

Enhancing Learning Agility, Job Crafting, and Innovative Work Behavior: Strategies to Thrive in A Competitive Industry

Verren Gisella¹, Zamralita², R. Urip Purwono³

Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: verrengisel@gmail.com, zamralita@fpsi.untar.ac.id*, urip.purwono@gmail.com

Keywords

Company;
Employees;
Innovative Work Behavior;
Learning Agility
Performance

ABSTRACT

The current industrial era is extremely fast-paced and dynamic. Companies require employees who can adapt quickly and enhance the company's competitiveness through innovative ideas. The aim of this study is to examine the role of Learning Agility as a predictor of Innovative Work Behavior, with Job Crafting as a mediator. Learning agility is the ability to quickly learn new skills and adapt to changing situations. Innovative Work Behavior involves identifying problems and implementing new ideas. Job crafting refers to how employees adjust their job demands and resources. This study was conducted with 158 employees, aged 18–58 years, with a minimum of one year of work experience. The measurement tools in this study were the Learning Agility Scale by Wardhani et al. (2022), the Innovative Work Behavior Scale by Jong & Den Hartog (2010), and the Job Crafting Scale by Tims et al. (2012). Data processing was carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics 30.0. The results of the study showed that Learning Agility has a significant influence on Innovative Work Behavior ($p=.000$; $p<.05$), Learning Agility has a significant influence on Job Crafting ($p=.000$; $p<.05$), Job Crafting has a significant influence on Innovative Work Behavior ($p=.0426$; $p<.05$), and Job Crafting partially mediates the relationship between Learning Agility and Innovative Work Behavior. The implications of this study suggest that managers and employees should develop Learning Agility capabilities and implement Job Crafting strategies to exhibit Innovative Work Behavior.

INTRODUCTION

Change is an inevitable aspect of life, particularly within the industrial sector. The current industrial era is marked by high levels of dynamism and rapid transformation, resulting in increased complexity, ambiguity, and intense competition. Employees are invaluable assets to any company. Without them, it would be impossible for a company to achieve its objectives and conduct its operations effectively (Fulmer & Ployhart, 2013) (Hammer, 2001). In such conditions, it is undeniable that organizational success relies heavily on the quality and performance of its workforce (Zamralita & Winata, 2024). However, not all employees are able to demonstrate the desired level of quality and performance. Many find themselves trapped in

routine, simply completing tasks as instructed. Employees who are entrenched in routine often struggle to cope with changes—such as shifting job demands or new assignments. It is common for such employees to become dissatisfied, lack resilience, and frequently switch jobs. Those who resist change often show a reluctance to learn and innovate, diminishing their competitiveness and hindering their ability to survive within a dynamic industrial landscape. This inability to adapt can ultimately reduce both individual productivity and organizational competitiveness (Haropis & Zamralita, 2023; Lestari & Zamralita, 2017; Zamralita & Wilis, 2023; Mahfuds & Yuliana, 2022).

When measured by GDP per worker, Indonesia's labor productivity still lags behind neighboring countries. According to the Ministry of Manpower, the productivity rate of Indonesian workers stands at 74.4%, which is below the ASEAN average of 78.2%. Countries such as the Philippines (86.3%), Singapore (82.7%), Thailand (80.1%), and Vietnam (80%) report higher productivity levels. This relatively low productivity among Indonesian workers is concerning, as it translates into diminished company performance. In today's fast-paced and constantly evolving industrial landscape, companies require employees who are not only productive and efficient but also innovative in responding to rapid industry developments (Danudoro et al., 2021; Augustin et al., 2021).

In such environments, organizations increasingly demand employees who are capable of generating novel ideas and adapting quickly (Riansyah & Syaroni, 2017). A strategic approach to fostering innovation is essential, as it enhances competitiveness, cultivates a positive work culture, increases organizational resilience, and supports succession planning (Gopay, 2024). *Innovative work behavior* refers to individual behaviors that involve the generation, introduction, and deliberate application of new ideas within a job role, team, or organization for the benefit of performance (Janssen, 2000). It also encompasses the intentional identification of problems (in the role, team, or organization) to develop creative solutions related to products, services, or work methods, including a series of behaviors necessary to implement and apply these ideas (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Employees are thus encouraged to exhibit *innovative work behavior* to solve problems creatively, achieve job satisfaction, and enhance productivity (Sanjaya et al., 2024).

Such behavior can be fostered through *learning agility*—the capacity of individuals to rapidly acquire new competencies and adapt effectively to changing environments (Wardhani et al., 2022). *Learning agility* comprises several dimensions: *people agility*, *results agility*, *mental agility*, and *change agility*. Individuals with high *learning agility* tend to engage in innovative behaviors such as idea exploration, adopting new methods, collaborating to implement changes, and executing solutions to achieve measurable results (Janssen, 2000; Jo & Hong, 2022).

Experiential learning is a vital tool for boosting productivity in volatile market conditions, making *learning agility* one of the most critical competencies for the modern workforce (Jo & Hong, 2022). Employees with strong *learning agility* actively learn from experiences and apply their knowledge to new and evolving situations (Gravett & Caldwell, 2016). They do not perceive challenges as setbacks, but as opportunities for growth and competency development (Vinesian et al., 2023). When confronted with problems, such

individuals leverage previous learning to develop innovative solutions (Eichinger et al., 2010; Jo & Hong, 2022).

A relevant strategy that can mediate the relationship between *learning agility* and *innovative work behavior* is *job crafting* (Aprilinda & Sahrah, 2022). According to Bakker et al. (2016), *job crafting* is a behavioral strategy through which employees proactively modify job demands and resources to improve their performance and foster innovation. *Job crafting* involves aligning job tasks and resources with individual preferences and capabilities (Tims et al., 2012; Sharma & Nambudiri, 2020). Employees make these adjustments based on their experiential learning, tailoring their work roles accordingly. Consequently, individuals with high *learning agility* are more inclined to implement *job crafting* strategies (Violi & Rostiana, 2025). Peng (2018) highlights that *job crafting* reflects a proactive attitude wherein employees modify the content and processes of their work to better align with individual or team goals, thus enhancing job meaning and engagement.

Prior studies have identified *learning agility* as a predictor of *innovative work behavior*, particularly among working students (Nathaniel & Dewi, 2024). The study concluded that students with high *learning agility* were more willing and able to learn from their experiences and apply those lessons in job-related tasks. Furthermore, Liu et al. (2021) described *job crafting* as a resource management process. Given that *learning agility* is a personal resource, it is hypothesized that employees can optimize its use through *job crafting*, thereby enhancing innovation. Demerouti et al. (2015) also emphasized that *job crafting*—by redesigning work tasks and boundaries—can promote autonomy and well-being, both of which are essential for fostering *innovative work behavior*. Panda et al. (2024) found that agility could enhance innovation through *job crafting*, but previous research has not specifically assessed whether *learning agility*—as a distinct type of agility—serves as a more powerful driver for innovation via *job crafting*.

Therefore, this research aims to investigate the role of *learning agility* as a predictor of *innovative work behavior* and to examine the mediating role of *job crafting* in this relationship, particularly among employees who have worked for at least one year. This study is expected to offer valuable insights into developing *learning agility*, implementing *job crafting* strategies, and applying them in organizational contexts to enhance innovation. For employees, the findings may serve as guidance to improve adaptability, creativity, and performance in fast-changing work environments.

This research is expected to yield both practical and theoretical contributions. Practically, the findings provide actionable guidance for HR professionals and organizational leaders on fostering *innovative work behavior* through the cultivation of *learning agility* and strategic application of *job crafting*. These insights are particularly valuable in supporting workforce adaptability and creativity amid rapid industrial changes. Theoretically, the study enriches organizational behavior literature by validating the mediating role of *job crafting* in the relationship between *learning agility* and *innovative work behavior*, particularly across varied employee roles and industry sectors. The integration of these variables offers a robust framework for future research in workplace innovation and talent development.

METHOD

The approach used in this study is a *quantitative research* approach employing a *non-experimental* method. The independent variable in this research is *learning agility*, while the dependent variable is *innovative work behavior*. The sampling targets individuals who meet the criteria of being aged 18–58 years and are actively employed with a minimum of one year of work experience. Researchers collect data by utilizing the online questionnaire facility provided by Microsoft. This online questionnaire is distributed through social networks connected to the research participants.

Tabel 1. Demographic Information

Demographic Information	Total	Percentage(%)	
Age	19-24	61	38.61
	25-30	67	42.41
	31-38	16	10.13
	39-44	8	5.06
	45-58	6	3.80
Gender	Male	60	37.97
	Female	98	61.39
Education	SMA/SMK	9	5.70
	D1	1	0.63
	D3	5	3.16
	D4	1	0.63
	S1		80.38
		127	
	S2	14	8.86
Marital Status	Married	45	28.48
	Single	113	71.52
Years of work experience	1 year	11	6.96
	>1 – 5 years	31	19.62
	>5 – 10 years	80	50.63
	>10 years	36	22.78
Position in work	Director/Executive	19	12.03
	Manager/Supervisor	32	20.25
	Specialist	5	3.16
	Staff	102	64.56
Employment sector	Agriculture	4	2.53
	Services	35	22.15
	Finance & Insurance	20	12.66
	Construction	4	2.53
	Manufacturing	13	8.23
	Education	25	15.82
	Procurement	1	0.63
	Trade/Restaurant/Hotel	48	30.38
	Transportation & Logistics	8	5.06

Source: Researcher

The equipment used in this study includes a laptop and the *Microsoft Forms* application. The data analysis techniques employed consist of a validity test, reliability test, and classical assumption tests, including the normality test, multicollinearity test, and heteroscedasticity test.

Additionally, data analysis involves the use of multiple linear regression, the coefficient of determination, *t*-test, and *F*-test. Data processing in this study is conducted using the *IBM SPSS Statistics* 30.0 application and *PROCESS* v4.2 by Andrew F. Hayes.

The dependent variable, *innovative work behavior*, is measured using the *Innovative Work Behavior Scale* (IWBS). This instrument, developed by Jong and Den Hartog (2010), consists of 10 items across four dimensions: *idea exploration* (3 items), *idea generation* (2 items), *idea championing* (2 items), and *idea implementation* (3 items). Examples of items include: "I search for new methods, techniques, or instruments for my work"; "I think about how to improve myself regarding my job at the workplace"; "I convince other members to support my innovative ideas"; "I contribute fully to the implementation of new ideas in the company." The IWBS uses a scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 4 (*Always*), with a reliability score of $\alpha = .915$.

The measurement instrument for the *learning agility* variable uses the *Learning Agility Scale*, adapted and translated by Wardhani et al. (2022). This scale consists of 18 items across four dimensions: *people agility* (5 items), *results agility* (5 items), *mental agility* (4 items), and *change agility* (4 items). Sample items include: "If a problem-solving approach fails, I move to another one"; "I like to get feedback about my skills and competencies"; "If I don't know the answer to something, I feel comfortable asking"; "I can deliver great results even in changing circumstances." The *learning agility* scale also ranges from 1 (*Never*) to 4 (*Always*), with a reliability score of $\alpha = .844$.

The *Job Crafting Scale* (JCS), developed by Tims et al. (2012), comprises 21 items distributed across four dimensions: *increasing structural job resources* (5 items), *decreasing hindering job demands* (6 items), *increasing social job resources* (5 items), and *increasing challenging job demands* (5 items). Sample items include: "I try to develop my capabilities"; "I try to make sure that my work is not too emotionally exhausting"; "I ask colleagues for advice"; "When there is an interesting project, I proactively become a co-worker." The JCS employs a 4-point *Likert* scale, ranging from 1 (*Very Rarely*) to 4 (*Very Often*). The internal consistency of the scale is high, with Cronbach's alpha (α) = .95.

Data were collected by distributing questionnaires via social networks associated with the study participants. The data analysis techniques used included validity tests, reliability tests, classical assumption tests, and regression analyses. Data processing was carried out using the *IBM SPSS Statistics* 30.0 application.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the table above, it can be seen that the results of the correlation test between dimensions and constructs indicate that the measurement tools for Learning Agility, Innovative Work Behavior, and Job Crafting demonstrate good reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values of $\alpha = .897$ for the Learning Agility Scale, $\alpha = .847$ for the Innovative Work Behavior Scale, and $\alpha = .873$ for the Job Crafting Scale. These Cronbach's alpha values are considered good, as they exceed .6, which is the minimum reliability threshold according to Hulin, Netemeyer, and Cudeck (2001). The researcher also examined the reliability of each dimension within the measurement tools. For the Learning Agility Scale, the reliability values were $\alpha = .655$ for People Agility, $\alpha = .698$ for Results Agility, $\alpha = .695$ for Mental Agility, and $\alpha = .776$ for

Change Agility. For the Innovative Work Behavior Scale, the reliability values were $\alpha = .728$ for Idea Exploration, $\alpha = .369$ for Idea Generation, $\alpha = .764$ for Idea Championing, and $\alpha = .752$ for Idea Implementation. Lastly, for the Job Crafting Scale, the reliability values were $\alpha = .702$ for Increasing Structural Job Resources, $\alpha = .804$ for Increasing Challenging Job Demands, $\alpha = .817$ for Increasing Social Job Resources, and $\alpha = .817$ for Decreasing Hindering Job Demands.

In addition to reliability, the researcher also examined the correlation results between the dimensions of the variables in this study. The correlations between the dimensions of the learning agility variable ranged from the lowest, .301–.538, in the people agility dimension, to the highest, .530–.666, in the change agility dimension. For the innovative work behavior variable, the lowest correlation was found in the idea exploration dimension, ranging from .304–.623, while the highest was in the idea implementation dimension, ranging from .556–.635. Meanwhile, for the job crafting variable, the lowest correlation appeared in the increasing structural job resources dimension, ranging from .247–.605, and the highest in the increasing challenging job demands dimension, ranging from .522–.709.

Table 2. Descriptives Analysis

	Items	N	Min	Max	M	M (Scale 1- 4)	Standard Deviation
<i>Learning Agility</i>	18	158	42	72	58.82	3.27	7.09
<i>Innovative Work Behavior</i>	10	158	20	40	32.39	3.24	4.32
<i>Job Crafting</i>	21	158	41	84	64.85	3.09	8.91

Source: Researcher

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the Learning Agility variable was measured using 18 items. The maximum score obtained was 72, and the minimum was 42. Learning Agility had a mean score of M (Scale 1–4) = 3.27 and a standard deviation of $SD = 7.09$. The Innovative Work Behavior variable was measured using 10 items, with a maximum score of 40 and a minimum of 20. This variable had a mean of M (Scale 1–4) = 3.24 and a standard deviation of $SD = 4.32$. The Job Crafting variable was measured using 21 items, with a maximum score of 84 and a minimum of 41. It had a mean score of M (Scale 1–4) = 3.09 and a standard deviation of $SD = 8.91$. These results indicate that the higher the score for learning agility, the higher the individual's tendency to engage in job crafting, which in turn can lead to innovative work behavior.

Classical assumption testing was conducted before performing the simple linear regression analysis for the research hypothesis.

Table 3. Results of Normality Test

Variable	Normality	Status
Learning Agility	.003	Not Normal
Job Crafting	.001	Not Normal
Innovative Work Behavior	.200	Normal

Source: Researcher

The normality test was conducted using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov method. The results of the normality test showed that the constructs of learning agility and innovative work behavior were not normally distributed, while the job crafting construct was normally distributed.

The researcher performed a correlation analysis using the Spearman’s correlation method to examine the relationship between the Learning Agility, Job Crafting, and Innovative Work Behavior variables.

Table 4. Results of Correlation Test Between Learning Agility, Job Crafting, and Innovative Work Behavior

		Spearman’s Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Correlation Between Learning Agility and Innovative Work Behavior	Learning Work	.753**	.000	158
Correlation Between Learning Agility and Job Crafting	Learning	.734**	.000	158
Correlation Between Job Crafting and Innovative Work Behavior	Job Crafting	.611**	.000	158

Source: Researcher

Based on the results of the correlation test, the correlation coefficient between learning agility and innovative work behavior was $r(158) = .753, p = .000; p < 0.05$. This result indicates a strong and significant positive relationship between the two variables. The correlation coefficient between learning agility and job crafting was $r(158) = .734, p = .000; p < 0.05$, indicating a strong and significant positive relationship as well. The correlation coefficient between innovative work behavior and job crafting was $r(158) = .611, p = .000; p < 0.05$, also showing a strong and significant positive relationship between the two variables. These results suggest that the higher an individual's learning agility, the greater their tendency to engage in job crafting, which in turn leads to higher levels of innovative work behavior.

The researcher conducted a PROCESS Model 4 test to perform a mediation analysis. The following are the results of the mediation test:

Table 5. Results of Direct Mediation Effect Test of Learning Agility and Innovative Work Behavior

Model	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-statistics	p-value	R squared
(constant)	4.5981	1.9117	2.4052	.0173	
Learning Agility	.3862	.0481	8.0309	.0000	.5695
Job Crafting	.0783	.0383	2.0449	.0426	.5808

Source: Researcher

The results of the direct effect test show that learning agility significantly influences innovative work behavior ($\beta = 0.3862, t = 8.0309, p = .0000; p < .05$). In addition, the results of the mediation test indicate that the path from job crafting to innovative work behavior is significant ($\beta = 0.0783, t = 2.0449, p = .0426; p < .05$).

Tabel 6. Results of Mediation Test of Learning Agility and Job Crafting

Model	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-statistics	p-value	R squared
(constant)	9.2642	3.9302	2.3623	.0194	.5652
Learning Agility	.9447	.0662	14.2393	.0000	

Source: Researcher

The results of the mediation test show that the mediation path from learning agility to job crafting is significant ($\beta = 0.9447$, $t = 14.2393$, $p = .0000$; $p < .05$).

Tabel 7. Results of Total Mediation Effect of Learning Agility and Innovative Work Behavior

Model	Coefficient	Standard Error	t-statistics	p-value
(constant)	5.3247	1.8975	2.8062	.0057
Learning Agility	.4601	.0320	14.3643	.0000

Source: Researcher

The results of the total effect test show that the sum of the direct and indirect effects is 0.4601.

Tabel 8. Summary of Mediation Analysis

Model	Total Effect	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Conclusion
Learning Agility Job Crafting Innovative Work Behavior	>.4601	.3862	.0739	Partial Mediation

Source: Researcher

The results of the mediation test show that the value of c' (the effect of learning agility on innovative work behavior with job crafting as a mediator) is 0.0739, while the total effect (c) is 0.4601. Based on these results, since the value of c' is smaller than the value of c , it can be concluded that job crafting mediates the relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior.

Discussion

In the testing of the first hypothesis, it was concluded that learning agility has a positive and significant influence ($\beta = 0.3862$, $t = 8.0309$, $p = .0000$; $p < .05$), with an effect size of 56.95% on innovative work behavior. This finding aligns with previous research by Nathaniel and Dewi (2024), which stated that learning agility is a predictor of innovative work behavior. Employees are a crucial factor in determining a company's growth and success. Companies need high-quality employees to remain competitive in a dynamic and demanding labor market. Employees must possess strong learning agility to learn from experience and quickly adapt to new, even complex, situations.

The first hypothesis was accepted. The ability to cope with change and uncertainty at work involves a willingness to try new approaches that can spark innovation. Individuals with high learning agility tend to continuously learn and grow, making them more capable of

generating relevant and innovative ideas (Milani et al., 2021). Innovation often requires experimenting with new methods, which involves taking risks. These experiments can lead to various problems that require creative problem-solving. Through this process of problem-solving and decision-making, individuals are able to evaluate multiple alternatives and choose the most appropriate solution to achieve optimal outcomes. People with high learning agility typically have open minds and appreciate diverse perspectives, including others' ideas, which enables them to build mutually beneficial relationships such as collaborations that result in greater innovation.

Unlike previous studies that focused on working students, this research examined actively employed individuals. A notable finding is that employees with positions such as Director, Manager, or Specialist demonstrated higher levels of learning agility, and therefore higher innovative work behavior, compared to those in Staff positions. This may be due to the greater strategic decision-making responsibilities, involvement in key processes, and broader work experience held by participants in higher-ranking positions (Surya & Yuniasanti, 2023).

In the testing of the second hypothesis, the results showed that learning agility has a positive and significant influence on job crafting ($\beta = 0.9447$, $t = 14.2393$, $p = .0000$; $p < .05$), with an effect size of 56.52%. This supports the view of Gravett and Caldwell (2016), who argued that the higher an employee's learning agility, the more actively they engage in experiential learning and apply that learning to succeed in new and changing conditions. This application may involve redesigning their jobs by increasing structural resources, reducing hindering demands, enhancing social relationships, and boosting challenging demands—all of which are aspects of job crafting (Tims et al., 2012).

Individuals with high learning agility are more capable of engaging in job crafting and fulfilling its various aspects. This is because they are better at adapting to dynamic environments and tend to have a mindset that is open to trying new approaches (Mitchinson & Morris, 2012), which supports their ability to enhance resources and maintain high levels of autonomy at work (Baron, 2022). As a result, they are able to reduce work demands, improve interpersonal relationships (Wardhani et al., 2022), and strengthen social connections. They also tend to view problems from different perspectives and treat them as challenges (Choi & Jeon, 2024). Individuals with high learning agility are better prepared to face job uncertainty and even redesign their roles to fulfill their responsibilities more effectively.

In the third hypothesis test, the results showed that job crafting has a positive and significant influence on innovative work behavior ($\beta = 0.0783$, $t = 2.0449$, $p = .0426$; $p < .05$), with an effect size of 58.08%. Previous research by Panda et al. (2024) also found that engaging in job crafting fosters autonomy, which can lead to more innovative work behavior. The findings of this study are consistent with previous research.

Job crafting and innovative work behavior share a common focus: both emphasize the individual's efforts to align their work with personal values, motivation, abilities, and skills (Wibisono, 2022). This encourages individuals to innovate and generate new solutions, allowing them to perform better. Job crafting enables individuals to feel a sense of ownership and control over their work, boosts engagement, and enhances creativity and innovation, leading to more effective and efficient work processes. It also increases motivation to tackle challenges. Individuals who apply job crafting strategies tend to have more meaningful work

experiences, greater opportunities for growth, and contribute more to innovative behavior at work.

In the fourth hypothesis test, the c' value (effect of learning agility on innovative work behavior with job crafting as a mediator) was 0.0739, and the total effect (c) was 0.4601, indicating that job crafting positively mediates the relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior. This is in line with Liu et al. (2021), who argued that job crafting is a process for managing resources, including learning agility. Individuals with high learning agility are more likely to engage in job crafting. The mediating effect of job crafting shows that individuals with high learning agility are more willing and capable of learning from experience and applying that learning to succeed in new work conditions. Their success fosters autonomy at work, which in turn promotes innovative behavior. Moreover, because job crafting is a bottom-up process, employees can initiate it independently without needing action from the organization (Amran et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that *learning agility* significantly predicts *innovative work behavior*, both directly and indirectly through the mediating role of *job crafting*. Learning agility also positively influences job crafting, which in turn enhances innovative work behavior. These findings highlight the importance of developing employee competencies related to agility and proactive job design as effective strategies to foster workplace innovation. Practically, the study offers valuable insights for organizations to implement capacity-building programs that cultivate learning agility and job crafting, supporting employees in adapting to dynamic environments and improving productivity. Theoretically, the research contributes to the growing literature on behavioral predictors of innovation in the workplace. However, the study's limitation lies in the diverse and uneven distribution of participants across organizational and cultural backgrounds, which may affect generalizability. Future research is encouraged to control for and examine contextual variables—such as organizational culture or industry type—to better understand how these factors influence the relationship between learning agility, job crafting, and innovative work behavior.

REFERENCES

- Amran, M., Zamralita, Z., & Lie, D. (2022, April). The impact of job crafting towards performance with work engagement as a mediator among high school teachers in South Tangerang, Indonesia. In *3rd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2021)* (pp. 1651-1656). Atlantis Press.
- Aprilinda, L., & Sahrah, A. (2022). Pelatihan Job Crafting Sebagai Solusi Meningkatkan Keterikatan Kerja Karyawan Perusahaan Finansial Teknologi. *Psikostudia: Jurnal Psikologi*, *11*(3), 500-508.
- Augustin, R. A., Zamralita, Z., & Saraswati, K. D. (2022, April). The Mediating Role of Burnout on Job Insecurity and Turnover Intention among Automotive Sales Force in Jakarta. In *3rd Tarumanagara International Conference on the Applications of Social Sciences and Humanities (TICASH 2021)* (pp. 1573-1578). Atlantis Press.

- Bakker, D., Kazantzis, N., Rickwood, D., & Rickard, N. (2016). Mental health smartphone apps: review and evidence-based recommendations for future developments. *JMIR mental health*, 3(1), e4984.
- Choi, S. W., & Jeon, K. S. (2024). Relationship between job challenge and job performance in the Korean Army: The mediating effect of learning agility and the moderating effect of job autonomy. *Military Psychology*, 1-13.
- Danudoro, K., Zamralita, Z., & Lie, D. (2021, August). The Effect of job demands on burnout with job resources as a moderator among external auditors. In *International Conference on Economics, Business, Social, and Humanities (ICEBSH 2021)*(pp. 1138-1143). Atlantis Press.
- De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and innovation management*, 19(1), 23-36.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., & Halbesleben, J. R. (2015). Productive and counterproductive job crafting: A daily diary study. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 20(4), 457.
- Enervon. (2020). Berikut ini ciri- ciri karyawan yang berkualitas di kantor [Halaman web]. Diakses dari <https://www.enervon.co.id/article/698/berikut-ini-ciri-ciri-tenaga-kerja-yang-berkualitas-di-kantor>
- Fulmer, I. S., & Ployhart, R. E. (2014). “Our Most Important Asset” a multidisciplinary/multilevel review of human capital valuation for research and practice. *Journal of management*, 40(1), 161-192.
- Wibisono, S. G. (2022). Pengaruh Ketidakpuasan Karir Terhadap Job Crafting Dengan Dukungan Sosial Dan Self Efficacy Sebagai Variabel Moderator. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Teknologi*, 3(6), 621–637. <https://doi.org/10.59141/jist.v3i06.438>.
- Gopay. (2024). Kenapa inovasi bisnis itu penting? Ini 4 alasan utamanya! [Halaman web]. Diakses dari <https://gopay.co.id/blog/inovasi-bisnis>
- Gravett, L. S., Caldwell, S. A., Gravett, L. S., & Caldwell, S. A. (2016). *What is learning agility?* (pp. 1-8). Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Haropis, Y. F., & Zamralita, Z. (2023). Studi Pada Karyawan Teknologi Informasi: Persepsi Dukungan Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Individual Dengan Keterikatan Kerja Sebagai Mediator. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, Dan Seni*, 7(3), 500-510.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900167038>.
- Jo Y and Hong AJ. (2022). Impact of agile learning on innovative behavior: A moderated mediation model of employee engagement and perceived organizational support. *Front. Psychol.* 13:900830. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.900830.
- Lestari W, Zamralita Z. 2017. Gambaran tuntutan pekerjaan (job demands) dan dukungan pekerjaan (job resources) pada pegawai institusi X DKI Jakarta. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora dan Seni*. 2017;1(2). <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmishumsen.v1i2.983>
- Liu, L., Wan, W., & Fan, Q. (2021). How and when telework improves job performance during COVID-19? Job crafting as mediator and performance goal orientation as moderator. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 14, Article 2181-2195.
- Mahfuds, I., & Yuliana, R. (2022). Analysis of determinants of labor productivity in Indonesia 2015-2020. *Seminar Nasional Official Statistics*, 2022(1), 1219-1228. <https://doi.org/10.34123/semnasoffstat.v2022i1.1444>.
- Milani, R., Setti, I., & Argentero, P. (2021). Learning agility and talent management: A systematic review and future prospects. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 73(4), 349–371. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000209>
- Mitchinson, A., & Morris, R. (2012). Learning about learning agility. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266852352>

- Nathaniel, J., & Dewi, Y. E. P. (2024). Innovative work behavior: The role of job crafting and job autonomy mediated by work engagement. *Petra International Journal of Business Studies*, 7(1), 57-65.
- Panda, Prerna & Singh, Pankaj. (2024). Resilient and agile employees' pursuit of innovative performance and well-being: the role of job crafting. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*. 10.1108/GKMC-11-2023-0450.
- Peng, Changyi. (2018). A literature review of job crafting and its related researches. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*. 06. 1-7. 10.4236/jhrss.2018.61022.
- Riansyah, R., & Syaroni, D.A. (2017). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kreatifitas dan inovasi serta implikasinya terhadap kinerja karyawan pada konsultan perencanaan dan pengawasan arsitektur di Kota Serang, Provinsi Banten.
- Sanjaya, M. Z. A., Kurniawan, I. S., & Kusuma, N. T. . (2024). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja, innovative work behavior, dan dukungan rekan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai dinas perhubungan Bantul: Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Terapan Dan Keuangan*, 13(03), 783–792. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jmk.v13i03.32421>.
- Setya, Devi. (2022). Jarang dilirik perusahaan, pakar Unair beberkan kendala fresh graduate [Halaman web]. Diakses dari <https://www.detik.com/edu/edutainment/d-6296038/jarang-dilirik-perusahaan-pakar-unair-beberkan-kendala-fresh-graduate>.
- Sharma, Anupama & Nambudiri, Ranjeet. (2020). Work engagement, job crafting and innovativeness in the Indian IT industry. *Personnel Review*. ahead-of-print. 10.1108/PR-11-2019-0607.
- Tims, M. and Bakker, A.B. (2010) Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v36i2.841>.
- Vinesian, Gresika & Sari, Reza. (2023). Pengaruh growth mindset dan resiliensi terhadap learning agility pada karyawan startup company. *Buletin Riset Psikologi dan Kesehatan Mental (BRPKM)*. 3. 92-102. 10.20473/brpkm.v3i1.49093.
- Violi, Laurens & Rostiana. (2025). Peran Learning Agility Terhadap Keterikatan Kerja Karyawan Generasi Z Dengan Job Crafting Sebagai Mediator. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ)*, 5(2), 6154–6165. <https://doi.org/10.37385/msej.v5i2.6891>.
- Wardhani, Nurnaifah & Sulastiana, Marina & Sulistiobudi, Rezki. (2022). Adaptasi alat ukur learning agility pada karyawan untuk meningkatkan organizational agility: Versi Bahasa Indonesia. *Psikologika: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Psikologi*. 27. 243-264. 10.20885/psikologika.vol27.iss2.art4.
- Zamralita Z, Wilis APL. 2023. Workplace well-being untuk meningkatkan work engagement karyawan. *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Ekonomi dan Bisnis*. 2023;7(2). <https://doi.org/10.24912/jmieb.v7i2.26050>
- Zamralita Z, Winata R. The role of psychological capital to job performance with work engagement as mediator of employee. *Jurnal of Educational, Health, and Community Psychology*. 2024;13(3).