna Costantini, Verona University, Department of Human Sciences, Lungadige Porta Vittoria 17, 37129 Verona, Italy. Email: arianna.costantini@univr.it

Abstract

In this chapter, we adopt a psychological perspective to the study of workplace innovation in Italy. Framing our contribution in the context of remote working and workplace innovation before, during, and after the COVID-19 emergency, we investigate how proactive behaviours (i.e., job crafting) transforming remote work processes resulted in different levels of work engagement during the pandemic. Three-wave longitudinal data were collected from a final sample of 35 remote workers (N=105 observations). Results from multilevel analyses with Bayesian estimator showed that remote working was associated with higher frequencies of behaviours aimed at actively distancing by one's work role, which in turn was associated with lower work engagement. On the other side, employees reporting more efforts to optimise their work processes proactively reported higher engagement than those displaying less proactivity towards remote work organisation. These findings highlight the need for remote working solutions to account for individual proactivity in enacting remote work processes, since such behaviours are significant predictors of work engagement, a key factor to allow higher organisational performance and work-related well-being.

Keywords: Job Crafting; Proactive Work Behaviours; Remote Working; Work Engagement; Workplace Innovation.

Workplace Innovation through Proactivity:

Job Crafting and Work Engagement Dynamics among Remote Workers in Italy.

COVID-19 abruptly accelerated the speed of changes related to how work is organised and experienced. Among the main challenges faced by workers and organisations, two turning points are represented by the rise of remote work and the accelerated shift to digital transformation (Kniffin et al., 2020). To successfully navigate this scenario, a perspective that integrates new systems, people, and processes across work innovations is needed. Indeed, the pandemic has brought into sharp relief how successful organisational adaptations strongly depend on how people at work are able to face new challenges and are involved in the innovation process themselves. Thus, the pandemic highlighted the need for revising not only work conditions and tools but also the understanding of individual motivation and engagement in the new context of work (Comella-Dorda, Garg, Thareja, & Vasquez-McCall, 2020; Kniffin et al., 2020).

The awareness that technological and digital innovation should be complemented and integrated with social innovation is at the roots of workplace innovation (Pot, Rus, & Oeij, 2017). Workplace innovation (WPI) is defined as an integral set of participative mechanisms for interventions relating structural and cultural aspects of the organisation, with the final aim to simultaneously improving organisational performance and quality of working life, including personal development, well-being at work, and engagement (Oeij & Dhondt, 2017, p.66). Accordingly, people are not only recipients of innovation but rather key-success factors for organisational performance and innovation capability, where employees' engagement allows improving the business and the quality of work (Costantini, Sartori, & Ceschi, 2017). Through their behaviours, employees can change work processes to make them more efficient, motivating, or both, enacting changes representing bottom-up examples of WPI (Costantini, Sartori, & Ceschi, 2018; Oeij & Dhondt, 2017).

Against this backdrop, in this chapter, we focus on WPI in Italy and zoom in on how companies and employees faced the challenges brought about by the COVID19 pandemic. We begin by outlining the context of change and the institutional measures adopted to support organisational renewal and innovation before the pandemic. Then, we present data on how companies faced remote working before, during, and after the pandemic. Next, we dig into employees' experiences through these transitions and present a longitudinal study investigating the role of proactive work behaviours during remote working and their link with work engagement. In doing so, we build on the idea of employees' initiated proactive changes as a bottom-up example of WPI to face and manage the challenges of the disruptive innovations brought by the pandemic, advancing the discussion on the role and possibilities of employees' involvement as a critical factor of WPI.

Workplace Innovation & Remote Working in Italy: A Pre-Post Emergency Scenario

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, in Italy WPI has been on the institutional agenda and promoted through the National Industry 4.0 Plan since 2017. Over the years, the number of companies implementing new projects within such a framework continued to grow, especially those focusing on developing IT solutions. Likely, remote working saw a growing trend in the years before the pandemic, particularly among large companies, which however represent only a minor percentage of the number of enterprises in Italy. As follows, we introduce such a context and elaborate on perspectives for remote working and WPI in Italy.

Institutional Measures to promote Workplace Innovation before COVID-19: The National Industry 4.0 Plan

Starting in 2017, Italy has launched the "National Industry 4.0 Plan 2017-2020" (from now on, 4.0 Plan). This plan provides a set of organic and complementary measures to encourage investments for innovation and competitiveness, based on three criteria (Calenda,

2017): (i) to operate in a logic of technological neutrality¹; (ii) to intervene with horizontal rather than vertical or sectorial actions; (iii) to act on enabling factors of innovation. To reach these aims and provide support for company projects, four strategic guidelines were identified (Calenda, 2017):

- *Innovative Investments*: to stimulate private investments in adopting enabling technologies for innovation and increase R&D expenditures;
- *Enabling Infrastructures*: to ensure adequate network infrastructures while guaranteeing security and data protection and collaborating in defining international interoperability standards;
- *Skills and Research*: to support the development of tech and digital competences, foster a culture of innovation and technology, and stimulate research through specific funds;
- *Awareness and Governance*: to spread the knowledge, the potential, and applications of 4.0 Plan technologies and guarantee public-private governance of innovations.

The projects developed within the 4.0 Plan include developing new IT and solutions to enable the adoption of technological components within traditional production assets and related services. In 2018, such projects reached a value of 3.2 billion euros, of which 82% were redirected towards Italian companies (Perego et al., 2019). Such a value reflects an increase of 35% compared to the previous year and a growth of 140% if considering the last four years (Perego et al., 2019).

These data suggest that the Italian IT sector is running faster and faster. However, to support and consolidate such growth, HR departments and workers should be involved in the design and development of such innovations, given that they are their end-users and play a

¹ The term “neutrality” indicates the freedom left to companies regarding their choices on the investments to be made, which can be either tangible or intangible assets.

key role in their deployment (Tortorella et al., 2021). However, data show that in more than one in four cases (26.6%) companies are not informed of the presence of the 4.0 Plan, while in only 6.8% of the companies, the HR function takes part in these initiatives (Perego et al., 2019).

Remote Working before COVID-19

In Italy, in 2019 before the COVID-19 outbreak, the percentage of large companies starting remote working projects was 58%, higher than the 56% in 2018 and 36% in 2017. Remote working initiatives were less common in SMEs, where they had gone from 8% of structured projects for remote working in 2018 to 12% in 2019. SMEs continued to prefer an informal approach to remote working, relying on intuition rather than planned job redesign approaches that account for different job conditions, probably because of the lower organisational complexity. Fifty-one per cent of SMEs showed no interest in starting remote working projects (Corso et al., 2019). Such data is particularly relevant given that in Italy, out of the total number of enterprises, SMEs represent over 75% of companies, equal to about 760 thousand companies. Among these, over 90% of Italian SMEs are made up of companies that employ less than ten people and operate in the tertiary sector (about 75%). Hence, small and medium-sized enterprises represent the backbone of the national production system, employing over 80% of the workforce operating in the area (Digital4, 2021).

Remote Working during the COVID-19 Lockdown and Right After

In the acute phase of the emergency, in Italy there were 2.11 million remote workers from large enterprises, 1.13 million from SMEs, and 1.5 million from micro-enterprises. Fifty per cent of SMEs had to suspend their business. More than two out of three large companies had to increase the supply of laptops and other hardware tools (69%) and to enable remote access to company applications (65%) (Balabio, Puelli & Orlando, 2020).

In September 2020, many companies adopted a hybrid work configuration, with employees working both remotely and at the workplace, for 5.06 million hybrid workers. To facilitate the return to safety, the main initiatives implemented at the workplaces were the introduction of rules and guidelines on the use of environments (for 91% of large companies), the definition of a plan for the return of people with shifts for work teams (88%), and the introduction of signs to guide flows and encourage safety behaviours (81%). Seventy-two per cent of large companies have left decisional latitude regarding the number of agile working days, but with procedures to not exceed the limit of people imposed by the need for distancing. The latter led to workplace alterations, such as more spaced or separate workstations (52% large companies) or the closure of some areas of the headquarters (45%). To avoid crowds, entry and exit times have been reshaped in 34% of large Italian companies (Balabio et al., 2020).

Future Perspectives

At the end of the emergency, it is estimated that, in Italy, workers who will work at least partially remotely will be 5.35 million (Balabio et al., 2020). Besides, one in two large companies will redesign physical spaces at the end of the emergency (51%), differentiating them (29%), expanding them (12%), or reducing them (10%). Thirty-eight per cent of large Italian companies do not foresee redesigns but will change the way of use; only 11% will return to work as before. Thirty-six per cent of large companies will modify their ongoing remote working projects and digitise the processes. As many as 70% of those with an agile work project will increase the days in which it is possible to work remotely, going from just one day a week before the pandemic to an average of 2.7 days after the emergency is over. Sixty-five per cent will involve more remote workers, 42% will include previously excluded profiles, and 17% will revise working hours (Balabio et al., 2020).

Overall, these data highlight the rise of remote and hybrid working in the context of Italian companies, which pinpoint the need for a systematic investigation of the new context of work (Wang, Liu, Qian, & Parker, 2020). That is, research is needed on how people working remotely channel their efforts through proactive behaviours to sustain their engagement, eventually transforming work processes and, with this, enacting innovation.

People as Innovation Agents. The Rise of Bottom-Up WPI.

Workplace innovation refers to the development and implementation of practice or combination of practices that, structurally or culturally, enable employees to participate in organisational change and renewal and improve the quality of work-life and organisational performance (Costantini et al., 2017; Oeij, & Dhondt, 2017). Such a concept leverages employees' engagement as key to deploying socio-organizational innovations that improve work and performance (Oeij, Rus, & Pot, 2017).

In the context of remote working, understanding the factors driving employees' engagement requires a focus on individual proactive behaviours, which can leverage high work autonomy to enhance work processes and outcomes actively (Demerouti, 2014). One such set of proactive behaviours is job crafting, designating self-initiated changes in the job boundaries to improve the job (Bruning & Campion, 2018). Research proposes that individuals engage in job crafting to improve the fit with their characteristics and experience better work-related well-being and job performance (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). Adopting a WPI framework, job crafting can be considered a set of behaviours through which employees proactively contribute to organisational performance and enhance well-being while working remotely. Accordingly, we propose that during remote working, individuals engage in proactive strategies to manage their virtual work characteristics and strive for fit and motivation.

Hypothesis 1: Remote working will be significantly related to job crafting behaviours in terms of (a) adoption of technology and other sources of knowledge; (b) work organisation; (c) work role reduction.

Moreover, research suggests that employees can craft their work through effortful and directed actions to either seek positive work aspects (i.e., approach crafting) or avoid/escape from negative work features (i.e., avoidance crafting; Bruning & Campion, 2018; Zhang & Parker, 2019). While abundant evidence exists on the role of approach crafting to sustain work engagement, studies document a detrimental role of avoidance crafting and show its negative relation with work engagement and positive association with job strain (e.g., Costantini, Demerouti, Ceschi, & Sartori, 2019; Lichtenthaler & Fischbach, 2019; Zhang & Parker, 2019). Hence, while managing remote working, employees may engage in proactive behaviours that could (i) lead to beneficial effects on their engagement because they enrich virtual work characteristics, or (ii) detriment motivation when striving for avoiding negative work situations or escape from negative work aspects.

Hypothesis 2a: Employees' active and goal-directed use of technology and other sources of knowledge to alter the job and enhance a work process (i.e., job crafting adoption behaviours) will be positively related to their work engagement.

Hypothesis 2b: Employees' active design of systems and strategies to organise the elements of work (i.e., job crafting work organisation behaviours) will be positively related to their work engagement.

Hypothesis 2c: Employees' active efforts to reduce their work role and effort expenditures (i.e., job crafting role reduction behaviours) will be negatively related to their work engagement.

Overall, based on the type of job crafting behaviour employees engage in, proactive efforts resulting from remote working may lead to higher work engagement based on whether

the focus is on improving and enriching the work characteristics as opposed to reducing work role and effort expenditures (cf. Bruning & Campion, 2018; Zhang & Parker, 2019).

Hypothesis 3: Remote working will be significantly related to work engagement through job crafting behaviours in terms of (a) adoption of technology and other sources of knowledge; (b) work organisation; (c) work role reduction.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

This study adopts a three-way longitudinal design involving a convenience sample of employees from Northern Italy. The first wave of data collection (T1) took place in March 2020, i.e., at the beginning of the COVID19 emergency; the second wave in April 2020 (T2), i.e., in full COVID19 emergency, and the third wave (T3) between May and June, i.e., during the phase of a gradual return to the pre-COVID19 emergency. Participants were informed that their responses were anonymous, kept confidential and used solely for the research purpose.

After matching the responses with a unique code created by the participants (letters from the name of some of their relatives in a specific order), we got a matched sample of 35 respondents who completed the study out of 57 (response rate: 61%). Among these ($M_{\text{age}} = 37.91$; $SD_{\text{age}} = 14.51$), 59.4% were female. On average, women reported a tenure of 10.5 years ($SD = 10.7$), while men reported a tenure of 15.3 years ($SD = 12.6$). Concerning education, 12.3% of the participants obtained a lower secondary school diploma, 57.9% obtained a high school diploma, 10.5% a bachelor's degree, and the remaining obtained higher degrees.

Forty-nine per cent of the participants reported having a full-time permanent contract, 10.5% a part-time permanent contract, 26.3% a part-time, fixed-term contract, and the remaining reported other types of contracts. Most of the participants (44.8%) worked in a

technical position, followed by administration (12.8%) and sales (7.2%), across a wide range of industries, including the internet, finance, manufacturing, education. At T1, participants reported that they worked an average of 36.4 (SD = 11.5) hours/week, with 71.9% working at the workplace, 24.6% working remotely, and 3.5% declaring their work had been interrupted. At T2, participants reported an average of 22.5 (SD = 19.6) working hours/week, with 38.3% participants working at the workplace, 25.5% worked remotely, and 36.2% declaring they could not work. Finally, at T3, participants reported 32.7 working hours/week (SD = 17.2), with 65.6% working at the workplace, 18.8% working remotely, and 15.6% participants reporting their work to be interrupted.

A non-response analysis showed no significant differences in gender, educational attainment, employment contract, and profession among participants who completed the study and those who interrupted the study at T1.

Measures

In all questionnaires, we asked participants to reflect upon their experiences during the past week. Five-point Likert scales ranging from (1) never to (5) very often/all of the time were used, unless indicated otherwise.

Remote Working. We assessed remote working asking participants to indicate whether, in the previous week, they worked remotely. Responses were dummy coded, with 0 indicating working at the workplace and 1 working either from home or elsewhere but not the workplace.

Job Crafting Behaviours. Job crafting behaviours were assessed using 13 items mapping the dimensions of adoption, work organisation, and work role reduction as per the conceptualisation of Bruninig & Campion (2018). *Adoption* was assessed with 5 items (e.g., “I use new knowledge or technology to automate work tasks”; Cronbach’s α T1-T3 ranged from 0.94 to 0.96). *Work organisation* was assessed with 4 items (e.g., “I create structure in

my work processes”; Cronbach’s α T1-T3 ranged from 0.71 to 0.89. *Work role reduction* was assessed with 4 items (e.g., “I find ways to get others to take my place in meetings”; Cronbach’s α T1-T3 ranged from 0.66 to 0.86).

Work Engagement. Work engagement was assessed using three items from the Italian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Balducci, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2010) capturing *vigour* (i.e., “At my work, I feel bursting with energy”), *dedication* (i.e. “I am enthusiastic about my job”), and *absorption* (i.e., “I am immersed in my job”); Cronbach’s, α T1-T3 ranged from 0.71 – 0.79.

Analytical Strategy

Our data have a multilevel structure, with monthly measures (Level 1) nested within individuals (Level 2). Accordingly, to test our hypotheses, we used multilevel structural equation modelling (MSEM) in Mplus version 8.4 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2019) using Bayesian estimation and default diffuse priors (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2019; Depaoli & Clifton, 2015). Multilevel SEM allows for decomposing the data into a within-person and a between-person part and modelling each part with its own model. Before hypothesis testing, we calculated the intra-class correlations (ICC1; Bliese, 2000) for our dependent variables, which show the amount of variance attributed to between level (between persons) variation. The between-person variance for our variables varied from 51% for work engagement to 80% for adoption, highlighting high variability between individuals and the need for adopting random intercepts models. All our variables were not specified as either between or within variables and were modelled at both analysis levels.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics and within-person correlations of the study variables (N=105 observations). Gender and educational level were significantly correlated

with adoption (i.e., gender, $r=-0.18$, $p=0.05$; educational level, $r=0.23$, $p=0.01$), and role reduction behaviours were significantly correlated with educational level ($r=0.37$, $p<0.001$). Furthermore, age ($r = 0.34$, $p<0.001$) and educational level ($r=0.27$, $p=0.002$) related positively with remote working, and tenure related positively with work organization behaviours ($r=0.21$, $p=0.02$). Work engagement related positively with job crafting behaviours in terms of adoption ($r=0.38$, $p<0.001$) and work organization ($r=0.26$, $p<0.001$), also work organization correlated with adoption ($r=0.53$; $p<0.001$). Finally, remote working was positively related to role reduction behaviours ($r=0.30$, $p<0.001$).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Hypotheses Testing

Figure 1 shows the results of our final model. The model fitted the data well (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2012): Posterior predictive P-value (PPp) = 0.25, indicating that the model can make predictions that are similar to the observations made about the model (Dombrowski, Golay, McGill, & Canivez, 2017). In our MSEM, we controlled for the number of hours worked, age, gender, educational level, and tenure. Findings from our final model showed that remote working was significantly related to role reduction behaviours only at the between level (estimate=.63; 95%CI= [0.13, 1.42]), providing partial support to Hypothesis 1, i.e., 1c. Moreover, at the between level, higher levels of work organisation were associated with higher work engagement (estimate=.71; 95%CI= [0.36, 1.11]), while role reduction behaviours were negatively related to it (estimate=-.39; 95%CI= [-0.73, -0.13]). At the within-person level, results showed that on weeks when employees reported a higher frequency of role-reducing behaviours compared to their usual patterns, they also reported significantly lower levels of work engagement (estimate=-.35; 95%CI= [-0.65, -

0.04]). Hence, Hypothesis 2a is rejected, Hypothesis 2b is confirmed only at the between level, and Hypothesis 2c is confirmed at both the between- and within-level of analysis. No support is provided for Hypothesis 3, as none of the indirect effects was significant.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Discussion

With remote and digital working being expected to last and spread as organisations realise the cost-savings and lower risks associated with structuring work around less office space (Pejtersen et al., 2011; Spreitzer, Cameron & Garrett, 2017), insights on the chances for successful implementation of WPI in the face of virtual work conditions are needed. In this chapter, we delved into the context of WPI and remote working in Italy and investigated the within and between dynamics of proactive behaviours that can contribute to WPI through improvement in work engagement during remote working.

Previous research at the European level indicated that companies developing and implementing WPI are characterised by closely cooperative relationships between management and employees, where organisational cultures are open to bottom-up renewal (Eurofound, 2015). Our research leverages such findings to advance knowledge on the individual processes prompting such a bottom-up renewal. To do so, it focuses on the links between employees' proactive behaviours and work engagement in the context of a sudden introduction of remote working, contributing in shaping the discussion on the role of employees in shaping WPI processes in Italy.

We presented a three-wave study conducted with employees in Italy starting right after the COVID-19 disruption, at the beginning of March, until June 2020. Our findings showed that when individuals engaged more often in the active design of systems and

strategies to organise the elements of work, i.e., high frequencies of job crafting in terms of work organisation behaviours, they also experienced higher work engagement than their own average levels. Differently, when individuals engaged more often in conscious behaviours aimed at reducing effort expenditures, i.e., role reduction behaviours, they also experienced lower engagement compared to their own average levels. This finding is particularly important when coupled with the one showing that employees reporting more frequent experiences of remote working engaged more often in role reduction behaviours than their counterparts who worked remotely less often. In turn, such behaviours were linked to lower work engagement also at the between level, signalling that individuals who consciously reduced effort expenditures reported lower levels of work engagement compared to employees who did not reduce their work roles. Interestingly, employees' active and goal-directed use of technology and other knowledge sources to alter the job and enhance work processes were not significantly associated with either remote working or work engagement. One possible explanation for such finding is that remote working experiences were introduced suddenly because of the pandemic, placing employees in the position of having to deal with the use of technology in this new context rather than proactively use it to enhance altered work processes they still have to master extensively.

These results contribute to the need for a systematic understanding of the changing nature of work in the context of remote working (Wang et al., 2020), and provide initial evidence on the importance of redesigning work processes to enable effective channelling of employees' proactive efforts while working remotely. In Italy, the shift to remote working during the pandemic has been often referred to as a shift towards smart working solutions. However, rather than resulting in revised and optimised work processes, such transitions have been largely understood as fully flexible work arrangements, mainly defined by the lack of work time or workplace constraints (Angelici & Profeta, 2020). Still, the distinction and

differences between *remote* and *smart* working require attention. For example, the Italian law specifically defines smart working as "*a method of executing the employment relationship established by agreement between the parties, including forms of organisation by phases, cycles, or objectives, without precise constraints on time or place of work, with the possible use of technological tools, to increase competitiveness and facilitate work-life balance*" (Parlamento Italiano, 2017). Hence, smart working is to be understood as a WPI process requiring different stakeholders' involvement in planning and redesigning work to sustain employees' performance and well-being while working remotely. However, probably also because of the lack of time and need to respond quickly to the COVID-19 emergency, the imposed shift to remote working did not reflect a parallel smart working transition (Balabio et al., 2020), which seem to be further confirmed by our research.

Indeed, our findings highlight the positive relationship between remote working and role reduction, suggesting that the apparent increase in autonomy can be linked to negative outcomes (i.e., lower work engagement) for employees who proactively tend to engage in distancing behaviours to manage their virtual characteristics. Therefore, this evidence further emphasises the need for considering remote working characteristics and their proactive redesign enacted by employees as assets for WPI, in that they may hinder or improve employees' engagement, which finally serves to promote work quality and performance (Oeij & Dhondt, 2017; Totterdill & Exton, 2014). Failing to consider the role of proactivity as a key factor for WPI in the context of remote working may lead to the active and systematic reduction of one's tasks, responsibilities, or interactions (Berg, Wrzesniewski, & Dutton, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), which eventually harm motivational and performance outcomes.

Limitations and Future Research

This study does not come without limitations. First, our sample size was rather small, and participants all came from a specific socio-economic context, hardly hit in terms of number of deaths and associated worries at the beginning of the pandemic emergency, i.e., at the time of the study. While the use of Bayesian estimator can improve advantages with small sample sizes (e.g., Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010), research involving larger samples and in a context of lower apprehension is needed to understand better the processes of proactivity during remote or smart working.

The focus of our investigation was work proactivity in terms of a specific set of job crafting behaviours (Bruning & Campion, 2018). While research has shown the relevance of job crafting behaviours for work quality and performance outcomes (Lichtenthaler, & Fischbach, 2019), there are also other forms of proactivity and job crafting, including cognitive crafting, that we omitted here and that may contribute meaningfully to employees' experiences during remote working. Hence, future research may consider other forms of proactivity during remote working as important dimensions shaping WPI and its outcomes.

Finally, in our study, we relied on self-ratings. Although self-ratings can meaningfully capture private experiences (e.g., work engagement) (Conway & Lance, 2010), future research could consider incorporating other-ratings of proactive behaviours when possible.

Conclusions

Individual proactivity can significantly shape WPI by enhancing or hindering work engagement. To fully benefit the chances resulting from the deployment of human talent and organising work processes remotely (Karanika-Murray & Oeij, 2017), individual approaches focusing on proactivity can meaningfully contribute to the understating of how WPI unfolds and leads to good work and better organisational performance.

References

- Angelici, M., & Profeta, P. (2020). *Smart-working: work flexibility without constraints*. CESifo Working Paper, No. 8165, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich.
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2010). *Bayesian analysis of latent variable models using Mplus* (version 3) (Technical Report).
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2019). Latent variable centering of predictors and mediators in multilevel and time-series models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 26, 119-142.
- Balabio, B., Puelli, M., Orlando, P. (2020). *Dallo smart working d'emergenza al "New normal": nuove abitudini e nuovi approcci al lavoro*. Osservatorio Smart Working della School of Management del Politecnico di Milano. Milano. Accessed on January 20, 2021, from <https://www.osservatori.net/it/ricerche/comunicati-stampa/smart-working-emergenza-covid19-new-normal>.
- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Italian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 26, 143–149.
- Berg, J. M., Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2010). Perceiving and responding to challenges in job crafting at different ranks: When proactivity requires adaptivity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 158–186
- Bliese, P.D. (2000). Within-group agreement, non-independence, and reliability: Implications for data aggregation and analysis. In K.K. Klein & S.W.J. Kozlowski (Eds.), *Multilevel theory, research, and methods in organizations* (pp. 349–381). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A role–resource approach–avoidance model of job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61, 499-522.

- Calenda, C. (2017). *Piano Nazionale Industria 4.0. Ministero Dello Sviluppo Economico*: Roma, Italy. From Mise (Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico). Accessed on January 19, 2021, from https://www.mise.gov.it/images/stories/documenti/Piano_Industria_40.pdf
- Comella-Dorda, S., Garg, L., Thareja, S., & Vasquez-McCall, B. (2020). Revisiting agile teams after an abrupt shift to remote. *McKinsey & Company, Organizational Practice*.
- Conway, J. M., & Lance, C. E. (2010). What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 325–334. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6>
- Corso, M., Crespi, ... Pluchino, J., (2019). *Smart Working davvero: la flessibilità non basta*. Osservatorio Smart Working della School of Management del Politecnico di Milano. Politecnico di Milano | Dipartimento di Ingegneria Gestionale.
- Costantini, A., Demerouti, E., Ceschi, A., & Sartori, R. (2019). Evidence on the hierarchical, multidimensional nature of behavioural job crafting. *Applied Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/apps.12232
- Costantini, A., Sartori, R., & Ceschi, A. (2017). Framing workplace innovation through an organisational psychology perspective: a review of current WPI studies. In P. Oeij, D. Rus, and F. D. Pot (Eds.). *Workplace Innovation* (pp. 131-147). Springer, Cham.
- Costantini, A., Sartori, R., & Ceschi, A. (2018, June). Job crafting paving the way towards workplace innovation. In P. Oeij, D. Rus, and P. Totterdill (Chairs). *Workplace Innovation: present and future scoping of a new field*. Symposium presented at 2018 EURAM conference. Reykjavik, Iceland.
- Demerouti, E. (2014). Design your own job through job crafting. *European Psychologist*, 19, 237-247.
- Depaoli, S., & Clifton, J. P. (2015). A Bayesian approach to multilevel structural equation modeling with continuous and dichotomous outcomes. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 22, 327-351.

Digital4. All about SMEs: news, regulations, advice and case studies of SMEs in Italy. (2021).

Accessed on January 19, 2021, from Digital4 (Digital360 Group):

<https://www.digital4.biz/pmi/>

Dombrowski, S. C., Golay, P., McGill, R. J., & Canivez, G. L. (2018). Investigating the theoretical structure of the DAS-II core battery at school age using Bayesian structural equation modeling. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55, 190-207.

Eurofound (2015). *Third European Company Survey – Workplace innovation in European companies*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

Karanika-Murray, M., & Oeij, P. R. (2017). How Can Work and Organisational Psychologists Fortify the Practice of Workplace Innovation? In P. Oeij, D. Rus, and F. D. Pot (Eds.). *Workplace Innovation* (pp. 339-353). Springer, Cham.

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhawe, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L. L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., Ozcelik, H., ... Vugt, M. V. (2020). COVID-19 and the workplace: Implications, issues, and insights for future research and action. *The American Psychologist*, doi.org/10.1037/amp0000716

Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Fischbach, A. (2019). A meta-analysis on promotion-and prevention-focused job crafting. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(1), 30-50.

Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (1998–2011). *Mplus user's guide*. Eighth edition. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Oeij, P., & Dhondt, S. (2017). Theoretical approaches supporting workplace innovation. In P. Oeij, D. Rus, and F. D. Pot (Eds.). *Workplace Innovation* (pp. 63-78). Springer, Cham.

Oeij, P., Rus, D., & Pot, F. D. (2017). *Workplace innovation: Theory, research and practice*. Springer, Cham.

Parlamento Italiano. *Measures for the protection of non-entrepreneurial self-employment and measures to encourage flexible working time and place of employment*. Law 81/2017 (2017, June 13th) (Italy). *Gazzetta Ufficiale*, (135).

- Pejtersen, J. H., Feveile, H., Christensen, K. B., & Burr, H. (2011). Sickness absence associated with shared and open-plan offices.—a national cross sectional questionnaire survey. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 376-382.
- Perego, A., Sianesi, A., Tedaldi, G., (2019). *Industria 4.0: la rivoluzione si fa con le persone!* Osservatorio Industria 4.0 della School of Management del Politecnico di Milano. Politecnico di Milano | Dipartimento di Ingegneria Gestionale.
- Pot, F. D., Rus, D., & Oeij, P. R. (2017). Introduction: The Need to Uncover the Field of Workplace Innovation. In P. Oeij, D. Rus, and F. D. Pot (Eds.). *Workplace Innovation* (pp. 1-8). Springer, Cham.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Cameron, L., & Garrett, L. (2017). Alternative work arrangements: Two images of the new world of work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 4, 473-499.
- Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1–9.
- Tortorella, G., Miorando, R., Caiado, R., Nascimento, D., & Portioli Staudacher, A. (2021). The mediating effect of employees' involvement on the relationship between Industry 4.0 and operational performance improvement. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(1-2), 119-133.
- Totterdill, P., & Exton, R. (2014). Defining workplace innovation: The fifth element. *Strategic Direction*, 30, 12–16.
- Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2020). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/apps.12290
- Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179–201.
- Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(2), 126-146.

Table 1.

Means, Standard Deviations, and Within-Person Correlations of the Study Variables (N Observations = 105).

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Gender	1.61	0.49	—									
2 Age	37.5	13.4	-0.11	—								
3 Educational Level	3.60	1.53	0.24**	0.06	—							
4 Tenure	2.97	2.59	0.06	0.04	0.12	—						
5 Hours Worked	30.5	17.4	-0.18*	0.01	-0.13	0.07	—					
6 Remote Working	0.22	0.42	-0.04	0.34***	0.27**	0.03	0.07	—				
7 Work Engagement	4.25	0.88	-0.12	0.15	-0.05	0.03	0.16	0.12	—			
8 Adoption	3.58	1.12	-0.18*	-0.07	0.23*	0.04	0.12	0.12	0.38***	—		
9 Role Reduction	1.84	0.77	-0.01	0.01	0.37***	0.11	0.02	0.30***	-0.12	0.14	—	
10 Work Organization	4.12	0.81	-0.02	-0.09	0.26**	-0.21*	0.08	0.08	0.26***	0.53***	0.19*	—

Note. Gender: 1=Male; 2=Female. Educational level: 1=Elementary school diploma; 2=Middle school diploma; 3=High school diploma; 4=Bachelor's degree (3 yrs); 5=Masters' degree (2+3 yrs); 6=Masters' degree (5 yrs); 7=Graduate school; 8=Specialization Course; 9=PhD. Remote working: dummy coded (0 = no; 1 = yes).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Figure 1.

Results from the Final Multilevel Model.