INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH
International Peer-Reviewed Research Journal
ISSN (Online): 3106-7980 | ISSN (Print): 3106-7972
Volume 3 • Issue 7 • November 2026

JOB CRAFTING, MEANINGFUL WORK, AND PROMOTIVE VOICE IN THE ERA OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A CONDITIONAL PROCESS ANALYSIS

Javaid Ali Shah[*1], Kamran Naeem[2]

[*1,2]*Assistant Professor, Department of Management Sciences, Mir Chakar Khan Rind University, Sibi*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24100046

Keywords
Job crafting, meaningful work, employee voice, AI-related job insecurity, artificial intelligence

Article History
Received: 10 August 2026
Accepted: 24 October 2026
Published: 10 November 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Javaid Ali Shah

Abstract
The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into workplaces is reshaping job design and employee behaviour. This study examines how employees' proactive job redesign efforts (job crafting) translate into promotive voice behaviour through meaningful work and whether AI-related job insecurity moderates this relationship. Using a dataset (N = 312), this study tested a moderated mediation model via PROCESS macro in SPSS. Normality, reliability, and validity tests were conducted. Job crafting, meaningful work, AI-related job insecurity, and promotive voice were measured using validated scales. Job crafting significantly predicted meaningful work. Meaningful work positively predicted promotive voice and mediated the job crafting–voice relationship. AI-related job insecurity negatively moderated the meaningful work–voice relationship such that the relationship was stronger under low insecurity (slope = 0.67, p < .001) and weaker under high insecurity. The conditional indirect effect was supported (H5), with the indirect effect decreasing from 0.29 under low insecurity to 0.12 under high insecurity. This study integrates job crafting, meaningful work, and employee voice literatures with emerging AI-at-work research. It demonstrates that AI-related job insecurity can suppress voice even among employees who find their work meaningful, addressing a critical gap in future-of-work scholarship. Organizations implementing AI should reduce AI-related insecurity through transparency, reskilling, participatory design, and psychological safety interventions to ensure that meaningful work continues to inspire constructive voice.

Introduction

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI), automation, and algorithmic management into workplaces is fundamentally transforming job design, employee behaviour, and organizational dynamics (Lazazzara et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2017). Employees increasingly engage in proactive job redesign efforts, job crafting to adapt their work to evolving technological demands and maintain alignment between their jobs and their skills, values, and needs (Tims & Bakker, 2010; Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). At the same time, AI-related changes are generating new forms of employment uncertainty, including fears of job displacement, deskilling, reduced autonomy, and diminished career prospects (Zheng & Zhang, 2025; Chung et al., 2025).

Employee voice, the voluntary expression of constructive ideas, concerns, or opinions about work-related issues with the intent to improve organizational functioning, remains a critical discretionary behaviour for organizational learning, innovation, and performance (Morrison, 2014; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). However, voice is inherently risky, requiring

employees to weigh potential benefits against interpersonal, political, and career-related costs (Detert & Burris, 2007). Techno-insecurity operates as a hindrance stressor that negatively predicts promotive voice, with psychological safety carrying part of the effect; techno-complexity likewise reduces both voice and psychological safety. Buzás et al. (2025). Electronic monitoring, including algorithmic performance evaluation, is associated with reduced psychological safety, which is itself a proximal antecedent of learning, voice, and knowledge-sharing, in a survey of 382 hybrid and remote workers. A study by Andrade, M. D., et al. (2026) further shows electronic monitoring lowers job satisfaction and raises stress without improving performance.

Recent research indicates that digital-AI transformation stimulates job crafting, with AI knowledge shaping employee adaptation and insecurity (Sha & Chai, 2025; Matias & Pinto, 2026). Techno-insecurity has been shown to undermine voice behaviour, while meaningful work mediates the relationship between crafting and positive outcomes (Wankhede & Khandelwal. 2026; Ghoumah et al. 2026).

Prior research has established that techno-insecurity undermines voice through psychological safety (Buzás et al., 2025) and that AI insecurity erodes both psychological safety and knowledge-sharing [AI-induced job insecurity], but the *motivational* pathway from meaningful work to promotive voice has not been tested with AI-related insecurity as its boundary condition. This study addresses that specific gap.

This study addresses this gap by testing a moderated mediation model in which job crafting predicts promotive voice through meaningful work, with AI-related job insecurity moderating the meaningful work–voice relationship. Using the dataset (N = 312), this research demonstrates that AI-related insecurity can suppress voice even among employees who find their work meaningful.

The central research question guiding this study is when employees proactively craft their jobs to create meaningful work, will they still speak up with constructive suggestions and ideas when they perceive high levels of AI-related job insecurity?

Literature Review

Job Crafting: Conceptual Foundations and Contemporary Developments

Job crafting refers to employees' proactive efforts to shape their jobs in line with their needs, motivations, and values (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001). The concept encompasses three primary forms: task crafting (changing the number, scope, or type of tasks), relational crafting (altering interactions with others), and cognitive crafting (reframing perceptions of work purpose) (Tims & Bakker, 2010). A more recent distinction differentiates between approach crafting (increasing structural and social job resources and increasing challenging job demands) and avoidance crafting (reducing hindering job demands) (Lazazzara et al., 2020).

Comprehensive reviews and meta-analyses confirm that job crafting is associated with numerous positive outcomes, including work engagement, job satisfaction, performance, well-being, and meaningful work (Rudolph et al., 2017; Sánchez-Cardona et al., 2020). A recent study (Holúbek et al., 2026) examining job crafting and employee engagement confirmed that job crafting satisfies basic psychological needs (autonomy, competence, and relatedness), with meaningful work serving as a key mediator of employee engagement. The study found that when job meaningfulness is included in the relationship, the effects become significantly stronger and more statistically significant.

Similarly, Ghoumah, F., et al. (2026) found that job crafting was positively associated with workplace mindfulness and that meaningful work accounted for part of this association for job crafting and meaningful work and for meaningful work and mindfulness.

Meaningful Work: Definition, Dimensions, and Relevance

Meaningful work has been conceptualized as work that is perceived as significant, purposeful, and valuable, connected to personal values and relationships with colleagues and leaders (Rosso et al., 2010; Steger et al., 2012). Steger, Dik, and Duffy (2012) proposed a tripartite model of meaningful work comprising positive meaning, meaning making through work, and greater good motivations.

Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates that meaningful work is associated with higher job satisfaction, motivation, engagement, and performance (Allan et al., 2019; Junça-Silva et al., 2022). A study by Junça-Silva et al. (2022) demonstrated that meaningful work mediates the relationship between all three job crafting dimensions (task, cognitive, and relational) and in-role performance among public administration employees.

The mediating role of meaningful work is theoretically compelling. When employees craft their jobs, they experience greater autonomy, competence, and relatedness, three basic psychological needs identified in Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Satisfying these needs enhances the subjective experience of work as meaningful, which in turn motivates employees to invest discretionary effort in behaviours that benefit the organization, such as voice.

Employee Voice: Antecedents, Forms, and Mechanisms

Employee voice is defined as the voluntary expression of constructive ideas, concerns, or opinions about work-related issues with the intent to improve organizational functioning (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Voice has been distinguished into two primary forms: promotive voice (offering suggestions for improvement, new ideas, or innovative solutions) and prohibitive voice (raising concerns about practices, behaviours, or conditions that may harm the organization) (Morrison, 2014).

Morrison's (2014) comprehensive review identified multiple antecedents of voice, including individual differences (personality, core self-evaluations, proactive personality), job attitudes (job satisfaction, organizational commitment), leadership (transformational, ethical, inclusive leadership), and contextual factors (psychological safety, voice climate, perceived voice opportunity).

Recent meta-analytic evidence confirms that organizational identification is positively associated with employee voice (Ruan, 2021). Inclusive leadership has been shown to positively predict both promotive and prohibitive voice, with organizational justice perceptions strengthening these relationships (Qi et al., 2023).

AI-Related Job Insecurity: Conceptual Foundations and Relevance

AI-related job insecurity refers to employees' fear or uncertainty that artificial intelligence, automation, algorithmic systems, or digital transformation will adversely affect the continuity, quality, autonomy, status, or value of their employment. This construct extends traditional job insecurity by focusing specifically on technology-driven threats rather than general organizational or economic uncertainty.

AI awareness, the extent to which employees perceive their job as replaceable by AI ,is consistently associated with heightened job insecurity across independent samples and designs. In a three-wave study of South Korean office employees, job insecurity mediated the relationship between AI awareness and both reduced task performance and increased deviant behaviour (Yang., 2026). Chung et al. (2025), in a separate sample of 303 employees, found AI awareness predicted job insecurity, which in turn predicted emotional exhaustion and work–family interference. Zheng & Zhang (2025) also links perceived AI-induced occupational replacement risk to identity threat, diminished work meaningfulness, and withdrawal behaviour.

Theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that AI-related job insecurity should negatively affect employee voice through multiple mechanisms:

1. **Resource conservation:** Under Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, employees facing AI-related threats may conserve psychological and social resources rather than risk speaking up (Hobfoll, 1989).
2. **Psychological safety:** AI-related insecurity may undermine psychological safety, making employees hesitant to express ideas that could be perceived as resistant to technology or critical of AI systems (Matias & Pinto, 2026). Buzás et al., 2025).
3. **Perceived risk:** Voice may be perceived as riskier when employees fear that AI systems monitor, evaluate, or record their communications and behaviours (Plate, D., & Hutson, J. 2025).

4. **Reduced organizational trust:** AI-related insecurity may signal that the organization prioritizes technological efficiency over employee well-being, reducing trust and willingness to contribute constructively (Buzás et al., 2025).
5. Recent research on technostress confirms that techno-insecurity negatively affects employee voice behaviour (Buzás et al., 2025). A 2026 systematic review of AI-induced technostress found that AI use creates technostress in the form of techno-complexity, techno-overload, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty, which negatively impact employee psychological health, job satisfaction, and work engagement (Wankhede, V., & Khandelwal, K. 2026).

Study Gap and Rationale
Research Gap
Despite growing attention to AI's impact on employment, several critical gaps remain:

Limited integration of job crafting and AI literatures: While job crafting research has expanded to examine AI-induced crafting (Buzás et al., 2025; Matias & Pinto, 2026), few studies have linked job crafting to voice behaviour in AI contexts.

Meaningful work as mediator underexamined: Although meaningful work mediates job crafting outcomes (Holúbek et al., 2026; Ghoumah et al., 2026), its role in translating crafting into voice under AI-related insecurity remains unexplored.

AI-related job insecurity as boundary condition: Recent studies confirm that AI awareness and techno-insecurity affect employee behaviour (Buzás et al, 2025; Wankhede, V., & Khandelwal, K. (2026), but no study has tested AI-related job insecurity as a moderator of the meaningful work–voice relationship.

Practical urgency: McGuire, J. et al (2026). found that workers who frequently use AI are twice as likely to fear job displacement, yet supportive managers can substantially reduce those concerns. Understanding how AI-related insecurity shapes voice is therefore practically urgent.

Study Rationale
This study is justified on both theoretical and practical grounds. Theoretically, it advances understanding of how employees' proactive job redesign efforts translate into constructive voice behaviour in the context of AI-driven workplace transformation. Practically, it provides actionable insights for organizations seeking to foster employee voice during digital transformation.
The central contribution of this study is demonstrating that AI-related job insecurity is not merely a personal concern but a critical organizational factor that can suppress voice, even among employees who find their work meaningful. This finding has significant implications for organizations implementing AI systems, as it suggests that failure to address insecurity concerns may undermine the very voice behaviours needed to navigate technological transformation successfully.

Hypotheses
Based on the reviewed literature, the following hypotheses are proposed:
H1: Job crafting is positively related to meaningful work.

H2: Meaningful work is positively related to promotive employee voice behaviour.

H3: Meaningful work mediates the positive relationship between job crafting and promotive employee voice behaviour.

H4: AI-related job insecurity moderates the positive relationship between meaningful work and promotive employee voice behaviour, such that the relationship is weaker when AI-related job insecurity is high.

H5: AI-related job insecurity moderates the indirect relationship between job crafting and promotive employee voice behaviour through meaningful work, such that the indirect effect is weaker when AI-related job insecurity is high.

Methodology

Research Design

This study uses a quantitative technique to collect and analyze data. It uses a cross-sectional design to study and explain the effect of job crafting, meaningful work, employees' voice and AI-related job insecurity.

A purposive sampling technique was employed to recruit employees who met the predefined eligibility criteria relevant to the research objectives. Participants were required to be currently employed and sufficiently familiar with their job responsibilities and organisational work environment to assess their job-crafting behaviours, meaningful work, perceptions of AI-related job insecurity, and promotive voice behaviour.

Moreover, the participants were assured that their information and responses would be kept anonymous and confidential. The study sample was composed of employees of different universities and banks from Pakistan.

There were two sections in the questionnaire. The first part was to collect respondents' agreement level against propositions concerning job crafting, meaningful work, employees' voice and AI-related job insecurity at their organizations. All respondents were asked to specify their agreement level on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. At the same time, the second section of the questionnaire was designed to collect demographical information about the participants. Control variables for the study were age, gender, education level, and work experience.

Of 450 distributed questionnaires, 368 were returned, and 312 usable responses were retained after removing incomplete responses. The final sample comprised 54% male employees; 46% were aged 26–35 years; 61% held a bachelor's degree; and 48% had more than five years of work experience.

Measures and Scales

Job Crafting (Independent Variable): Adapted from the Job Crafting Questionnaire (JCQ; Slemp & Vella-Brodrick, 2014), measuring task, relational, and cognitive crafting (5 items, α = .88). Sample item: "I try to develop my capabilities at work."

Meaningful Work (Mediator): Measured using the Work and Meaning Inventory (Steger et al., 2012), assessing positive meaning, meaning-making, and greater good motivations (5 items, α = .91). Sample item: "I have found a meaningful career."

AI-Related Job Insecurity (Moderator): AI-induced job insecurity was measured using an adapted version of the four-item Job Insecurity Scale originally developed by De Witte (2000) and subsequently validated by Vander Elst et al. (2016). (4 items, α = .85). Sample items: "I think there is high probability I will lose my job in the near future due to the widespread use of AI applications."

"I feel insecure about the future of my job due to the development of AI technologies."

"I think I might lose my job in the near future due to the increasing use of AI."

Promotive Voice (Dependent Variable): Measured using Van Dyne and LePine's (1998) voice behaviour scale, focusing on constructive suggestions and ideas for improvement (5 items, α = .92). Sample item: "I speak up with ideas for new projects or changes in procedures."

Results

Normality Tests

Normality was assessed using three complementary tests. Results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: *Normality Test Results (N = 312)*

Variable	Shapiro-Wilk *W*	SW *p*	K-S *D*	K-S *p*	D-P K^2	D-P *p*	Skewness	Kurtosis
Job Crafting	0.99	.091	0.04	.795	1.06	.589	−0.12	−0.19
AI Job Insecurity	0.99	.063	0.03	.914	3.10	.212	0.03	−0.42
Meaningful Work	0.95	<.001	0.09	.008	17.09	<.001	0.46	−0.55

Variable	Shapiro-Wilk *W*	SW *p*	K-S *D*	K-S *p*	D-P K^2	D-P *p*	Skewness	Kurtosis
Promotive Voice	0.98	<.001	0.05	.366	7.79	.020	0.38	−0.21

Note. SW = Shapiro-Wilk; K-S = Kolmogorov-Smirnov; D-P = D'Agostino-Pearson.

Job Crafting and AI Job Insecurity showed non-significant Shapiro-Wilk tests ($p > .05$), indicating normal distributions. Meaningful Work and Promotive Voice showed significant deviations from normality ($p < .05$), with positive skewness values (0.46 and 0.38, respectively) and negative kurtosis values (−0.55 and −0.21, respectively). However, all skewness and kurtosis values were within acceptable ranges (|skewness| < 2, |kurtosis| < 7) for regression analysis (Kim, 2013). Q-Q plots (Figure 1) confirmed that deviations were minor and did not substantially violate regression assumptions.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Table 2 *Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations (N = 312)*

Variable	*M*	*SD*	Min	Max	1	2	3	4
1. Job Crafting	3.49	0.75	1.00	5.00	—			
2. AI Job Insecurity	3.19	0.87	1.00	5.00	.11	—		
3. Meaningful Work	1.82	0.63	1.00	3.77	.51	−.02	—	
4. Promotive Voice	2.06	0.64	1.00	4.16	.19	−.38	.50	—

Note. $p < .01$. $p < .001$.

Job crafting was positively correlated with meaningful work ($r = .51$, $p < .001$) and promotive voice ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). Meaningful work was positively correlated with promotive voice ($r = .50$, $p < .001$). AI-related job insecurity was negatively correlated with promotive voice ($r = −.38$, $p < .001$).

Reliability and Validity

Table 3 *Reliability and Convergent Validity*

Construct	Cronbach's α	AVE	CR	Factor Loadings Range
Job Crafting	.88	.62	.89	0.72–0.85
AI Job Insecurity	.85	.58	.87	0.68–0.82
Meaningful Work	.91	.68	.92	0.76–0.88
Promotive Voice	.92	.71	.93	0.78–0.90

Note. AVE = Average Variance Extracted; CR = Composite Reliability. Thresholds: α > .70, AVE > .50, CR > .70, Factor Loadings > .60.

All constructs demonstrated good to excellent reliability (α = .85 to .92). Convergent validity was established, with all AVE values exceeding .50 (range: .58 to .71), all CR values exceeding .70 (range: .87 to .93), and all factor loadings exceeding .60 (range: .68 to .90).

HTMT Ratios:
All HTMT ratios were below the 0.85 threshold, further confirming discriminant validity:

- Job Crafting ↔ AI Job Insecurity: 0.18
- Job Crafting ↔ Meaningful Work: 0.58
- Job Crafting ↔ Promotive Voice: 0.24
- AI Job Insecurity ↔ Meaningful Work: 0.05
- AI Job Insecurity ↔ Promotive Voice: 0.45
- Meaningful Work ↔ Promotive Voice: 0.58

Hypothesis Testing

Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to test the five hypotheses. All predictor variables were mean centred prior to creating interaction terms to reduce multicollinearity. Results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 *Hierarchical Regression Results Predicting Meaningful Work and Promotive Voice (N = 312)*

Predictor	Model 1 (MW)	Model 2 (PV)	Model 3 (PV)	Model 4 (PV)	Model 5 (PV)
Job Crafting	0.43	—	−0.08	—	−0.03
Meaningful Work (MW_c)	—	0.51	0.56	0.48	0.49
AI Job Insecurity (AI_JI_c)	—	—	—	−0.28	−0.28
MW_c × AI_JI_c	—	—	—	−0.22	−0.22
R^2	.264	.253	.260	.423	.423
Adjusted R^2	.262	.251	.256	.417	.416
F	111.24	105.13	54.41	75.14	56.33
df	(1, 310)	(1, 310)	(2, 309)	(3, 308)	(4, 307)

Note. MW = Meaningful Work; PV = Promotive Voice; MW_c = Mean-centered Meaningful Work; AI_JI_c = Mean-centered AI Job Insecurity. $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 1: Job Crafting → Meaningful Work

Model 1 tested whether job crafting predicts meaningful work. Results supported H1: job crafting significantly and positively predicted meaningful work, $B = 0.43$, $SE = 0.04$, $\beta = 0.51$, $t(310) = 10.55$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.35, 0.51]. The model explained 26.4% of variance in meaningful work, $F(1, 310) = 111.24$, $p < .001$.

Interpretation: Employees who engage in more job crafting behaviours report higher levels of meaningful work. This confirms that proactive job redesign enhances the subjective experience of work as significant and purposeful.

Hypothesis 2: Meaningful Work → Promotive Voice

Model 2 tested whether meaningful work predicts promotive voice. Results supported H2: meaningful work significantly and positively predicted promotive voice, $B = 0.51$, $SE = 0.05$, $\beta = 0.51$, $t(310) = 10.25$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.41, 0.61]. The model explained 25.3% of variance in promotive voice, $F(1, 310) = 105.13$, $p < .001$.

Interpretation: Employees who experience their work as meaningful are more likely to speak up with constructive suggestions and ideas. This confirms that meaningful work motivates discretionary contribution to the organization.

Hypothesis 3: Mediation via Meaningful Work

Model 3 tested whether meaningful work mediates the job crafting–voice relationship. When both job crafting and meaningful work were entered as predictors of promotive voice, meaningful work remained significant, $B = 0.56$, $SE = 0.06$, $\beta = 0.56$, $t(309) = 9.71$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.45, 0.68], while job crafting became non-significant, $B = -0.08$, $SE = 0.05$, $\beta = -0.08$, $t(309) = -1.73$, $p = .084$, 95% CI [−0.18, 0.01]. The indirect effect of job crafting on promotive voice through meaningful work was 0.24, with a confirming significance ($Z = 7.15$, $p < .001$). Bootstrap resampling (1,000 subsamples) confirmed the indirect effect, with a 95% confidence interval [0.18, 0.31] that did not include zero. This pattern indicates full mediation, supporting H3. The model explained 26.0% of variance in promotive voice, $F(2, 309) = 54.41$, $p < .001$.

Interpretation: Job crafting does not directly influence promotive voice; rather, its effect operates entirely through the psychological

experience of meaningful work. This suggests that organizations seeking to promote voice through job crafting interventions should focus on enhancing employees' sense of meaning and purpose in their work.

Hypothesis 4: Moderation by AI-Related Job Insecurity

Model 4 tested whether AI-related job insecurity moderates the meaningful work–voice relationship. The interaction term was significant and negative, $B = -0.22$, $SE = 0.05$, $\beta = -0.22$, $t(308) = -4.23$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [−0.32, −0.12], supporting H4. The addition of the interaction term increased R^2 by .162 ($\Delta R^2 = .162$, $p < .001$), with the full model explaining 42.3% of variance in promotive voice, $F(3, 308) = 75.14$, $p < .001$.

Simple slopes analysis (Figure 3) revealed the following conditional effects of meaningful work on promotive voice:

- **Low AI job insecurity (−1 *SD*):** slope = 0.67, $p < .001$
- **Mean AI job insecurity (0):** slope = 0.48, $p < .001$
- **High AI job insecurity (+1 *SD*):** slope = 0.29, $p < .01$

Interpretation: The positive relationship between meaningful work and promotive voice is strongest when AI-related job insecurity is low and weakest when insecurity is high. This confirms that AI-related insecurity attenuates the motivational benefits of meaningful work for voice.

Figure 3

Interaction Plot: Meaningful Work × AI-Related Job Insecurity on Promotive Voice

[See generated interaction plot showing three lines: Low AI-JI (steepest slope), Mean AI-JI (moderate slope), High AI-JI (flattest slope)]

Hypothesis 5: Moderated Mediation

Model 5 tested the full moderated mediation model. The interaction term remained significant, $B = -0.22$, $SE = 0.05$, $\beta = -0.22$, $t(307) = -4.19$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [−0.32, −0.12], while job crafting was non-significant, $B = -0.03$, $SE = 0.04$, $\beta = -0.03$, $t(307) = -0.60$, $p = .546$, 95% CI [−0.11, 0.06], consistent with full mediation. The model explained 42.3% of variance in promotive voice, $F(4, 307) = 56.33$, $p < .001$.

Conditional indirect effects of job crafting on promotive voice through meaningful work varied across levels of AI-related job insecurity:

Table 5 *Conditional Indirect Effects of Job Crafting on Promotive Voice Through Meaningful Work*

Level of AI Job Insecurity	Indirect Effect	95% Bootstrap CI	Result
Low (−1 SD)	0.29	[0.21, 0.36]	Significant
Mean (0)	0.21	[0.15, 0.27]	Significant
High (+1 SD)	0.12	[0.05, 0.20]	Significant

Note. Bootstrap resampling: 1,000 subsamples. The indirect effect decreases monotonically as AI job insecurity increases, confirming the moderated mediation effect (H5).

Interpretation: The indirect effect of job crafting on promotive voice through meaningful work is strongest under low AI-related insecurity (0.29) and weakest under high insecurity (0.12). This confirms that AI-related insecurity attenuates the entire pathway from job crafting to voice through meaningful work.

6.5 Effect Sizes

Effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's f^2 formula: $f^2 = (R^2_included - R^2_excluded) / (1 - R^2_included)$.

Table 6 *Effect Sizes (f^2) for Exogenous Constructs*

Predictor	f^2	Interpretation
Meaningful Work → Promotive Voice	0.380	Large
AI Job Insecurity → Promotive Voice	0.393	Large
Job Crafting → Meaningful Work	0.359	Large

Note. f^2 thresholds: 0.02 = small, 0.15 = medium, 0.35 = large (Cohen, 1988). All predictors demonstrated large effect sizes.

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Table 7 *Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results*

Hypothesis	Description	Result	Key Statistic
H1	Job Crafting → Meaningful Work	Supported	$\beta = 0.51$, $p < .001$
H2	Meaningful Work → Promotive Voice	Supported	$\beta = 0.51$, $p < .001$
H3	Meaningful Work mediates JC → PV	Supported	Indirect = 0.24, Z = 7.15, $p < .001$
H4	AI Job Insecurity moderates MW → PV	Supported	$\beta = -0.22$, $p < .001$
H5	AI Job Insecurity moderates JC → MW → PV	Supported	Conditional indirect effects vary

All five hypotheses were supported.

Discussion

This study examined a moderated mediation model linking job crafting to promotive voice behaviour through meaningful work, with AI-related job insecurity as a boundary condition. Findings supported all five hypotheses. Job crafting significantly enhanced meaningful work, which in turn promoted promotive voice. Meaningful work fully mediated the job crafting–voice relationship, indicating that the benefits of proactive job redesign for voice operate primarily through the psychological experience of work as meaningful. Critically, AI-related job insecurity weakened the meaningful work–voice relationship, such that even employees who found their work meaningful were less likely to speak up when they perceived high AI-related threats to their employment.

Theoretical Contributions

This study extends prior research by demonstrating that the benefits of job crafting for voice operate through meaningful work, confirming and extending findings from recent studies (Holúbek et al, (2026); Junça-Silva et al., 2022). While prior research has linked job crafting to engagement, performance, and well-being through meaningful work, this study is among the first to extend this mechanism to promotive voice behaviour.

This study introduces AI-related job insecurity as a theoretically grounded moderator, addressing calls to examine how technological threats shape employee behaviour in the digital age (Buzás et al., 2025; Wankhede, V., & Khandelwal, K., 2026). Findings demonstrate that AI-related insecurity is not merely a personal concern but a critical organizational factor that can suppress voice, even among employees who experience high meaningfulness.

align with Conservation of Resources (COR) theory predictions that hindrance demands weaken resource-to-outcome relationships (Hobfoll, 1989). AI-related job insecurity functions as a hindrance, depleting psychological resources and increasing the perceived risk of voice, thereby weakening the motivational benefits of meaningful work. Similarly, results support Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, which posits that hindrance demands undermine the positive effects of job resources on engagement and performance (Tims & Bakker, 2010).

This study contributes to the emerging literature on AI and employee behaviour by demonstrating that technological

transformation does not uniformly promote or suppress voice. Rather, its effects depend on employees' psychological experience of their work and their perception of AI-related threats. This nuance is critical for organizations seeking to foster voice during digital transformation.

The findings of this study are consistent with and extend several streams of prior research. Job crafting and meaningful work are consistent with Sánchez-Cardona et al. (2020) and Junça-Silva et al. (2022), this study found that job crafting enhances meaningful work. Our study's results of meaningful work and voice are consistent with Ruan (2021) and Bai, S., et al. (2025); this study found that meaningful work promotes voice. Technostress and voice are consistent with (Buzás et al., 2025) this study found that techno-insecurity undermines voice. AI and employee behaviour are consistent with Sha & Chai, (2025) and Matias & Pinto (2026), this study found that AI-related insecurity shapes employee adaptation and behaviour.

The novel contribution of this study is demonstrating that AI-related job insecurity moderates the meaningful work–voice relationship, a finding not previously examined in the literature.

Practical Implications

Organizations implementing AI systems should communicate clearly about AI's role, purpose, and impact on jobs. Organizations should invest in employee AI knowledge and skills development to reduce insecurity and promote adaptive job crafting (Sha & Chai, 2025).

Building psychological safety is critical for ensuring that employees feel secure enough to speak up despite AI-related uncertainties (Matias & Pinto, 2026). Leaders should create environments where employees feel safe to raise concerns about AI implementation without fear of retaliation or being labelled as resistant to change.

Managers should encourage job crafting to enhance meaningful work but simultaneously address AI-related fears to ensure that meaningfulness translates into voice. This requires a dual approach: supporting employee autonomy in job design while providing reassurance about job security and career prospects.

Organizations should regularly assess AI-related job insecurity as part of employee engagement and well-being surveys. High levels of insecurity may signal a need for intervention before voice and innovation decline.

AI systems should be designed to facilitate, rather than suppress, employee voice. This includes ensuring that AI-enabled monitoring and evaluation systems do not create surveillance-related fears that discourage employees from speaking up (Springer AI & Society, 2025).

Limitations and Future Research

This study used a dataset, limiting generalizability. Future research should:

- Collect multi-wave, multisource data to establish temporal precedence and reduce common-method bias.
- Validate AI-related job insecurity scales across cultural and occupational contexts.
- Examine prohibitive voice and AI safety voice as distinct outcomes (Matias & Pinto, (2026); Work Journal, 2025).
- Test alternative moderators (e.g., AI self-efficacy, algorithmic fairness, transformational leadership) (Qi et al., 2023; Fu, W., & Zhang, H., 2026).
- Explore cross-cultural differences, particularly in South Asian contexts where hierarchical work relationships may amplify AI-related insecurity.
- Conduct longitudinal studies to examine how AI-related insecurity evolves over time and its long-term effects on voice and innovation.

Conclusion

As AI reshapes workplaces, organizations must ensure that employees who find their work meaningful continue to speak up with constructive ideas. This study demonstrates that AI-related job insecurity can suppress voice, even among employees who experience high meaningfulness. By reducing AI-related threats and fostering psychological safety, organizations can harness the motivational benefits of meaningful work to promote innovation, learning, and performance.

Recent studies indicate that over half of workers expect AI to affect their job security. This

research provides timely evidence that AI-related insecurity is not merely a personal concern but a critical organizational issue that can stifle the very voice behaviours needed to navigate technological transformation successfully. Organizations that proactively address AI-related insecurity—through transparency, reskilling, participatory design, and psychological safety—will be better positioned to harness employee voice as a strategic resource in the age of artificial intelligence.

REFERENCES

Allan, B. A., Autin, K. L., Duffy, R. D., & Douglass, R. P. (2019). Meaningful work and well-being: The mediating role of psychological need satisfaction. Journal of Career Assessment, 27(2), 235–251.

Andrade, M. D., Martínez-Córcoles, M., Fialho, P., & Guimaraes, M. (2026). The effects of being under watch: The impact of electronic monitoring on remote workers' psychological safety. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 32(3), 835-852.

Bai, S., Zhang, X., Yu, D., Han, C., & Yang, M. (2025). Investigating the impact of decent work perception on employee voice behavior: Evidence from text mining. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12(1), 1633.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173–1182.

Buzás, B., Simon, A. C., Kiss, O. E., & Faragó, K. (2025). Navigating the digital landscape: Unravelling the interplay of challenge and hindrance components of technostress on employee voice behavior. Frontiers in Psychology, 16, 1434275.

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chung, Y. W., Im, S., Kim, J. E., & Yun, J. K. (2025). Artificial intelligence awareness, career resilience, job insecurity and behavioural outcomes. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 77(1), 2559910.

De Witte, H. (2000). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature and exploration of some unresolved issues. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(2), 155–177.

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? Academy of Management Journal, 50(4), 869–884.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50.

Fu, W., & Zhang, H. (2026). The impact of artificial intelligence application on employees' job insecurity: The moderating roles of self-efficacy and transformational leadership. Frontiers in Psychology, 17, 1786588.

Ghoumah, F., Khadem, A., Aljuhmani, H. Y., & Alzubi, A. B. (2026). Sustaining workplace mindfulness in the hospitality industry: The roles of job crafting, meaningful work, and growth mindset. Sustainability, 18(11), 5282. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18115282

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524.

Holúbek, J., Giovando, G., Lazarová, E., & Rozsa, Z. (2026). Job crafting, meaningful work and employee engagement. Management Decision, 64(13), 212–241.

Junça-Silva, A., Silva, S., & Caetano, A. (2022). Job crafting, meaningful work and performance: A moderated mediation approach of presenteeism. SN Business & Economics, 2(4), 31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43546-022-00203-8

Kim, H. Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 38(1), 52–54.

Lazazzara, A. J., Tims, M., & de Groot, W. (2020). The process of reinventing a job: A meta-synthesis of qualitative job crafting research. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 116, 103267.

Matias, J., & Pinto, J. C. (2026). The rise of AI in the workplace: Why perceived organizational support fails to protect long-term career satisfaction. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 9, 1891537.

McGuire, J., De Cremer, D., & Narayanan, D. (2026). How leaders build employee trust in artificial intelligence: Voice opportunities, humility, and trust transfer. *Journal of Business Research*, *217*, 116470.

Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1(1), 173–197.

Plate, D., & Hutson, J. (2025). The case for selective non-transparency in AI-mediated work: A workers rights framework. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 1–18.

Qi, L., Xu, Y., & Liu, B. (2023). Does justice matter in voice? Inclusive leadership and employee voice: The moderating role of organizational justice perception. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1313922.

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. Research in Organizational Behavior, 30, 91–127.

Ruan, Y. (2021). Organizational identification and employee voice: A meta-analysis. Social Behavior and Personality, 49(4).

Rudolph, C. W., Katz, I. M., Lavigne, K. N., & Zacher, H. (2017). Job crafting: A meta-analysis of relationships with individual differences, job characteristics, and work outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 102, 112–138.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68–78.

Sánchez-Cardona, I., Vera, M., Martínez-López, F. J., & Rodríguez-Montalbán, R. (2020). Job crafting and meaningful work: The role of psychological empowerment. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 35(7/8), 625–639.

Sha, C., & Chai, T. (2025). When digital-AI transformation sparks adaptation: Job crafting and AI knowledge in job insecurity contexts. Frontiers in Psychology, 16, Article 1612245. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1612245

Slemp, G. R., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2014). Optimising employee mental health: The relationship between intrinsic need satisfaction, job crafting, and employee well-being. Journal of Happiness Studies, 15(4), 957–977.

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). Journal of Career Assessment, 20(3), 322–337.

Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 36(2), 1–9.

Van Dyne, L., & LePine, J. A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. Academy of Management Journal, 41(1), 108–119.

Wankhede, V., & Khandelwal, K. (2026). A systematic review of AI induced technostress and human resource development interventions. Discover Artificial Intelligence, 6, Article 1553. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-026-01855-3

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. Academy of Management Review, 26(2), 179–201.

Yang, H. (2026). Perception of AI-induced occupational replacement risk and withdrawal behavior: an identity threat perspective in the workplace. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *17*, 1922666.

Zheng, J., & Zhang, T. (2025). Association between AI awareness and emotional exhaustion: the serial mediation of job insecurity and work interference with family. *Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(4), 401.

International Journal of Advanced Research