Humanities and Social Sciences Letters
2026 Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 220-231
ISSN(e): 2312-4318
ISSN(p): 2312-5659
DOI: 10.18488/73.v14i1.4701

Agile leadership and job satisfaction: Mediating role of job redesign within the framework of dynamic capability theory

Udin Udin[1]
Masoud Nikzad[2]
Suteera Chanthes[3+]
Pankom Sriboonlue[4]

[1,2]*Management Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia.*
[1]*Email: udin@umy.ac.id*
[2]*Email: masoud.nikzad.psc23@mail.umy.ac.id*
[3,4]*Mahasarakham Business School, Mahasarakham University, Thailand.*
[3]*Email: suteera.c@msu.ac.th*
[4]*Email: pankom.s@acc.msu.ac.th*

(+ Corresponding author)

Article History
Received: 11 August 2025
Revised: 2 December 2025
Accepted: 29 December 2025
Published: 13 January 2026

Keywords
Agile leadership
Dynamic capability theory
Job redesign
Job satisfaction
Structural equation modeling

ABSTRACT

In today's dynamic and highly competitive business environment, organizations face constant pressure to adapt quickly to changing market conditions, technological advancements, and evolving customer expectations. Agile leadership has emerged as a critical capability for driving organizational flexibility and enhancing employee outcomes. Despite growing interest in this leadership style, the mechanisms through which agile leadership influences job satisfaction remain underexplored. Grounded in Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT), this study investigates both the direct effect of agile leadership on job satisfaction and the mediating role of job redesign. A cross-sectional survey was administered to 167 employees of First MicroFinance Bank, Afghanistan, using validated measurement scales for agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction. Data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with SmartPLS (version 3.3.0) to test the hypothesized relationships. The results reveal that agile leadership significantly enhances job satisfaction, demonstrating both a direct positive effect and an indirect positive effect through job redesign. Job redesign also emerged as a strong predictor of job satisfaction, highlighting its strategic importance for aligning work structures with employee needs and organizational goals. Mediation analysis confirmed that job redesign partially mediates the relationship between agile leadership and job satisfaction. These findings provide important theoretical insights into the dynamic capability perspective and offer practical implications for managers seeking to strengthen employee well-being and organizational outcomes through agile leadership and thoughtful job redesign strategies.

Contribution/Originality: This study extends the Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT) by empirically linking agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction. It introduces job redesign as a key mediating mechanism through which agile leaders build adaptive structures that enhance employee satisfaction. This approach offers both theoretical advancements and practical insights for leadership development in dynamic organizational contexts.

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's rapidly changing business environment, organizations must continuously adapt to emerging challenges. Agile methodologies, initially rooted in software development, have become widely adopted across various industries to enhance flexibility and responsiveness (Khan, Siddiqui, Waheed, Hassan, & Duc, 2019), have expanded into organizational leadership, requiring leaders to be flexible, collaborative, and responsive qualities central to agile

leadership (Udin, 2025). This leadership style emphasizes empowerment, rapid decision-making, and alignment of team capabilities with external demands, making it highly relevant in the digital era.

At the same time, job satisfaction remains a critical organizational outcome, closely tied to productivity, retention, engagement, and innovation (Ngoc, Huu, Minh, Lam, & Van, 2024; Ramasamy, Inore, Muduli, & Singh, 2023; Syaifuddin, Lie, Lubis, Novirsari, & Nasib, 2024). Yet, many organizations struggle to sustain high satisfaction levels amid constant restructuring, raising questions about how agile leadership influences employee well-being in dynamic contexts.

Empirical findings on this relationship are mixed. Some studies highlight that agile leadership fosters a culture of adaptability, continuous feedback, and recognition, which enhance satisfaction (Hariyati, Kalsum, & Supriaddin, 2023; Udin, 2025). Conversely, others report no significant (Porkodi, 2024) or even negative effects, suggesting that blurred roles, stress, or cultural misfits in hierarchical settings may undermine satisfaction (Aftab, Khalid, Waheed, Aftab, & Adnan, 2022; Alghamdi, 2025; Özgenel, Yazıcı, & Asmaz, 2022).

One mechanism through which agile leadership may enhance satisfaction is job redesign. Agile leaders, with their adaptive and employee-centered orientation, can align individual roles with organizational goals through meaningful redesign (Geffers, Bretschneider, Eilers, & Oeste-Reiß, 2024). To anchor this inquiry, the study adopts Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT), which emphasizes the capacity to integrate, build, and reconfigure competencies in response to changing environments (Cadrazco-Parra, Zapata-Domínguez, & Lombana-Coy, 2020). Within this framework, agile leadership represents a dynamic capability that enables organizations to sense opportunities, redesign jobs to seize them, and transform internal operations to improve outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Despite its conceptual relevance, empirical research linking agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction within the DCT framework remains limited. This study addresses this gap by examining how agile leadership affects employee job satisfaction and the mediating role of job redesign, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of how contemporary leaders can foster sustainable employee satisfaction in evolving organizational contexts.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Dynamic Capability Theory

Dynamic Capability Theory (DCT) provides a strategic lens to explain how organizations can adapt and thrive in dynamic environments (Fatoki, 2021). The theory emphasizes three core capabilities (Teece, 2007): sensing changes (i.e., the ability to identify opportunities and threats in the environment), seizing opportunities (i.e., the ability to mobilize resources to capture identified opportunities), and transforming internal structures (i.e., the ability to reconfigure and renew organizational resources and processes). Dynamic capabilities are not just ordinary capabilities like production or logistics, but higher-order capabilities that help firms adapt, innovate, and renew resources over time.

DCT helps explain how firms manage digital disruption and innovation ecosystems (Inigo & Albareda, 2019). Firms must develop adaptive capacity to sense changes and respond proactively. DCT provides a powerful lens to understand how agile leadership creates strategic and psychological adaptability (Kaya, 2023). By embedding agile routines and empowering behaviors, leaders not only enhance organizational survival but also foster employee job satisfaction.

2.2. Agile Leadership

Agile leadership has emerged as a critical leadership paradigm in the context of rapid technological changes, global disruptions, and market volatility. It is characterized by adaptability, collaboration, iterative thinking, and the empowerment of team members (Akkaya & Sever, 2022; Alghamdi, 2025). Unlike traditional hierarchical leadership models, agile leaders foster decentralized decision-making, promote learning from failure, and facilitate cross-functional teamwork to increase responsiveness and innovation (Jain, Kamat, Saini, Singh, & Whig, 2024).

Agile leadership can be viewed through five key perspectives: person-based, position-based, purpose-based, process-based, and result-based. Agile leaders are visionary, humble, adaptable, and engaged. They focus on aligning teams with a clear vision, promoting a culture of learning, enhancing transparency, and empowering team-based decision-making (Geffers et al., 2024). Empirical studies have found that agile leadership enhances organizational flexibility, employee engagement, and innovation outcomes (Porkodi, 2024; Surapto, Suhud, & Wiradendi Wolor, 2024; Udin, 2025). These qualities are crucial in environments requiring constant adaptation, making agile leadership not only a strategic imperative but also a potential contributor to positive employee experiences, including job satisfaction.

2.3. Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is broadly understood as an individual's emotional and cognitive assessment of their job and overall work environment. It reflects how employees feel about various aspects of their roles and the conditions under which they work. A growing body of research highlights the significant impact of job satisfaction on various organizational outcomes. Employees who are content with their roles are not only more likely to remain with their organizations (Balaji, Charumathi, Ahmed, & Appu, 2024; Gautam, Gautam, & Bhetuwal, 2025) but also tend to demonstrate stronger job performance (Ramasamy et al., 2023). Moreover, they often go beyond their formal duties by engaging in extra-role behaviors that contribute positively to the overall work environment (Hermawan et al., 2024).

Several core factors influence job satisfaction, both intrinsic and extrinsic. These include the degree of autonomy an employee experiences, the extent to which they feel recognized and appreciated, the perceived significance of their tasks, the quality of interpersonal relationships in the workplace, and the effectiveness of leadership (Chordiya, Sabharwal, & Battaglio, 2019; Sinniah, Al Mamun, Md Salleh, Makhbul, & Hayat, 2022). Thus, understanding and improving these factors are essential for organizations aiming to foster a more engaged, productive, and loyal workforce.

Leadership plays a decisive role in shaping job satisfaction. Leaders who exhibit supportive, inclusive, and empowering behaviors tend to foster higher satisfaction among employees (Uman, Argento, Grossi, & Mattei, 2023). Agile leadership emerges as a critical enabler of dynamic capabilities. Agile leaders demonstrate responsiveness, flexibility, and a learning orientation, traits that align closely with the DCT imperatives of sensing, seizing, and transforming. These leaders cultivate environments where experimentation is encouraged, feedback is constant, and authority is distributed rather than centralized (Bornay-Barrachina, López-Cabrales, & Salas-Vallina, 2025). Consequently, agile leadership plays a vital role in translating organizational agility into tangible workplace practices, particularly in how jobs are structured and experienced. By fostering adaptability, psychological safety, and autonomy, agile leaders create conditions that not only improve job satisfaction but also align individual purpose with organizational objectives (Nikzad & Udin, 2025; Surapto et al., 2024; Udin, 2025). Through practices such as iterative workflows, shared responsibilities, and employee empowerment, agile leaders actively reshape job roles to be more dynamic and responsive (Akkaya, Panait, Apostu, & Kaya, 2022). This ongoing process of job redesign enhances both the meaningfulness of work and overall employee well-being.

H_1: Agile leadership positively influences job satisfaction.

H_2: Agile leadership positively influences job redesign.

2.4. Job Redesign as a Mediator

Job redesign is the intentional restructuring of job roles to improve employee motivation and performance (Rengamani, James, Srinivasan, Poongavanam, & Vettriselvan, 2019). This process enriches jobs by incorporating more meaningful tasks and responsibilities, thereby making work more fulfilling. A central goal of job redesign is to deepen employee engagement by increasing autonomy, responsibility, and opportunities for personal growth.

According to Taylor (2015) The key dimensions of effective job redesign include (1) skill variety (i.e., the extent to which a job requires diverse abilities and skills); (2) task identity (i.e., the extent to which a job involves completing a whole, identifiable piece of work); (3) task significance (i.e., how substantially the job impacts others, either outside or within the organization); (4) feedback (i.e., the clarity and immediacy of information received about performance through the job itself); and (5) autonomy (i.e., the degree of freedom and independence employees have in scheduling tasks and determining procedures). Increasing employee autonomy such as by involving them in decision-making and encouraging ownership of their tasks can notably boost motivation and job satisfaction (Henderson & Sowa, 2022).

In contemporary agile work environments, job redesign has been empirically linked to increased motivation, engagement, and job satisfaction (Pila-Ngarm & Siengthai, 2017). Bottom-up job redesign strategies, such as job crafting, allow employees to proactively modify their jobs to better fit their needs and preferences, enhancing motivation and performance (Seppälä, Harju, & Hakanen, 2020). Moreover, redesigning work roles to suit dynamic conditions allows employees to better align their competencies with evolving demands, thus reinforcing satisfaction and retention (Daniels, Gedikli, Watson, Semkina, & Vaughn, 2017).

H_3: Job redesign positively influences job satisfaction.

H_4: Job redesign mediates the relationship between agile leadership and job satisfaction.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Sample and Procedure

This study employed a cross-sectional survey design to examine the influence of agile leadership on job satisfaction and the mediating role of job redesign. The target population consisted of employees of First MicroFinance Bank-Afghanistan (FMFB-A). A convenience sampling method was applied, and data were collected through a structured electronic questionnaire. Participation was voluntary and confidential, resulting in valid responses from 167 employees across all 47 FMFB-A branches.

3.2. Measurements

To assess agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction, the study employed established and validated measurement scales, each rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Agile leadership. Agile leadership was measured using four items adapted from Akkaya and Sever (2022) and Setiawati (2021), covering dimensions such as anticipating change, generating confidence, initiating action, and liberating thinking.

Job redesign. Job redesign was measured with seven items adapted from Achieng, Ochieng, and Owuor (2014) and Fajrin, Subyantoro, and Pujiharjanto (2022), focusing on job autonomy, task variety, skill utilization, and feedback.

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with five items adapted from Saeed, Mir, Hamid, Ayaz, and Iyyaz (2023), including satisfaction with work, supervision, and overall working conditions (e.g., "I am satisfied with the work I am doing in my company").

All scales demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.811 (Agile leadership), 0.835 (Job redesign), and 0.849 (Job satisfaction).

3.3. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with SmartPLS 3.3.0. Convergent validity was assessed through the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity was evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait (HTMT) ratio. For the structural model, path coefficients and their significance were estimated via bootstrapping (5,000 resamples). Mediation analysis of job redesign between

agile leadership and job satisfaction was also conducted using the bootstrapped indirect effect approach recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 provides a comprehensive evaluation of the measurement model's validity and reliability an essential prerequisite in structural equation modeling (SEM). Prior to hypothesis testing, it is critical to confirm that the constructs agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction are measured both accurately and consistently.

Factor loadings (or outer loadings) indicate how well each item (e.g., AL1, JR1, JS1) reflects its associated construct. According to Hair Jr, Matthews, Matthews, and Sarstedt (2017), a factor loading above 0.70 is considered ideal, as it suggests that the item explains more variance in the construct than error variance. In this study, all items measuring agile leadership and job satisfaction exhibit strong loadings, exceeding 0.76, indicating high reliability in capturing their respective constructs. For job redesign, most items meet the recommended threshold; however, item JR7 shows a relatively low loading of 0.568. This may suggest that JR7 is not as closely aligned with the latent construct as the other indicators. Nonetheless, its retention is justifiable due to its contribution to content validity and because the construct's average variance extracted (AVE) remains acceptable (≥ 0.50). As Chin (1998) notes, indicators with loadings between 0.50 and 0.60 can be retained when the overall measurement model demonstrates satisfactory reliability and validity.

Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha were used to assess internal consistency that is, the degree to which items within each construct are interrelated. The Cronbach's Alpha values for agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction range from 0.811 to 0.849, indicating a high level of reliability. Composite Reliability scores are even higher, ranging from 0.876 to 0.892, further confirming that the items consistently measure their intended constructs.

The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) measures the proportion of variance explained by a construct in relation to the variance attributed to measurement error. A value of at least 0.50 is considered acceptable. In this study, agile leadership (0.638) and job satisfaction (0.622) both exceed this benchmark, indicating strong convergent validity. Job redesign has an AVE of 0.506, slightly above the threshold, suggesting that while its indicators are acceptable, they marginally meet the criterion for convergent validity.

Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values were analyzed to evaluate potential multicollinearity among the indicators. A VIF value below 3.3 is generally considered acceptable, indicating that multicollinearity is not a concern. The VIF values in this study range from 1.297 to 2.423, demonstrating that each indicator provides distinct and non-redundant information within its respective construct.

Table 1. Convergent validity and reliability.

Variables	Items	Loadings	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	VIF
Agile leadership	AL1	0.767	0.811	0.876	0.638	1.588
	AL2	0.789				1.536
	AL3	0.826				1.818
	AL4	0.811				1.835
Job redesign	JR1	0.737	0.835	0.877	0.506	1.776
	JR2	0.672				1.514
	JR3	0.690				1.522
	JR4	0.769				1.801
	JR5	0.769				1.755
	JR6	0.753				1.772
	JR7	0.568				1.297
Job satisfaction	JS1	0.806	0.849	0.892	0.622	1.841
	JS2	0.850				2.423
	JS3	0.761				1.859
	JS4	0.727				1.533
	JS5	0.796				1.667

To assess discriminant validity, this study employed two widely accepted methods: the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT). Table 2 presents the square roots of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values on the diagonal agile leadership (0.799), job redesign (0.711), and job satisfaction (0.789) while the off-diagonal elements represent the inter-construct correlations (e.g., 0.703, 0.701, 0.594). Based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion, discriminant validity is confirmed when the square root of a construct's AVE exceeds its correlations with other constructs. In this study, agile leadership's AVE (0.799) is greater than its correlations with job redesign (0.703) and job satisfaction (0.594). Similarly, job redesign's AVE (0.711) exceeds its correlations with agile leadership (0.703) and job satisfaction (0.701). Job satisfaction's AVE (0.789) also surpasses its correlations with agile leadership (0.594) and job redesign (0.701). These results confirm that each construct shares more variance with its own indicators than with other constructs, thus satisfying the Fornell-Larcker criterion for discriminant validity.

The HTMT ratio evaluates discriminant validity by comparing the average correlations across constructs (heterotrait) with the average correlations within the same construct (monotrait). Lower HTMT values indicate stronger evidence that constructs are empirically distinct. A commonly accepted threshold for HTMT is 0.90, with a more conservative benchmark at 0.85. In this study, the HTMT values are as follows: agile leadership and job redesign = 0.846, job redesign and job satisfaction = 0.809, and agile leadership and job satisfaction = 0.693. All values fall below the 0.90 threshold, and two of the three are also below the stricter 0.85 criterion. The highest HTMT value, 0.846 (between agile leadership and job redesign), is close to the cutoff but remains within acceptable limits. This suggests that while these constructs are conceptually related as expected given their theoretical alignment they remain empirically distinct. Taken together, the results from both the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the HTMT ratio confirm that the constructs in the measurement model demonstrate satisfactory discriminant validity.

Table 2. Discriminant validity.

Fornell-Larcker criterion			
Latent variable	**Agile leadership**	**Job redesign**	**Job satisfaction**
Agile leadership	0.799		
Job redesign	0.703	0.711	
Job satisfaction	0.594	0.701	0.789
Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT)			
Latent variable	Agile leadership	Job redesign	Job satisfaction
Job redesign	0.846		
Job satisfaction	0.693	0.809	

Table 3 presents the model fit statistics for both the saturated and estimated models are presented. The saturated model includes all possible paths, serving as a benchmark for comparison, while the estimated model reflects the hypothesized relationships based on theoretical assumptions. For a model to demonstrate good fit, the estimated model's statistics should closely align with those of the saturated model. In this study, the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) is 0.078 for both models.

According to Hu and Bentler (1999), an SRMR value below 0.08 indicates a good model fit, suggesting that the predicted relationships among variables are consistent with the observed data. Additionally, the Squared Euclidean Distance (d_ULS) is 0.830, and the Geodesic Distance (d_G) is 0.272 for both models, further indicating that the model reproduces the empirical data with minimal error.

The Normed Fit Index (NFI) for the estimated model is 0.807, which exceeds the commonly accepted threshold of 0.80, denoting an acceptable level of model fit. These results collectively support the conclusion that the proposed structural model exhibits satisfactory overall fit.

Table 3. Model fit indices.

Indices	Saturated model	Estimated model
SRMR	0.078	0.078
d_ULS	0.830	0.830
d_G	0.272	0.272
NFI	0.807	0.807

Table 4 presents the structural model results highlight the statistical relationships among the key constructs, including both direct and indirect effects. The results indicate a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between agile leadership and job redesign ($\beta = 0.703$, t-value = 8.954, $\rho < 0.001$). This finding suggests that agile leadership characterized by anticipating change, generating confidence, initiating action, and liberating thinking plays a crucial role in shaping how work is structured. Leaders who adopt agile practices are more likely to redesign roles, tasks, and responsibilities to align with evolving organizational demands. Additionally, agile leadership exerts a direct and statistically significant positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.200$, t-value = 2.681, $\rho = 0.008$). While the effect size is moderate, it indicates that employees tend to report higher satisfaction when led by agile leaders who promote openness to change, empowerment, and proactive support. These results underscore the importance of agile leadership in influencing both structural aspects of work and employee attitudes.

The findings further reveal a strong and statistically significant positive effect of job redesign on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.560$, t-value = 6.804, $\rho < 0.001$). This result confirms that modifying tasks, responsibilities, and work structures through job redesign substantially contributes to enhancing employees' satisfaction. A thoughtfully implemented job redesign process emerges as a key driver of job satisfaction, indicating that when employees experience roles that are better aligned with their skills, interests, and organizational needs, their overall work attitudes improve significantly.

The results also demonstrate a statistically significant indirect effect, indicating that job redesign partially mediates the relationship between agile leadership and job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.394$, t-value = 4.735, $\rho < 0.001$). This finding suggests that agile leadership influences job satisfaction not only through a direct pathway but also more substantially through its impact on how jobs are redesigned.

Notably, the strength of the indirect effect ($\beta = 0.394$) is nearly twice that of the direct effect ($\beta = 0.200$), underscoring the pivotal role of job redesign as a mechanism through which agile leadership enhances employee satisfaction. This highlights the importance of structural job adjustments in translating leadership agility into positive employee outcomes.

Table 4. Direct and indirect effects.

Relationships	Original sample (β)	Mean	Standard deviation	T statistics	P values (ρ)	Decision
Direct effects						
Agile leadership → Job redesign	0.703	0.699	0.078	8.954	0.000	Supported
Agile leadership → Job satisfaction	0.200	0.197	0.075	2.681	0.008	Supported
Job redesign → Job satisfaction	0.560	0.558	0.082	6.804	0.000	Supported
Specific indirect effect						
Agile leadership → Job redesign → Job satisfaction	0.394	0.392	0.083	4.735	0.000	Supported

Agile leadership has a strong and positive impact on job redesign, underscoring the vital role of adaptive, future-focused leaders in reshaping how work is structured. Leaders who demonstrate agility marked by flexibility, openness to change, quick decision-making, and a commitment to continuous learning cultivate environments that encourage innovation and experimentation in job roles.

They promote collaboration and empower employees to actively participate in tailoring their roles to better align with both organizational objectives and individual strengths (Alghamdi, 2025; Jain et al., 2024). This leadership approach supports flatter hierarchies, minimizes bureaucracy, and enables decentralized decision-making, fostering more dynamic and responsive work systems. These findings align with research by Akkaya and Sever (2022), which highlights agile leaders as key drivers of organizational transformation in times of volatility and change.

Agile leadership also significantly enhances job satisfaction. By emphasizing clear communication, empathy, empowerment, and continuous feedback, agile leaders help create a psychologically supportive workplace. Employees led by such leaders tend to feel more valued, autonomous, and purposeful, factors known to boost morale and motivation. This aligns with Self-Determination Theory (Forner, Jones, Berry, & Eidenfalk, 2021), which suggests that fulfilling core psychological needs autonomy, competence, and relatedness promotes well-being and motivation. Agile leaders naturally support these needs by distributing authority and recognizing individual contributions, thus reinforcing employee engagement and satisfaction (Geffers et al., 2024).

The strong and statistically significant impact of job redesign on job satisfaction highlights the essential role of meaningful work design in promoting employee well-being. Redesigning jobs by enhancing task variety, autonomy, significance, and feedback fosters greater engagement and fulfillment. This finding supports the Job Characteristics Model (Taylor, 2015), which emphasizes that enriched work leads to increased internal motivation and satisfaction. In agile organizations, job redesign is often a strategic response to change, enabling employees to better align their roles with their strengths. This not only boosts satisfaction but also contributes to higher performance, retention, and innovation.

Furthermore, the mediating role of job redesign in the relationship between agile leadership and job satisfaction reveals how leadership drives positive outcomes. Rather than influencing satisfaction directly, agile leaders initiate structural and functional changes that empower employees to shape their own work (Adhiatma, Fachrunnisa, Nurhidayati, & Rahayu, 2023; Aftab et al., 2022). This mechanism aligns with DCT (Kaya, 2023), which emphasizes the need for strategic leadership to reconfigure organizational processes and resources, such as job roles, to sustain adaptability and competitiveness. In this context, agile leadership is not merely defined by flexibility or charisma but by its capacity to build organizational agility through purposeful job redesign.

5. CONCLUSION

This study provides strong evidence of the pivotal role agile leadership plays in shaping job redesign and job satisfaction. The findings reveal that agile leadership enhances satisfaction both directly and indirectly through job redesign, which emerges as a strategic mechanism for aligning employees' responsibilities with evolving business demands and personal strengths. Grounded in DCT, the results underscore that in dynamic environments, organizations need adaptive and people-focused leaders who act as change enablers. By integrating leadership development with continuous job assessment and redesign, organizations can cultivate a satisfied, resilient, and high-performing workforce.

The findings of this study hold significant implications for both theory and organizational practice. From a theoretical perspective, the study extends the DCT by positioning leadership and job design as micro-foundations of organizational adaptability. While DCT traditionally emphasizes an organization's ability to sense, seize, and transform in response to environmental shifts (Teece, 2007), this study advances the framework to the managerial level. It demonstrates that agile leadership cultivates dynamic capabilities by enabling structural adjustments that enhance employee satisfaction, thereby enriching the understanding of how everyday leadership behaviors contribute to organizational resilience.

From a practical perspective, the results offer timely guidance for organizations navigating disruption and complexity. Agile leadership emerges as a central driver of adaptability, not only through strategic decision-making but also by reshaping how work is designed and experienced. Leaders who embrace openness, empowerment, and

adaptability foster psychological safety and flexibility, allowing employees to redefine their roles in ways that boost satisfaction and performance. For organizations, this underscores the need to invest in leadership development programs that cultivate agile mindsets and equip leaders to proactively redesign work whether by restructuring tasks, increasing autonomy, or aligning roles with evolving goals. In this way, job redesign becomes a strategic tool for advancing both employee well-being and organizational success.

This study offers valuable theoretical and practical contributions, but several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design prevents firm conclusions about causality; while significant associations were identified between agile leadership, job redesign, and job satisfaction, the temporal and directional nature of these links remains uncertain. Future longitudinal research could better trace how these relationships evolve, offering richer insights into the role of agile leadership in shaping job design and employee outcomes.

Second, the reliance on self-reported data raises the risk of common method bias and social desirability effects. Although statistical remedies may mitigate these issues, future studies should incorporate multi-source data such as supervisor evaluations, peer assessments, or objective performance indicators to enhance validity.

Finally, the use of non-probability convenience sampling, while practical for accessing participants across FMFB-A, may limit the generalizability of findings to other populations and contexts. Employing probability-based sampling across diverse institutions and industries would improve external validity and broaden the applicability of results.

Funding: This research project was financially supported by Mahasarakham University (Grant number: Fiscal Year 2569).
Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia, under protocol number (569/A.3-III/DRP/VIII/2025), dated (9 August 2025). Informed verbal consent was obtained from all participants, and all data were anonymized to protect participant confidentiality.
Transparency: The authors state that the manuscript is honest, truthful, and transparent, that no key aspects of the investigation have been omitted, and that any differences from the study as planned have been clarified. This study followed all writing ethics.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Authors' Contributions: All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Achieng, O. E., Ochieng, I., & Owuor, S. (2014). Effect of job redesign on employee performance in commercial banks in Kisumu, Kenya. *Greener Journal of Business and Management Studies*, *4*(4), 115-137. http://doi.org/10.15580/GJBMS.2014.4.040714179

Adhiatma, A., Fachrunnisa, O., Nurhidayati, & Rahayu, T. (2023). Creating digital ecosystem for small and medium enterprises: The role of dynamic capability, agile leadership and change readiness. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, *14*(5), 941-959. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-12-2020-0171

Aftab, S., Khalid, K., Waheed, A., Aftab, A., & Adnan, A. (2022). Role of agile leadership in managing inter-role conflicts for a satisfying job and life during COVID-19 in a VUCA world. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 979792. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.979792

Akkaya, B., Panait, M., Apostu, S. A., & Kaya, Y. (2022). Agile leadership and perceived career success: The mediating role of job embeddedness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(8), 4834. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19084834

Akkaya, B., & Sever, E. (2022). Agile leadership and organization performance in the perspective of VUCA. In Post-Pandemic Talent Management Models in Knowledge Organizations. In (pp. 213-228). Hershey, Pennsylvania, USA: IGI Global.

Alghamdi, A. S. (2025). Agile leadership and organizational sustainability, between hope and reality. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, *23*(1), 324-339. http://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.0027

Balaji, S. G., Charumathi, D., Ahmed, M. R., & Appu, A. (2024). The influence of job satisfaction on retention of primary healthcare professionals in Tamil Nadu. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, *11*(2), 238-247. https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.02.025

Bornay-Barrachina, M., López-Cabrales, Á., & Salas-Vallina, A. (2025). Sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring dynamic capabilities in innovative firms: Why does strategic leadership make a difference? *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, *28*(2), 399-420. https://doi.org/10.1177/23409444231185790

Cadrazco-Parra, W., Zapata-Domínguez, Á., & Lombana-Coy, J. (2020). Dynamic capabilities: Contributions and trends. *Revista Lasallista de Investigación*, *17*(1), 325-337.

Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A. Marcoulides (Ed.), Modern Methods for Business Research. In (pp. 295-336). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chordiya, R., Sabharwal, M., & Battaglio, R. P. (2019). Dispositional and organizational sources of job satisfaction: A cross-national study. *Public Management Review*, *21*(8), 1101-1124. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1544274

Daniels, K., Gedikli, C., Watson, D., Semkina, A., & Vaughn, O. (2017). Job design, employment practices and well-being: A systematic review of intervention studies. *Ergonomics*, *60*(9), 1177-1196. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2017.1303085

Fajrin, V., Subyantoro, A., & Pujiharjanto, A. (2022). The effect of job redesign and workload on job satisfaction of medical employees with burnout as a mediation variable at the Banjarsari Health Center, temanggung regency. *Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, *1*(2), 131-144.

Fatoki, O. (2021). Dynamic capabilities and performance of hospitality firms in South Africa: The mediating effect of innovation. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, *36*(2spl), 616-623. http://doi.org/10.30892/GTG.362SPL08-690

Forner, V. W., Jones, M., Berry, Y., & Eidenfalk, J. (2021). Motivating workers: How leaders apply self-determination theory in organizations. *Organization Management Journal*, *18*(2), 76-94. https://doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-03-2020-0891

Gautam, P. K., Gautam, D. K., & Bhetuwal, R. (2025). Work-life balance, job satisfaction and turnover intentions among nurses. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *33*(3), 538-557. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-09-2023-4002

Geffers, K., Bretschneider, U., Eilers, K., & Oeste-Reiß, S. (2024). *Leading teams in today's dynamic organizations: The core characteristics of agile leadership*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.

Hair Jr, J. F., Matthews, L. M., Matthews, R. L., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: Updated guidelines on which method to use. *International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis*, *1*(2), 107-123. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMDA.2017.087624

Hariyati, H., Kalsum, U., & Supriaddin, N. (2023). The influence of job description and agile leadership on job satisfaction and employee performance at the regional secretariat of Southeast Sulawesi Province. *POMA Journal: Publish of Management*, *1*(1), 193-207.

Henderson, A. C., & Sowa, J. E. (2022). Job design and motivation: Crafting the work of the public sector. In Research Handbook on Motivation in Public Administration. In (pp. 234-248). Northampton, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hermawan, F., Purnomo, H., Kusumastuti, D., Fitriana, R., Octaleny, E., Ie, M., & Sudadi, S. (2024). The role of transformational leadership, job satisfaction and organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of SMEs employees in the digital era. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, *8*(7), 1-16.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Inigo, E. A., & Albareda, L. (2019). Sustainability oriented innovation dynamics: Levels of dynamic capabilities and their path-dependent and self-reinforcing logics. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *139*, 334-351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.11.023

Jain, A., Kamat, S., Saini, V., Singh, A., & Whig, P. (2024). Agile leadership: Navigating challenges and maximizing success. In Practical Approaches to Agile Project Management. In (pp. 32-47). Hershey, Pennsylvania, USA: IGI Global.

Kaya, Y. (2023). Agile leadership from the perspective of dynamic capabilities and creating value. *Sustainability*, *15*(21), 15253. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115253

Khan, K., Siddiqui, A., Waheed, U., Hassan, F., & Duc, A. N. (2019). Towards continuous value delivery with review meetings in agile methodologies: A structured review. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, *6*(10), 25-31. http://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2019.10.005

Ngoc, T. D. T., Huu, H. N., Minh, T. P., Lam, T. D. H., & Van, D. N. (2024). Enhancing employee's job satisfaction in Vietnam: Exploring the impact of organizational commitment, supervisor emotional support and training. *Journal of Social Economics Research*, *11*(2), 162-174. http://doi.org/10.18488/35.v11i2.3648

Nikzad, M., & Udin, U. (2025). The effects of job redesign, job satisfaction, and agile leadership on employees' performance in the first MicroFinance Bank-Afghanistan: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, *14*(2), 414-432. http://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2025.60514

Özgenel, M., Yazıcı, Ş., & Asmaz, A. (2022). The mediator role of organizational justice in the relationship between school principals' agile leadership characteristics and teachers' job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 895540. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.895540

Pila-Ngarm, P., & Siengthai, S. (2017). Job redesign and employee performance: The mediating effects of human capital investment and job satisfaction. *Organization Development Journal*, *35*(2), 79.

Porkodi, S. (2024). The effectiveness of agile leadership in practice: A comprehensive meta-analysis of empirical studies on organizational outcomes. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, *20*(2), 117-138.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, *40*(3), 879-891. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

Ramasamy, A., Inore, I., Muduli, K., & Singh, S. (2023). Evaluation of factors affecting job satisfaction pathways for improved sustainable business performance in emerging economies. *International Journal of Social Ecology and Sustainable Development*, *14*(1), 1-17. http://doi.org/10.4018/IJSESD.328217

Rengamani, J., James, F. A., Srinivasan, R., Poongavanam, S., & Vettriselvan, R. (2019). A research on job enrichment and redesigning of work in Indian manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, *8*(6S4), 465-467. http://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.F1096.0486S419

Saeed, F., Mir, A., Hamid, M., Ayaz, F., & Iyyaz, U. (2023). Employee salary and employee turnover intention: A key evaluation considering job satisfaction and job performance as mediators. *International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences*, *13*(1), 1-23.

Seppälä, P., Harju, L., & Hakanen, J. J. (2020). Interactions of approach and avoidance job crafting and work engagement: A comparison between employees affected and not affected by organizational changes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *17*(23), 9084. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17239084

Setiawati, L. (2021). The effect of agile leadership and work environment to employees' performance in a VUCA world (Study on millennial generation employees in Jabodetabek). *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, *4*(11), 3123-3131. http://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v4-i11-08

Sinniah, S., Al Mamun, A., Md Salleh, M. F., Makhbul, Z. K. M., & Hayat, N. (2022). Modeling the significance of motivation on job satisfaction and performance among the academicians: The use of hybrid structural equation modeling-artificial neural network analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 935822. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.935822

Surapto, D., Suhud, U., & Wiradendi Wolor, C. (2024). Agile leadership: Enhancing trust, innovation ambidexterity, and job performance. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, *22*(2), 9759-9767. http://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00737

Syaifuddin, S., Lie, D., Lubis, F. R. A., Novirsari, E., & Nasib, N. (2024). The role of job satisfaction in mediating the relationship between family conflict, volunteer management, and employee performance at PT. Perkebunan Nusantara 3. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences, 11*(12), 180-191. http://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2024.12.020

Taylor, G. (2015). Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model. *Teaching Business & Economics, 19*(2), 7-9.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319-1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Udin, U. (2025). Agile leadership and employee outcomes: A bibliometric analysis for future research agenda. *Human Systems Management, 44*(2), 237-248.

Uman, T., Argento, D., Grossi, G., & Mattei, G. (2023). Supportive leadership and job satisfaction at the European Court of Auditors. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 90*(2), 454-473. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523231187275