



DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF INTEGRATED DYNAMIC JOB CRAFTING AGILITY MEASUREMENT SCALE (IDJCA-MS)



Chijioke NWACHUKWU

Horizons University France
Global Centre for Strategic Supply Chain and
Operations Management Ltd UK
Email: cesogwa@yahoo.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7982-2810

Received: July 22, 2026

Accepted: August 23, 2026

Online Published: September 10, 2026

ABSTRACT

To better understand job crafting in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environment, this study developed and tested a 27-item measure, the Integrated Dynamic Job Crafting Agility Measurement Scale (IDJCA-MS). The study presents a new scale that integrates job crafting with the continuous, responsive aspect of agility, while also incorporating individual characteristics, contextual resources, and environmental demands. A rigorous, multi-stage technique based on literature construct integration and a quantitative approach is employed to develop the IDJCA-MS. The author establishes reliability and psychometric properties, analyses discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity of IDJCA-MS. The study used proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and environmental turbulence to develop a new job-crafting agility scale that predicted job performance in a volatile, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous environment. This paper makes a novel contribution by proposing IDJCA-MS, a multidimensional job crafting agility scale.

Keywords: Dynamic capability, contextual resources, environmental turbulence, job crafting agility, proactive motivation

JEL classification: M12, M50, D23, J24, J28

Paper type: Research article

Citation: Nwachukwu, Ch. (2026). Development and validation of integrated dynamic job crafting agility measurement scale (IDJCA-MS). *Bulgarian Journal of Business Research*, 37(2), 222-243, DOI: 10.46656/bposoki.2026.37.2(7)



INTRODUCTION

Organisations operate in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environment which calls for modification of strategies, structure and processes to maintain operational performance and employee well-being (Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Technological advancements, globalisation, digitalisation, and shifting organisational structures have disrupted traditional job roles and expectations, demanding new levels of adaptability from the workforce (Puaschunder et al., 2020; Roczniowska et al., 2023). As such, job crafting agility is a potential intervention that can enhance performance and motivation. According to Wrzesniewski and Dutton (2001), "job crafting involves employees' proactive modification of their tasks, relationships, or mental views to better match personal strengths, values, or interests." The construct of job crafting has been widely examined over the past two decades. Yet existing models tend to view crafting as a static behaviour, often disconnected from the dynamic realities of contemporary work environments (Demerouti, 2014; Tims & Bakker, 2010; Kooij et al., 2017). These approaches ignore the real-time, continuous modifications employees must undertake to align with rapidly changing organisational demands, technological changes, and employees' expectations (Dhanpat, 2025). Dhanpat (2025), introducing the construct of job crafting agility, argues that JCA is employees' capacity to proactively modify their jobs to better align with changing organisational demands. Previous job crafting scales (e.g., Petrou et al., 2012; Slep & Vella-Brodrick, 2013) align with foundational job crafting literature (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), but consider a limited number of job crafting behaviours (Niessen et al., 2016). The recent Job Crafting Scale (BJCS) proposed by Vanbelle et al. (2023) focused on self-initiated changes made by employees to optimise their functioning. Together, these measures ignored the multidimensional nature of job crafting in volatile, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous environments. Moreover, this study responds to the call by Dhanpat (2025) for a scale that effectively captures job crafting agility. To the best of our knowledge, no measurement scale describes how employees enact agile, continuous job crafting to address evolving organisational demand. To overcome this problem, author developed and validated an integrated dynamic job crafting agility measurement scale (IDJCA-MS). The scale captures the multifaceted nature of job crafting agility, including proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, environmental turbulence, and job performance, particularly in times of digital transformation, hybrid work, and market uncertainty.

The objective of this study is to develop a contextually relevant and psychometrically sound measurement scale. Author followed five phases to develop the IDJCA-MS and ensured its reliability and validity. In light of (Nwachukwu, n.d) integrated dynamic job crafting agility theory (IDJCA-T), author propose a multidimensional scale; proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and responsiveness to environmental turbulence. The IDJCA-MS is an instrument designed to assess key components of job crafting agility using a 7-point Likert scale. This instrument helps to operationalise the IDJCA theory. By

capturing personal agency, environmental influences, and contextual resources, the IDJCA-MS provides researchers and practitioners with a practical tool to evaluate and foster adaptive work behaviour in dynamic settings. This paper makes a significant contribution to human resource management and organisational behaviour scholarship by developing a measurement scale that is useful for organisations that are interested in building resilient, flexible and engaged workforce. By assessing employees' adaptive crafting capacity, HR professionals, managers, and change agents can create interventions such as agile behaviour and leadership training focused on autonomy-supportive practice, or structural change to better provide access to contextual resources.

Job Crafting Agility

Job crafting agility draws on the construct of job crafting which emphasises task, relational, and cognitive adjustments individuals make to align work with their strengths and interests (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013). While traditional job crafting is mainly concerned with enhancing individual outcomes like job satisfaction (De Beer et al., 2016), well-being (Hakanen et al., 2018), and meaningful work (Dhanpat et al., 2019), job crafting agility focuses on continuous, adaptive behaviour in response to changing organisational demands (Dhanpat, 2025). It reflects individuals' proactive reconstruction of their work activities, relationships, and practices in real-time, making it appropriate for contexts characterised by volatility (e.g., remote work, hybrid teams, and digital transformation) (Ulrich & Yeung, 2019). Job crafting agility is all about responsiveness to change, flexibility, and continuous learning (Tims et al., 2022; van den Heuvel et al., 2015). It requires employees to experiment with new approaches and strategies, moving beyond typical role adjustments to innovate and evolve their job functions (Dhanpat, 2025). This adaptability distinguishes it from other forms of job crafting that are often goal-specific or depend on existing competencies (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014). Job crafting agility is connected to organisational agility, allowing organisations to remain competitive and responsive (Dhanpat, 2025).

Proposed Measurement Scale- Integrated Dynamic Job Crafting Agility IDJCA-T

The integrated dynamic job crafting agility IDJCA-T theory conceptualises job crafting as a dynamic, multidimensional construct influenced by personal motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and environmental turbulence (Nwachukwu, n.d). To test this theory, the author developed a robust measurement scale that reflects IDJCA-T's distinct and interconnected components. The proposed IDJCA-MS evaluates the four pillars of the IDJCA-T (proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and environmental turbulence) as well as the job performance outcome variable.

Scale Development Process

We employed a rigorous technique proposed by DeVellis (2016) and Hinkin (1998), which included item generation, expert validation, pilot testing, factor analysis, reliability, and validity assessments. To ensure



practical relevance and face validity, items were adapted from previously validated scales, theoretical constructs from the literature, and surveys administered to professionals and scholars in various industries; technology, healthcare, education, retail and finance in selected countries in Africa, Europe and Asia.

Construct Dimensions and Sample Items

Proactive motivation (PM)- captures the innate drive and self-confidence of an individual to generate and sustain job crafting behaviour. The author adapts the proactive personality scale (Bateman & Crant, 1993) and intrinsic motivation inventory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) for proactive motivation measures. The grounds for selecting these measures were solid theoretical fit, psychometric characteristics, and appropriateness for contemporary work contexts, where initiative, self-direction, and autonomy are valued. The Proactive Personality Scale (PPS) assesses consistent dispositional inclination to bring about a change in one's environment. PPS measures can identify individuals who have a high rating on proactive personality and can recognise opportunities, initiate, and persevere until substantial changes are made. Given the importance of proactive role redefinition to IDJCA theory, PPS provides a direct measure of the core underlying characteristic. Accordingly, research has linked proactive personality with career success, leadership emergence, and creative work behaviour, and therefore, it is an efficient measure that firms seeking to develop agility and self-learning among employees use. Intrinsic motivation inventory (IMI) measures whether people engage in activities for satisfaction instead of external benefits. These qualities are important in remote or hybrid work environments, where intrinsic motivation drives engagement and perseverance when direct supervision is lacking. IMI inclusion in the scale supports the notion that proactive job crafting is motivated by personality attributes and the desire for competence, autonomy, and relatedness as advocated by self-determination theory. These instruments are robust and consistent with both academic rigour and real-world application for analysing proactive motivation in the context of IDJCA-T. Sample items include: "I actively look for new ways to improve how I do my job.", "I feel confident that I can modify my tasks to suit my strengths." "I craft my job roles to align with my values and interests."

Dynamic Capabilities (DC): demonstrates an employee's ability to adapt and learn in response to changing job demands. Dynamic capabilities sub-dimensions are learning agility (DeRue & Ashford, 2010), resilience (Luthans et al., 2007), and adaptability (Pulakos et al., 2000). For dynamic capabilities measures, the learning agility index and psychological capital questionnaire (Luthans et al., 2007) were adapted. These measures are conceptually fit, empirically solid, and relevant to contemporary work environments. Learning agility construct is consistent with the dynamic, fast-changing environments that the IDJCA theory addresses. The learning agility index (LAI) focuses on important areas such as mental flexibility, adaptability, self-reflection, and experimentation, which are relevant for job crafting in volatile environments, especially where technology and organisational demands change quickly. The Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ) emphasises four



important psychological resources such as resilience, hope, efficacy, and optimism. In the context of the IDJCA theory, psychological capital supports employees' ability to stay engaged, solution-focused, and seek mastery when faced with uncertainty or when restructuring their roles. This measure is widely used, psychometrically tested, and consistent with positive organisational behaviour literature. Both instruments are appropriate for remote, hybrid, and physical work models, making them relevant in today's flexible organisational structures. LAI and PCQ reflect observable behaviours such as initiative-taking, coping with change, and maintaining performance under stress; behaviours typically reported by HR experts and managers as indicators. Arguably, these instruments ensure conceptual clarity, measurement reliability, and comparability. LAI and PCQ provide a theoretically grounded and empirically supported tool for assessing the dynamic capabilities that underpin the IDJCA theory. The sample items include "I quickly adjust to changes in work priorities or strategies", "I recover easily from setbacks in my job," and "I apply new knowledge to change how I approach my tasks."

Contextual Resources (CR): Captures perceptions of job resources and social support that facilitate crafting behaviours. Contextual resources measures are based on Job Demands-Resources Questionnaire JD-RQ (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and Relational Crafting Scale RCS (Leana et al., 2009). JD-RQ is widely acknowledged for measuring the availability of structural job resources such as autonomy, performance feedback, and growth opportunities. These aspects are important for understanding how contextual factors support or hinder employee job crafting. RCS assesses how employees proactively change their interactions and networks to improve effectiveness (Leana et al., 2009; Morrison, 1994). Accordingly, social support and interpersonal flexibility are important contextual components in job crafting, particularly in hybrid and remote contexts, where relational dynamics are less visible and more flexible (Tims et al., 2013). This instrument gives valuable insights into the relational dimensions of contextual resources. The choice of JD-RQ and RCS is informed by their robust theoretical alignment with the IDJCA theory, established empirical validity, and practical relevance in diverse work environments. Sample items include: "My supervisor gives me the freedom to experiment with how I do my job", "I receive constructive feedback that helps me redefine my role," and "I rely on my colleagues when I want to try new approaches to my work."

Environmental Turbulence (ET): Assesses the degree of unpredictability and change in the external work environment. The sub-dimensions of ET are role ambiguity (Meyer et al., 2009), industry volatility (Grant & Parker, 2009), and complexity and uncertainty (Anderson, 1999). The situational strength scales (Meyer et al., 2009; Schäpers et al., 2020) were modified to assess ambiguity, job role clarity, and behavioural expectations, which are important characteristics of turbulent work settings. SSS provides a robust psychometric foundation for measuring perceived changes and pressure in employee decision-making contexts. Furthermore, the foundational works of Miller and Friesen (1983) and Jansen et al. (2006) were used to assess macro-level environmental dynamism, such as changes in market demand, competitive intensity, and technological change,



which are particularly important in today's fast-paced workplaces. Grant and Parker (2009) provided insights into how role redefinition and uncertainty management influence employee behaviour in changing work environments. Integrating these sources ensures that the ET dimension incorporates both internal (role ambiguity, situational cues) and external (market and technological volatility) job crafting enablers, therefore increasing the theoretical robustness and practical relevance of the IDJCA theory. The sample items include: "The requirements of my job often change without notice", "I work in an industry where customer needs change rapidly", and "I often deal with unclear expectations from my role or organisation." The adapted items were reviewed by experts for content validity. Pilot testing was conducted before the main data collection to ensure clarity and reliability within the specific research context. The sample items include: "I frequently adjust my job tasks to align with changing priorities", "I proactively redefine my job role to stay relevant in a dynamic environment," and "I engage in ongoing experimentation to improve how I do my job."

The IDJCA-MS is based on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree). A 7-point Likert scale is a methodologically sound choice that improves the instrument's precision, sensitivity, and usability. This scale enables respondents to express more nuanced levels of agreement or disagreement; therefore, it is appropriately suited to quantify complex, subjective constructs such as proactive motivation, dynamic capability, and environmental turbulence. Prior studies suggest that 7-point scales are better than more limited options such as 5-point scales on reliability and validity (Preston & Colman, 2000), and they present a not-too-demanding cognitive burden for respondents (Finstad, 2010). Furthermore, its capacity to engage with established instruments such as the psychological capital questionnaire (Luthans et al., 2007) and the job demands-resources questionnaire (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) ensures ease of scale development, consistency, and simplicity of integration into larger HRM practices. Importantly, the 7-point approach minimises central tendency bias, reflects small differences in behavioural and motivational traits, and accommodates both self-reflective assessment and organisational research needs. Thus, the scale type makes a considerable contribution to the IDJCA-MS's theoretical and practical rigour.

Job Performance: The individual work performance questionnaire (IWPQ) developed by Koopmans et al. (2013) was adapted to assess job performance. This scale is a well-established and psychometrically validated tool that evaluates individual job performance across three domains: task, contextual, and counterproductive work behaviour. Five items were selected and modified in line with the specific organisational and cultural context of the target population, emphasising task and contextual performance. The items were clearly worded using a seven-point Likert scale. Sample of adapted questions include: "I demonstrate initiative in solving work-related problems" and "I manage my time well and stay productive throughout the workday." This adaptation ensures relevance and is consistent with the original construct definitions and measurement integrity of the IWPQ.

Validation Strategy

This strategy combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies, using established psychometric criteria and current best practices in organisational research (DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021; Hair et al., 2021).

Procedure and participants

Data on the IDJCA-MS were collected using an online survey. Participants were invited to take part in the survey via a link sent to their email and professional social networks platforms (LinkedIn). The questionnaire was in English and available online throughout the month of May 2025. The participants were conveniently and purposively selected from technology, healthcare, manufacturing, education, retail, and finance sectors across selected countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and South America. Only participants from Africa, Asia, and Europe returned the questionnaires. In total, 398 employees participated in the study. More than half of the respondents indicated that they have not engaged in job crafting interventions or training (54.1%). 45.9% of respondents have been involved in job crafting interventions or training. The results highlight valuable information on employees' current familiarity with job crafting concepts. From a scale development perspective, this diversity in prior training ensures comparison between those who have been trained and those without job crafting training, enabling validation of the scale across different levels of familiarity. Respondents worked in education (24.1%), finance (16.2%), healthcare (10.8%), retail (18.1%), manufacturing 12.7% and technology (18.1%). This diverse industry distribution offers a robust foundation for developing IDJCA-MS that is relevant across different organisations and occupations. This distribution across industries ensures that IDJCA-MS reflects the nuanced ways of practising job crafting agility in both flexible and highly regulated contexts. For age distribution, the majority of participants fall within 31–40 (36.8%), 41–50 (28.9%), 21–30 (18.4%), and 51–60 (15.8%). This diverse age distribution supports a well-rounded development of the IDJCA-MS by integrating perspectives from across employees' career lifespans. In terms of education level, 34.2% of respondents possess doctorate degrees, 36.8% master's degrees, 23.7% bachelor's degrees, 2.6% associate degrees, and 2.6% hold a high school certificate. This distribution demonstrates that IDJCA-MS is mainly informed by highly skilled and knowledgeable employees who are working in organisations that provide more autonomy, cognitive complexity, and job crafting opportunities. The significant presence of respondents with advanced degrees (doctorate and master's) indicates that the IDJCA-MS items may reflect a conceptual or cognitive understanding of job crafting, awareness of organisational structures, and self-directed job design. Further, the presence of bachelor's, associate, and high school certificate holders ensures that IDJCA-MS development accommodates less academically qualified employees. The average work experience of the respondents is 10.58 (Standard Deviation, 7.36) years. 44 % of participants work in Africa, 36% in Europe, and 24% in Asia.

Content Validity

To ensure content validity, we subjected the scale to expert review by scholars and practitioners in industrial/organisational psychology and HRM. The panel consists of four scholars and five practitioners. Initially, the authors constructed a pool of 30 items to capture all four pillars of IDJCA-T. They evaluated 30 items for clarity, relevance, and alignment with their intended construct. This ensured that the scale captures the core dimensions of IDJCA-T and demonstrates real-world workplace dynamics, such as hybrid work environments and the impact of technology (MacKenzie et al., 2011). All 30 items were answered using a 7-point Likert scale. To examine whether the newly constructed scale aligned with the four pillars of IDJCA-T, the author analysed the factor structure and reliability of the scale.

Pilot Study and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

We conducted a pilot study using a purposive sample of 60 employees selected from technology, healthcare, manufacturing, education, retail, and finance sectors across selected countries in Africa, Asia, and Europe. Conducting a pilot study is important in new scale development and assists researchers in evaluating internal consistency. The selected sample of 60 participants is consistent with previous research (e.g., Johanson & Brooks, 2010; Hertzog, 2008). 60 participants were selected due to time and resource constraints. A pilot test is useful in providing insights into how to improve the final version of the scale. (Van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2001). The pilot test revealed that some items were poorly worded, which resulted in inconsistent responses and measurement errors. Consequently, these items were revised to ensure clarity and consistent understanding across respondents. The preliminary reliability testing using composite reliability (ρ_c) showed that a few items did not meet the recommended threshold. This led to the revision of items that negatively impacted reliability. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to examine the underlying factor structures of IDJCA-MS. EFA provides a robust statistical tool for simplifying items, minimising redundancies, and clarifying latent variables within each construct (Fabrigar et al., 1999). The inclusion of various industries adds to the scale generalisability and practical use across industries. A sample of 430 participants was used for exploratory factor analysis. Only 398 participants returned the questionnaire. Presented in Table 1 are the factor loading results. Although loadings ≥ 0.70 are considered strong indicators of a construct, values as low as 0.40–0.60 may be acceptable in exploratory or early-stage studies (Hair et al., 2019). Based on the exploratory nature of this study, which is to develop a scale for testing job crafting agility, only item loadings below 0.40 are removed (see Table 1). Therefore, DCLA 2, PM 2, and PM 5 were removed from the final scale.

Table 1. Items, loading and decision

Items	Loading	Decision
CRJR 1. My supervisor gives me the autonomy to decide how to approach my work tasks.	0.706	Retained
CRJR 2. I receive frequent feedback from my supervisor that helps me improve my job performance.	0.693	Retained
CRJR 3. I am provided with adequate resources (e.g., tools, time) to perform my tasks effectively.	0.867	Retained
CROF1. My organisation encourages employees to suggest changes to improve their job roles.	0.858	Retained



CROF2. I am allowed to modify my job tasks to fit my strengths and needs.	0.602	Retained
CROF 3 I have access to the necessary resources (e.g., training, technology) to craft my job effectively.	0.921	Retained
CRSS1. My colleagues provide support when I am trying to implement changes in my work.	0.578	Retained
CRSS2. I often collaborate with others in my team to refine my job roles and responsibilities.	0.945	Retained
CRSS3. I feel comfortable discussing job-related challenges with my colleagues and seeking their advice.	0.580	Retained
DCA1. I am flexible when my job requirements or role expectations change.	0.628	Retained
DCA2 I regularly experiment with new ways of approaching my work tasks	0.805	Retained
DCA3. I can effectively manage the uncertainty that comes with shifting work environments.	0.806	Retained
DCLA1 I quickly adjust to changes in work priorities or strategies.	0.653	Retained
DCLA2 I actively seek out new learning opportunities to improve my skills.	0.075	Removed
DCLA3 I easily acquire new knowledge and skills when required.	0.862	Retained
DCLA4 I am confident in my ability to learn new approaches to performing my tasks.	0.846	Retained
DCR1. I am flexible when my job requirements or role expectations change	0.790	Retained
DCR 2. I remain focused and productive even when things do not go as planned.	0.839	Retained
DCR 3 I can manage stressful situations without letting them negatively affect my performance.	0.830	Retained
ET1. The requirements of my job often change with little notice.	0.634	Retained
ET2. My role often lacks clear expectations or direction.	0.436	Retained
ET3. I work in an industry that experiences frequent shifts in customer demands.	0.686	Retained
ET4 I am often uncertain about how external changes (e.g., market, technology) will affect my job.	0.761	Retained
ET5 The work environment in my organisation is unpredictable and frequently changes.	0.858	Retained
PM1. I actively seek new ways to improve how I do my job.	0.594	Retained
PM2. I feel confident that I can modify my tasks to better suit my strengths and interests.	0.343	Removed
PM 3 I often look for creative ways to improve the way I do my job.	0.665	Retained
PM4. I am motivated to make changes to my role to align it with my personal goals.	0.650	Retained
PM5 I often look for creative ways to improve the way I do my job.	0.339	Removed
PM6 I am motivated to make changes to my role to align it with my personal goals.	0.588	Retained
JP1 I complete my job tasks effectively and efficiently.	0.698	Retained
JP2 I consistently meet the performance standards required for my role	0.626	Retained
JP3 I actively help others and contribute to a positive work environment.	0.736	Retained
JP4 I demonstrate initiative in solving work-related problems	0.709	Retained
JP5 I manage my time well and stay productive throughout the workday	0.811	Retained

Source: Author's own work

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

CFA is conducted using a sample size of 398 participants. This analysis confirms the measurement scale by examining the proposed structure of IDJCA-T's four core dimensions: proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and environmental turbulence. SmartPLS 4.1 software was employed in assessing confirmatory factor analysis. The model fit is evaluated using Standardised Root Mean Square Residual, d_ULS, d_G, Chi-square, and Normed Fit Index (NFI) for both the saturated and estimated models (Kline, 2015) (see Table 2). The SRMR value for both models of 0.06 is less than the recommended threshold of 0.08, suggesting a good fit between the model's predicted correlations and the actual observed data. This implies that the model effectively captures the relationships among the constructs (Henseler et al., 2016).



Likewise, the d_{ULS} and d_G values are 1.997 and 0.811, respectively. These results support the model's adequacy. The Normed Fit Index (NFI) value of 0.94 exceeds the threshold of 0.90, suggesting that the proposed model significantly fits the data (Bentler & Bonett, 1980). The combination of SRMR (0.06) and NFI (0.94) indicates that the structural model fits the data, assuring the overall quality and explanatory strength of the proposed model.

Table 2. Model fit

	Saturated model	Estimated model		
SRMR	0.06	0.06		
d_{ULS}	1.997	1.997		
d_G	0.811	0.811		
Chi-square	1782.490	1782.490		
NFI	0.94	0.94		

Source: Author's own work

Reliability Analysis

Composite Reliability (CR) is employed to evaluate the reliability of each construct. Composite reliability (ρ_c) is the most appropriate and widely used measure for internal consistency in PLS-SEM, due to its ability to measure the actual outer loadings of the indicators (Hair et al., 2021). Composite reliability (ρ_c) does not assume equal loadings, making it more accurate and appropriate for PLS-SEM, where indicators have unequal contributions to their constructs. The composite reliability values presented in Table 3 are well above the acceptable threshold of 0.70, suggesting strong internal consistency of the constructs.

Table 3. Constructs, Composite reliability and Average Variance Extracted

Construct	Composite reliability (ρ_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
ET	0.858	0.669
PM	0.753	0.505
CR	0.885	0.659
DC	0.875	0.700
JP	0.833	0.626

Source: Author's own work

Construct Validity

The author tested construct validity by comparing convergent and discriminant validity. The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) scores show whether constructs are adequately represented by their items. The Fornell-Larcker criterion was employed to determine whether the constructs are different from one another (Hair et al., 2021). To evaluate discriminant validity, the Fornell-Larcker criterion is used, which suggests that the square root of the AVE for each construct should be greater than its correlations with other constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The results in Table 4 demonstrate that each construct is more strongly associated



with its own indicators than with others, thus confirming adequate discriminant validity based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion. All HTMT values are below the conservative threshold of 0.85, indicating that discriminant validity is established across all construct pairs (Henseler et al., 2016). The relatively high HTMT values between JP–PM (0.840) and PM–DC (0.839) suggest these pairs are conceptually close but still distinct (see Table 5). IDJCA-MS is presented in Appendix 1.

Table 4. Fornell-Larcker Criterion

	ET	JP	PM	CR	DC
ET	0.818				
JP	0.368	0.791			
PM	0.158	0.507	0.710		
CR	0.181	0.334	0.085	0.812	
DC	-0.043	0.327	0.530	0.185	0.837

Source: Author's own work

Table 5. Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) discriminant validity

	ET	JP	PM	CR	DC
ET		0.500	0.310	0.270	0.118
JP	0.500		0.840	0.375	0.418
PM	0.310	0.840		0.193	0.839
CR	0.270	0.375	0.193		0.245
DC	0.118	0.418	0.839	0.245	

Source: Author's own work

Predictive Validity

To examine criterion validity, we tested the scale against well-established outcomes such as job performance. Positive correlations between IDJCA-MS dimensions and job performance would support the scale's predictive ability and practical relevance in organisational settings (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Structural Model Results: Determinants of Job Performance

The structural model was analysed to examine the effects of contextual resources, dynamic capabilities, environmental turbulence (ET), and proactive motivation (PM) on job performance (JP). We conducted bootstrapping using 5000 samples (See Table 6). The analysis revealed that all four constructs significantly



and positively influence job performance, with statistically significant path coefficients ($p < 0.001$) for each predictor.

Specifically, proactive motivation is the strongest predictor of job performance ($\beta = 0.331$, $t = 7.539$, $p = 0.000$), indicating that proactive motivation, a dimension of job crafting agility, significantly enhances employees' job performance. This suggests that employees with high proactive motivation tend to perform better on the job. Dynamic capabilities also showed a significant positive influence on JP ($\beta = 0.287$, $t = 4.364$, $p = 0.000$), supporting the notion that individuals who can quickly adapt to changes, learn new skills, and reorganise their work in response to evolving situations are more likely to perform better at work. This finding is consistent with dynamic capability theory, which emphasises the importance of adaptability and strategic flexibility in managing changing work environments (Teece et al., 2016). Environmental turbulence had a significant effect on JP ($\beta = 0.229$, $t = 4.417$, $p = 0.000$). This result suggests that turbulent environments stimulate employees' problem-solving and agility, thereby enhancing job performance. Contextual resources had a significant but comparatively smaller effect on JP ($\beta = 0.200$, $t = 5.732$, $p = 0.000$). This underscores the importance of external job-related resources such as autonomy, social support, and feedback in enhancing individuals job performance. The results in Table 6 show that the R-square value for Job Performance (JP) is 0.407, and the adjusted R-square is 0.402. This implied that 40.7% of the variance in job performance can be explained by job crafting agility dimensions. The adjusted R-square is 0.402, which represents the number of predictors to the sample size, and is slightly higher, suggesting a moderately strong model fit with reliable explanatory power.

Table 6. Mean, Standard Deviation, T statistics and P-values

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values
CR -> JP	0.200	0.199	0.035	5.732	0.000
DC-> JP	0.287	0.278	0.066	4.364	0.000
ET -> JP	0.229	0.232	0.052	4.417	0.000
PM -> JP	0.331	0.337	0.044	7.539	0.000
	R-square	Adjusted R-square			
JP	0.407	0.402			

Source: Author's own work

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is used to identify multicollinearity among predictor variables in a structural model. VIF values above 3.3 in PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2019) may indicate problematic levels of multicollinearity, where predictors are too highly correlated, potentially distorting regression coefficients. The computed VIF values across all items suggest that no significant multicollinearity exists within the measurement model. The model structure appears statistically robust in terms of item independence and is suitable for further structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM).



Table 7. Items and Variance Inflation Factors

Items	VIF
CRJR1	1.237
CRJR2	1.217
CRJR3	1.399
CROF1	1.788
CROF2	1.443
CROF3	1.627
CRSS1	1.139
CRSS2	1.436
CRSS3	1.280
DCA1	1.441
DCA2	1.189
DCA3	1.662
DCLA1	1.198
DCLA3	1.881
DCLA4	2.027
DCR1	1.538
DCR2	1.457
DCR3	1.635
ET1	1.320
ET2	1.462
ET3	1.559
ET4	1.404
ET5	2.379
JP1	2.150
JP2	1.661
JP3	1.663
JP4	1.603
JP5	2.930
PM1	1.231
PM3	1.511
PM4	1.506
PM6	1.603

Source: Author's own work

DISCUSSION

Based on pioneering job crafting perspectives, which proposed diverse definitions and types of job crafting (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001), we developed a measurement scale that recognises employee job crafting behaviour in VUCA work contexts. To enable quantitative research in the domain of job crafting agility, the author developed the Integrated Dynamic Job Crafting Agility Measurement Scale (IDJCA-MS). This 27-item measure proved to be reliable, consistent over time, and valid across different



samples. First, the IDJCA-MS proved to be different from but related to other job crafting measurements (Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2013; Tims et al., 2012). The scale was based on proactive motivation, dynamic capability, contextual resources, and turbulent environment. Our results suggest that job crafting agility is not a single behavioural tendency but rather a synergistic system where personal initiative, adaptive capacity, supportive contexts, and environmental demands work together to shape performance. This is a holistic approach that connects employees' will (i.e., motivation), skill (capabilities), means (resources), and trigger (turbulence) to job crafting and enhances performance. This finding is consistent with (Parker et al., 2010; Helfat & Peteraf, 2009; Donaldson, 2001). In line with recent literature, our findings suggest that the relationships between job crafting agility and job performance is straightforward.

Theoretical contribution

The development of the IDJCA-MS contributes to theory and practice by answering important questions regarding how employees redesign job roles in the face of environmental, technological, and organisational change. Theoretically, the IDJCA-MS enriches job crafting research by integrating several psychological and organisational theories into a single, dynamic measure. Existing scales of job crafting, such as those by Wrzesniewski & Dutton (2001) and Tims et al. (2012), are mostly centred on relatively stable contexts. The IDJCA-MS encompasses environmental turbulence as an explicit element, drawing upon complexity theory (Anderson, 1999), situational strength theory (Meyer et al., 2009), and uncertainty management (Grant & Parker, 2009) as a primary source of agility. This leaves space for a more situational understanding of role adaptation in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments. The scale enables researchers to empirically examine how individual agency (e.g., learning agility, self-efficacy) interacts with environmental variables (e.g., social support, job autonomy, environmental turbulence), facilitating theoretical development and testing. Besides, the scale provides a multidimensional measurement of job crafting agility, a construct still relatively in its infancy.

Practical Contribution

IDJCA-MS provides HR practitioners, leaders, and change agents with a diagnostic instrument to measure employees' agile job crafting capacity in real-world settings. Due to the advent of hybrid work, digital transformation, and decentralised decision-making, organisations require evidence-based methods for enhancing workforce resilience and flexibility (Bakker et al., 2016; Baptista et al., 2020). In this context, IDJCA-MS allows practitioners to determine staff strengths and development priorities for agile job crafting. This data can be used to design interventions like adaptive behaviour training, proactive role engagement coaching, and leadership development initiatives to foster autonomy-supportive workplaces. The scale can also be applied to inform strategic workforce planning by providing a model for viewing how different teams or departments are organised to respond to disruptions. For example, strong dynamic capability and contextual



resource ratings can suggest readiness to undertake transformation projects; low ratings can indicate a need to develop capacity in a targeted way. In talent management, the tool can be integrated into performance review or development planning systems to inform career progression pathways consistent with both individual employee capabilities and organisational agility goals. In practice, organisations can promote proactivity through establishing an environment that encourages autonomy and self-determination. For example, permitting the ownership of work by employees or adjusting work in order to adapt to employees' abilities is likely to drive motivation and promote a more committed workforce (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

Limitations and Future Research Directions

While the IDJCA-MS provides a useful scale on employees' adaptive and proactive actions in today's work contexts, it is without some shortcomings. The IDJCA-MS is yet to be empirically tested across diverse organisational settings and outcomes. Subsequent research should validate the IDJCA-MS by testing its application in other organisations, cultures, and outcomes (e.g., engagement, job satisfaction)

CONCLUSION

The present study proposed an integrated dynamic job crafting agility measurement scale (IDJCA-MS). The IDJCA-MS offers robust tools for assessing how employees engage in job crafting behaviours in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous work settings. Based on the intersection of personal motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, and environmental turbulence, IDJCA-MS is theoretically and methodically sound and relevant to dynamic work environments. IDJCA-MS provides a solid scale for empirical validation of job crafting agility in contemporary organisations, providing an avenue for future research and use in employee development, organisational adaptability, and strategic human resource management. The IDJCA-MS offers a general, actionable, and context-sensitive tool for understanding and developing agile work behaviours. It bridges theory and practice in an operationally significant and empirically relevant manner, constitutes a timely and important contribution to contemporary human resource management and organisational behaviour scholarship and practice.

Conflict of interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing-original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, visualization, supervision – Ch.N.

Author have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.”

Funding /Acknowledgement: No funding was received.

Institutional Review Board Statement: not applicable



The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the ethics committee of the (Horizons University France/ Business), (approval number: 012, 07/04/2025).

Informed Consent Statement:

Informed consent was obtained from all the participants involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy issues.

References

- Anderson, P. (1999). Complexity Theory and Organisation Science. *Organization Science* 10 (3): 216–232. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640328>
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources Model: State of the Art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol.22 (3): 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
- Bakker, A.B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Sanz Vergel, A.I. (2016). Modelling Job Crafting Behaviours: Implications for Work Engagement. *Human Relations* 16 (1): 169–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715581690>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.
- Baptista J., Stein M-K., Klein S., Watson-Manheim M.B., Lee J. (2020). Digital work and organisational transformation: Emergent Digital/Human work configurations in modern organisations. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*. 29(2):101618. doi: 10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101618.
- Bateman, T.S., and Crant, J.M. (1993). The Proactive Component of Organisational Behaviour. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14 (2): 103–118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202>
- Bentler, P.M., and Douglas G. B. (1980). Significance Tests and Goodness of Fit in the Analysis of Covariance Structures. *Psychological Bulletin* 88 (3): 588–606. DOI: 10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
- De Beer, Leon T., Maria Tims, and Arnold B. Bakker. (2016). Job Crafting and Its Impact on Work Engagement and Job Satisfaction in Mining and Manufacturing. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 19 (3): 400–412. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v19i3.1481>
- Deci, E.L., and R.M. Ryan. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- DeRue, D. S., and S.J. Ashford. (2010). Who Will Lead and Who Will Follow? A Social Process of Leadership Identity Construction in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35 (4): 627–647. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.4.zok627>
- DeVellis, R.F. (2016). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeVellis, R.F., and C.T. Thorpe. (2021). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dhanpat, N. (2025). Job Crafting Agility: A Conceptual Proposition for Rethinking Behaviour in Organisations. *International Journal of Organisation Theory & Behaviour*, 28 (1): 18–33. DOI: 10.1108/IJOTB-03-2023-0062
- Dhanpat, N., R.T. De Braine, and M.Geldenhuis. (2019). Weekly Job Crafting and Weekly Meaningful Work: A Diary Study. EURAM 2019 European Academy of Management Conference, Lisbon, Portugal, June 26–28.
- Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations*. London: Sage Publications, Inc., New York. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452229249>
- Fabrigar, L.R., D. T. Wegener, R.C. MacCallum, and E.J. Strahan. (1999). Evaluating the Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Psychological Research. *Psychological Methods*, 4 (3): 272–299. DOI: 10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272



- Finstad, Kraig. (2010). Response Interpolation and Scale Sensitivity: Evidence Against 5-Point Scales. *Journal of Usability Studies*, 5 (3): 104–110.
- Grant, A.M., and Sh.K.Parker. (2009). Redesigning Work Design Theories: The Rise of Relational and Proactive Perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3 (1): 317–375.
- Hair, J.F., G.T.M. Hult, Ch.M. Ringle, and M.Sarstedt. (2019). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.3926/oss.37>
- Hair, J.F., G. Tomas M. Hult, Christian M. Ringle, and M.Sarstedt. (2021). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helfat, C.E., and M.A. Peteraf. (2009). Understanding Dynamic Capabilities: Progress Along a Developmental Path. *Strategic Organization*, 7 (1): 91–102.
- Henseler, J., G.Hubona, and P.A. Ray. (2016). Using PLS Path Modeling in New Technology Research: Updated Guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 116 (1): 2–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-09-2015-0382>
- Hertzog, M.A. (2008). Considerations in Determining Sample Size for Pilot Studies. *Research in Nursing & Health* 31 (2): 180–191.
- Jansen, J.J. P., F.A. J. Van Den Bosch, and H.W. Volberda. (2006). Exploratory Innovation, Exploitative Innovation, and Performance. *Management Science*, 52 (11): 1661–1674. DOI: 10.1287/mnsc.1060.0576
- Johanson, G.A., and G.P. Brooks. (2010). Initial Scale Development: Sample Size for Pilot Studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 70 (3): 394–400. DOI: 10.5395/rde.2024.49.e3
- Kline, R.B. (2015). Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling. 4th ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kooij, D.T. A. M., van Woerkom, M., Wilkenloh, Ľ., Dorenbosch, L., and J.J. A. Denissen. (2017). Job crafting towards strengths and interests: The effects of a job crafting intervention on person–job fit and the role of age. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 102 (6): 971–981. DOI: 10.1037/apl0000194
- Koopmans, L., C.M. Bernaards, V.H. Hildebrandt, van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A.J., de Vet, H.C.W. (2013). Development of an Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62 (1): 6–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273>
- Leana, C., E. Appelbaum, and I. Shevchuk. (2009). Work Process and Quality of Care in Early Childhood Education: The Role of Job Crafting. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52 (6): 1169–1192. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.47084651>
- Luthans, F., C.M. Youssef, and B.J. Avolio. (2007). Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, S.B., P.M. Podsakoff, and N.P. Podsakoff. (2011). Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research. *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (2): 293–334. DOI: 10.2307/23044045
- Mason, R.B. (2007). The External Environment Effect on Management and Strategy: A Complexity Theory Approach. *Management Decision*, 45 (1): 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740710718935>
- Meyer, R.D., R.S. Dalal, and R.Hermida. (2009). A Review and Synthesis of Situational Strength in the Organisational Sciences. *Journal of Management*, 36 (1): 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309349309>
- Miller, D., and P.H. Friesen. (1983). Strategy-Making and Environment: The Third Link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4 (3): 221–235. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2486083>
- Morrison, E.W. (1994). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: The importance of the employee's perspective. *Academy of Management Journal* 37 (6): 1543–1567. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256798>
- Oldham, G.R., and J. R.Hackman. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: The future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31 (2–3): 463–479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.678>
- Niessen, C., D. Weseler, and P.Kostova. (2016). When and Why Do Individuals Craft Their Jobs? *Human Relations*, 69 (6): 1287–1313. DOI: 10.1177/0018726715610642



- Parker, S.K., Uta K. Bindl, and K. Strauss. (2010). Making Things Happen: A Model of Proactive Motivation. *Journal of Management*, 36 (4): 827–856. DOI: 10.1177/0149206310363732
- Petrou, P., E. Demerouti, M. C. Peeters, W.B. Schaufeli, and J. Hetland. (2012). Crafting a Job on a Daily Basis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33 (8): 1120–1141. DOI: 10.1002/job.1783
- Preston, C.C., and A.M. Colman. (2000). Optimal Number of Response Categories in Rating Scales. *Acta Psychologica*, 104 (1): 1–15.
- Pulakos, E.D., S. Arad, M.A. Donovan, and K. E. Plamondon. (2000). Adaptability in the Workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85 (4): 612–624.
- Puaschunder, J.M., M. Gelter, and S. Sharma. (2020). COVID-19 Shock: Considerations on Sociotechnological, Legal, Corporate, Economic and Governance Changes and Trends. Paper presented at the 18th Research Association for Interdisciplinary Studies Conference, Princeton University. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3679326
- Roczniewska, M., A. Rogala, M. Marszałek, H. Hasson, A.B. Bakker, and U. von Thiele Schwarz. (2023). Job Crafting Interventions. *Systematic Reviews*, 12 (1): 1–8. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-023-02170-z
- Schäpers, P., P. Mussel, F. Lievens, C.J. König, J-P. Freudenstein, and S. Krumm. (2020). The Role of Situations in Situational Judgment Tests: Effects on construct saturation, predictive validity, and applicant perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105 (8): 800–818. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000457>
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., and M. Salanova. (2006). The Measurement of Work Engagement with a Short Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66 (4): 701–716.
- Slemp, G.R., and D.A. Vella-Brodrick. (2013). The Job Crafting Questionnaire. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 3 (2): 126–146.
- Teece, D.J., M. Peteraf, and S. Leih. (2016). Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility. *California Management Review*, 58 (4): 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1525/cmr.2016.58.4.13>
- Tims, M., and A.B. Bakker. (2010). Job Crafting: Towards a New Model of Individual Job Redesign. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36 (2): 1–9.
- Tims, M., A. B. Bakker, and D. Derks. (2012). Development and Validation of the Job Crafting Scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80 (1): 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.05.009>
- Tims, M., A.B. Bakker, and D. Derks. (2013). The Impact of Job Crafting on Job Demands, Job Resources, and Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18 (2): 230–240.
- Tims, M., M. Twemlow, and C. Y. M. Fong. (2022). A State-of-the-Art Overview of Job Crafting Research. *Career Development International*, 27 (1): 54–78. DOI: 10.1108/CDI-08-2021-0216
- Ulrich, D., and A. Yeung. (2019). Agility: The New Response to Dynamic Change. *Strategic HR Review*, 18 (4): 161–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SHR-04-2019-0032>
- Van Teijlingen, E., and V. Hundley. (2001). The Importance of Pilot Studies. *Social Research Update*, 35: 1–4.
- Wrzesniewski, A., and J. E. Dutton. (2001). Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26 (2): 179–201.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY)



Appendix 1.

IDJCA Measurement Scale (IDJCA-MS)

I wish to invite you to take part in a study focused on how people shape and change their job roles in dynamic environments. As part of this research, we created a measurement tool called the Integrated Dynamic Job Crafting Agility (IDJCA) Measurement Scale (IDJCA-MS). This questionnaire is designed to measure the essential dimensions of proactive motivation, dynamic capabilities, contextual resources, environmental turbulence, and job crafting agility in individuals across various work environments. The survey is short, takes about 15-20 minutes to complete. All responses are completely confidential and anonymous, and the data is exclusively for academic and research purpose.

Instructions: Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your job crafting behaviours, work environment, and personal characteristics.

Response Scale:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Slightly Disagree
- 4 = Neutral
- 5 = Slightly Agree
- 6 = Agree
- 7 = Strongly Agree

1. Proactive Motivation (PM)

This section assesses your drive, confidence, and motivation to initiate and sustain job crafting behaviors.

- 1. I actively seek new ways to improve how I do my job.
- 2. I take the initiative to change the way I approach my work when needed.
- 3. I feel that my work provides me with opportunities to pursue activities that I find meaningful.
- 4. I am motivated to make changes to my role to align it with my personal goals.

2. Dynamic Capabilities (DC)

This section assesses your ability to adapt, learn, and respond to changes and challenges in your work.

Learning Agility

- 1. I quickly adjust to changes in work priorities or strategies.
- 2. I easily acquire new knowledge and skills when required.
- 3. I am confident in my ability to learn new approaches to performing my tasks.

Resilience

- 1. When faced with setbacks at work, I am able to recover and continue my tasks effectively.
- 2. I remain focused and productive even when things do not go as planned.
- 3. I can manage stressful situations without letting them negatively affect my performance.

Adaptability

- 1. I am flexible when my job requirements or role expectations change.
- 2. I regularly experiment with new ways of approaching my work tasks.
- 3. I can effectively manage the uncertainty that comes with shifting work environments.



3. Contextual Resources (CR)

This section assesses the availability of resources and social support that enable you to craft your job.

Job Resources

1. My supervisor gives me the autonomy to decide how to approach my work tasks.
2. I receive frequent feedback from my supervisor that helps me improve my job performance.
3. I am provided with adequate resources (e.g., tools, time) to perform my tasks effectively.

Social Support

1. My colleagues provide support when I am trying to implement changes in my work.
2. I often collaborate with others in my team to refine my job roles and responsibilities.
3. I feel comfortable discussing job-related challenges with my colleagues and seeking their advice.

Organisational Flexibility

1. My organisation encourages employees to suggest changes to improve their job roles.
2. I am allowed to modify my job tasks to fit my strengths and needs.
3. I have access to the necessary resources (e.g., training, technology) to craft my job effectively.

4. Environmental Turbulence (ET)

This section assesses the degree of unpredictability, change, and ambiguity in your work environment.

1. The requirements of my job often change with little notice.
2. My role often lacks clear expectations or direction.
3. I work in an industry that experiences frequent shifts in customer demands.
4. I am often uncertain about how external changes (e.g., market, technology) will affect my job.
5. The work environment in my organisation is unpredictable and frequently changes.

5. Job Performance (JP)

This section assesses your ability to carry out assigned job.

1. I complete my job tasks effectively and efficiently.
2. I consistently meet the performance standards required for my role
3. I actively help others and contribute to a positive work environment
4. I demonstrate initiative in solving work-related problems
5. I manage my time well and stay productive throughout the workday

Biodata Section

Please provide the following information. This section is optional and your responses will remain confidential.

1. Age:
2. ☐ Under 20
3. ☐ 21-30



4. ☐ 31-40
5. ☐ 41-50
6. ☐ 51-60
7. ☐ Over 60
8. Gender:
9. ☐ Male
10. ☐ Female
11. ☐ Prefer not to say
12. Highest Level of Education :
13. ☐ High School or Equivalent
14. ☐ Associate Degree
15. ☐ Bachelor Degree
16. ☐ Masters Degree
17. ☐ Doctoral Degree
18. ☐ Other: _____
19. Years of Work Experience:
20. ☐ Less than 1 year
21. ☐ 1-3 years
22. ☐ 4-6 years
23. ☐ 7-10 years
24. ☐ More than 10 years
25. Industry/Field of Work:
26. ☐ Education
27. ☐ Healthcare
28. ☐ Technology
29. ☐ Finance
30. ☐ Manufacturing
31. ☐ Retail
32. ☐ Other: _____
33. Type of Employment
34. ☐ Full-time
35. ☐ Part-time
36. ☐ Contract
37. ☐ Freelance
38. ☐ Internship



39. ☐ Other: _____
40. Organizational Size:
41. ☐ Small (1-50 employees)
42. ☐ Medium (51-200 employees)
43. ☐ Large (201+ employees)
44. Location:-----
45. Have you ever participated in any job crafting interventions or training?
46. ☐ Yes
47. ☐ No