



EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF LEARNING AGILITY ON CAREER ADAPTABILITY THROUGH WORKFORCE AGILITY IN THE BANKING SECTOR

Amal Almas ¹, Muhammad Ikram Khan Afridi ², Syed Kausar Ali Shah ³

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.63544/jbii.v5i10.239>

Affiliations:

¹ Student, Business Administration,
TMUC

Email: amalkhanwazire@gmail.com

² PhD Scholar, Department of
Management Sciences, Fata University,
Dara Adam Khel, FR Kohat
Email: ikram.afridi007@gmail.com

³ Department of Business Administration,
Sindh Madressatul Islam University,
City Campus, Karachi
Email: kshah1101101@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0831-3015>

Corresponding Author's Email:

¹ amalkhanwazire@gmail.com

Copyright:

Author/s

License:



Article History:

Received: 30.08.2026

Accepted: 20.09.2026

Published: 02.10.2026

Abstract

In this study, learning agility and its influence on career adaptability among banking employees was explored, in relation to workforce agility. The study employed a quantitative approach consisting of cross-sectional type which was conducted in the collection of the data in this study, the researcher used a structured questionnaire with respondents being 300 employees in the banking field. Openness to learning, learning from experience, feedback seeking, adaptability to new situations, and application of new knowledge were assessed as facets of learning agility. Workforce agility was measured as adaptability, proactivity, flexibility, responsiveness to change and resilience; and career adaptability was measured as career concern, control, curiosity and confidence. The proposed relationships were tested using descriptive and mediation analyses. The results indicated the learning agility ($M = 3.82$; $SD = 0.64$), workforce agility ($M = 3.76$; $SD = 0.67$) and career adaptability ($M = 3.88$; $SD = 0.61$) each had a mean score. The direct effects of learning agility on workforce agility were 0.62 and the effect of workforce agility on career adaptability was 0.44. The low direct effect of learning agility on career adaptability ($e=0.27$) was also observed. The indirect effect on the workforce agility was 0.34 with the 95% bootstrap confidence interval of 0.27-0.42, which failed to include zero. The results showed that the effect of Career Adaptability was fully mediated by Workforce Agility. The study emphasized the need for employees' learning and adaptability at work in order to give effective adjustment to the career in banking sector.

Keywords: Career Adaptability, Banking Sector, Learning Agility, Mediation, Workforce Agility, Workplace Adaptability

1. Introduction

The banking industry was rapidly becoming different: technological advancements, digital banking, customer banking needs, competition and new banking structures were all driving the change of the banking job market. Not only were teachers being introduced to new technologies, but new processes of work, new tasks, new services were also being introduced, in addition to the growing need for professional development. All this put greater demands on employee learning quickly and putting new knowledge into practice where they didn't know it. In this way, the concept of learning agility was a significant individual capability as it reflected employees' willingness to learn and accept new experiences, their willingness to embrace new change and transfer knowledge they learnt to a new context. Learning agility was usefully relevant to employees in business organizations, particularly in those with a dynamic character or those that constantly change, and in the latter, employees were required to learn to quickly, effectively and proactively, Ghosh et al. (2021) found. According to Milani et al. (2024), the Learning agility can be defined as an individual



difference that can be used for the skill acquisition, attitude to change and adaptability in challenging situations of human being/human resources.

There was a strong linkage between workforce agility and rising importance of learning agility. Workforce agility was translated into the ability of the labourers to respond and behave appropriately and proactively to changes in the character of work, stress and risk which were referred to as adaptability, proactivity and resilience. Petermann and Zacher (2022) were able to develop and test a multidimensional measure of workforce agility and find work agility to be a measure of the employee's agility in meeting changing and uncertain work demands. Alviani et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of 74 studies, which revealed that workforce agility had been used as an independent variable, a mediating variable, an independent and dependent variable, and agility attributes of adaptability, proactivity and resilience were the central dimensions of workforce agility. These findings revealed that indeed "workforce agility" was not the only indicator of "greater speed of task performance" but it also required the "agile behaviour" of the employees as a response to the needs of the organization. In particular, the results of Muduli and Choudhury (2026) showed that digital technology through workforce agility had significant mediation on the digital technology acceptance–digital technology outcomes correlation among banking employees of India.

The ability to respond to changes in the workplace was another important workplace asset for employees. To be able to do career transitions with concern, control, curiosity and confidence; to be able to do career changes with these tools; to be able to do different jobs with these tools; to be able to handle potential career blocks with these; etc. The results indicated that career adaptability is related to two career outcomes: proactive and positive. Thivierge et al. (2023) contended that career adaptability was a factor in explaining how employees react to the uncertainty and change in the workplace to create proactive work behaviours. Coetzee et al. (2023) further found that agile learning and career agility resources were linked to a constellation of career agility resources that in turn was linked to career resilience and career satisfaction. The banking case was also relevant evidence. Kaur and Kaur (2020) employed three-wave data from Indian banking employees and found correlation between career adaptability and job outcomes through person-job fit perception of the employees.

1.1 Background of the Study

Banking services' delivery and operation were a particular sector that had undergone digital transformation, and there was also a need for adaptability in the banking industry in order to prepare employees. Technology — e-platforms, automation, mobile apps, analytics, artificial intelligence, and shifting customer expectations — have transformed the nature of bank jobs. Customer expectations, data-driven decision making, artificial intelligence, mobile banking, automated systems, and digital platforms have redefined bank jobs. Staff members were discovering the need to maintain their skills, gain knowledge of new technologies, adapt to new procedures and adjust to new customer and business requirements. Muduli and Choudhury (2026) examined the Indian bank industry and uncovered agility in the workforce as a key linkage between the adoption of technology and the results of digital technology in the banking sector.

The context gave rise to contexts that once-learned knowledge may be insufficient, thereby making learning agility more salient as a skill in the context of the workplace. The findings of Ghosh et al. (2021) revealed that other organizational variables such as e-learning technology and organization culture were related to learning agility and further explained that continuous learning is a necessity to facilitate employees' adaptability. Milani et al. (2024) also developed and validated an ILA item-total psychometric analysis consisting of 11 items to measure ILA and demonstrated the validity of measuring ILA for several career level occupations and across cultures. Ibrahim et al. (2026) has conducted a study for 307 nurses and hypothesize that learning agility is positively predictive for career adaptability, and a mediating variable between digital competence and career adaptability.

One potential behavioural pathway that might result in the emergence of learning capabilities as adaptive responses at work was workforce agility. But being reactive and able to learn something new or pick up a new skill or ability was not enough, as whether or not they transferred the new knowledge and skill to their workplace in an agile and resilient manner makes a significant difference in regard to organizational



effectiveness. Petermann and Zacher (2022) defined workforce agility as the response of individuals in the workforce to changes in their work demands while Alviani et al. (2024) showed that the discussion of workforce-agility has begun to concentrate on adaptability, proactivity and resilience. Another finding in the study on career adaptability, with the references provided by other respondents, is that the employees' career adaptability resources was an impacting factor in the employees' response to career transition situations. Kumi et al. (2024) found that there was a higher correlation between boundary integration and job crafting when career adaptability and the employees' adapting behaviours in the workplace were stronger. Coetzee et al. (2023) demonstrated a positive relationship between career adaptability resources, career resilience and agile learning.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

1. To compare and contrast between learning agility and career adaptability of employees in the banking industry.
2. To analyse learning and workforce agility in the banking industry.
3. To explore how agile and adaptable the workforce is to move up careers in the banking industry.
4. To examine the mediating role of workforce agility between learning agility and career adaptability.

1.3 Research Questions

RQ1. The relationship of learning agility and career adaptability among the banking sector employees was investigated.

RQ2. How is learning agility associated with workforce agility for banking-sector workers?

RQ3. How were the careers of banking-sector employees related to workforce agility?

RQ4. Was there a mediating effect of workforce agility between the constructs of learning agility and career adaptability?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study was important because findings in the study contributed to an integrated understanding of how learning agility helped in making people more career adaptable in the banking sector through workforce agility. It was useful to provide an explanation of how an employee's capacity to learn from new experiences, gain new skills, meet changing demands and apply knowledge in unfamiliar situations may enable them to adapt to changing career needs. For banking organizations, the study was also relevant given the technological advancement, digital transformation, evolving customer expectations, and new job responsibilities, which made it necessary to create flexible, responsive employees. The study explored workforce agility as a intermediary and offered practical implications for human resource managers to consider when developing training, development and career support programs to equip employees with the skills and abilities to learn and adapt. The results can also help staff develop an appreciation of the value of lifelong learning, initiative, and flexibility in career transitions. From an academic perspective, the study helped advance the body of knowledge by merging learning agility, workforce agility, and career adaptability in one study and served as a basis for future research in other industrial areas and environments.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Learning Agility and Employee Development

With an organization that's constantly evolving, adapting job requirements and accepting new technologies, learning agility became more of a required employee characteristic. Interpretation was that it was written about how one is willing to learn from one's experience, be open to new experience, pick up new information, and transfer learning from the past to a new circumstance. The results of new publications showed that learning agility is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, rather than a learning-related trait. Reyes et al. (2024) reviewed 20 years of research on learning agility and concluded this emergence of a convergence between a new understanding of learning agility and individual development, leadership, talent management, and a changing landscape of work was unfolding in the field. Nayak and Malik (2024) pinpointed learning agility as a key part of their organization in uncertain situations and proposed a comprehensive learning agility framework that links the pre- and post-factors to mediators.



More research was undertaken on the measurement and development of learning agility. An increasing interest in the study of learning agility was shown in terms of measurement and development. In Smith and Watkins (2024) research on the learning-agility measures (LAM) they reviewed found that there was a significant amount of variation when it comes to conceptual specification and operationalisation of the construct, thus highlighting an ongoing need for a reliable and theoretically unified measure of learning-agility. Ostrowska and Chruszczewski (2023) created a questionnaire measuring learning-agility's dimensions (mental agility, change agility, people agility and results agility) and conducted empirical assessments of these dimensions among employees, yielding good psychometric values. These studies suggested that there is a cognitive and behavioural component to learning agility, and that it is a curriculum mini-activity and can be separately studied for their use in business to adjust to change. In this post COVID time of great uncertainty, Peng et al. (2022) also concluded that for learning profession staff, learning agility seems to be relevant; pointing out that the ability of a learning & development professional to learn and adapt their work, when things around learning change.

Learning agility was also used to measure with employee behaviour, organizational adaptation, and others. Bagdžiūnienė and Dzimidienė (2022) proved that there was a correlation between work agility and self-efficacy when it came to employee innovative behaviour: When employees can easily get used to and adapt to different working environments, they can also be innovative at work. The relationships between enterprise social-media use and 'agility of employees mediated via communication-related pathways' were all reported by Pitafi et al. (2021) which indicated that information and communication environments within the workplace may offer opportunities for employees to respond to shifting workplace demands.

2.2 Reports on Workforce Agility and Adaptive Work Behaviour

Market workers' quick thinking and agility enabled them to react and act quickly and appropriately to changing conditions of work, new needs and unanticipated challenges. Recent literature began to differentiate between the agility of the workforce and that of the organisation as such, by drawing attention to the fact that workforce is one of the key actors in the process of adapting and responding of the organisation. The research on employees under the theme of agility (Salmen & Festing, 2022) defines employee-agility as the capability of the employees to learn, flex and adapt to varying requirements of their work. Their review also emphasized the significance of HR practices in creating the agility among employees, which implies the systems could shape an employee's ability to adjust to novel requirements. In related review, Nayak and Sahoo (2026) take a systematic review of the recent research on workforce agility and share a definition of what workforce agility is: "workforce agility is a multi-level capability that gets influenced by individual-level, group-level and organization-level factors."

Empirical research also confirmed that worker agility was connected to measures of workplace outcomes that involves flexibility and responsiveness. Zhang et al. (2022) paid attention to the employee agility issue regarding enterprise social media, and elucidated enterprise communication technologies for enhancing employees' agility by providing them with related information quickly and processing it in a timely manner. Dzimidienė and Bagdžiūnienė (2022) revealed the correlation between employees agility and their innovative work behaviours, which means that these employees may be able to escape from their routine and offer positive answer to the new work challenges and tasks. In a like fashion, Varshney and Varshney (2020) have confirmed that emotional intelligence did have a medium effect in the middle for adaptive and contextual performance with workforce agility in small entrepreneurial firms.

The need for workforce agility was really brought to light when it came to digitally transforming an environment of services. Muduli and Choudhury (2024) offered a review of the concept of workforce agility in the context of digital transformation, demonstrating that, in addition to technology, the organizational capacity, employee capability, employee attitude, and employee behavior have to change for a digital transformation to be a success. They discussed the term of employee agility as one of the important human factors of Technological changes in their analysis. Additionally, Salmen and Festing (2022) noted that changes in job requirements in the past had led to high demands for learning quickly: shifting from one task to another or changing behavior as a result of evolving or new requirements.



2.3 Relationship Between Career Adaptability and Learning

Career adaptability was employees' psychosocial ability to handle their career's changing circumstances, transitions to a new work role, increased responsibilities and uncertain career conditions. The influence of career adaptability as a resource has been a more recent research interest of scholars in this area, with focus on those who are currently employed in "soft environments," which are typically defined as labour markets that are prone to low stability and high turnover. Themes from recent literature within the post-pandemic research on career adaptability were identified by reviewing the literature using a bibliometric analysis as conducted by Parrey and Kour (2024) and included uncertainty, career transitions, employability and changing work environments. Therefore, Finch et al. (2023) decided to focus on characterising career adaptation and identified problem solving, self-reliance, collaboration, communication, literacy and workplace skills as significant factors that aided in the coping process for adapting to different career environments.

Empirical studies also showed that career adaptability is related to employees' work experience and career outcomes. Accordingly, Wang et al. (2022) determined that focusing on career adaptability in the three-wave study showed that the impact of career adaptability can manifest in different career outcomes in different ways and in different career contexts. When taking into account the connection between career adaptability and work engagement, person-organization in between was indeed held moderating and job insecurity was discovered to affect the general relationship (Chen et al., 2024). Feng et al. (2023) also explored factors associated with career adaptability, and found self-efficacy and social support to be two paths that role accumulation had a significant impact on career adaptability.

An important basis for the examination of the mechanisms of workforce agility was the relationship between the agility related capabilities and career adaptability. Ren et al. (2023) were able to investigate the role of personal competencies in supporting career adaptation if individuals experienced significant changes in their career. Their analysis indicated that the personal resource factor explained how people made sense of and responded to the ambiguous labour market situation. A set of adaptive meta-skills were also recognized, such as those used by Finch et al. (2023) to fit a person's abilities to different occupations. Employee learning from experience could also lead to better employee future readiness in terms of the behavioural flexibility and employees' behaviours in terms of the need for jobs and careers, which matched the relationship established in the literature regarding the concept of learning-agility.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study used a quantitative research design that is a type of cross-sectional research with a correlational nature. The quantitative approach was used due to the study using a set of items from the structured questionnaires to measure the three constructs and the respondents' perceptions on the level of each of the constructs were converted to numbers to be processed in the later statistical analysis. A cross-sectional design was used, with information collected from the respondents at one time.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population included the employees of Banks in Pakistan. The group that was targeted were employees directly involved in banking activities and who had encountered transition in their organizational practices, technology, customers service as well as professional work. Staff of various departments and job roles were qualified to participate. The study included employees both male and female. The banking industry was chosen because of the ongoing digital transformation and evolving service demands, generating a setting for staff to develop new capabilities, adapt their work processes, and needs to gain new knowledge, undergo changes in jobs, and adjust work behaviours.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

A sample of 300 employees from the banking sector was used in the study. The convenience sampling technique was used for recruitment, since the accessibility of the organization and the staff's availability and willingness to participate were key factors in accessing banking employees. The respondents are tapped from various banking institutions and networking. There was an attempt to include employees who were working



in the banking sector and who were able to provide information relevant to their learning experiences, behaviours in the workplace and career development. The 300 participants chosen were yielding enough observations for descriptive statistics and reliability and mediation analysis.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

Structured questionnaire was used for the primary data to collect. questionnaires were sent out to the employees in the banking organizations using electronic messages and printed questionnaires. Respondents were briefly informed about the purpose of the research and the voluntary nature of participation before they started to participate. They were told their answers would be kept confidential and only for academic research. To the extent that possible, the respondents were asked to respond to each statement based upon their actual experiences and perceptions in the workplace. The questionnaires were then checked for completeness after they were collected, and the completed questionnaires were then coded and entered into SPSS for statistical analysis.

3.5 Data Screening and Preparation

Responses were screened prior to statistical analysis after the data were collected. Data on questionnaires that had significant amounts of missing information were not included in the final sample. All the rest of the answers were verbatimly transcribed onto SPSS. The data was reviewed for errors and discrepancies. Summarized descriptive statistics were obtained to describe the respondents and the distribution of the main study variables. This resulted in Mean and Standard Deviation scores for learning agility, workforce agility, and career adaptability.

3.6 Mediation Analysis

Mediating role of the workforce agility was analysed using Hayes PROCESS Macro Model 4. The independent variable was specified as learning agility, the dependent variable, career adaptability, and the mediator, workforce agility. The indirect pathway in which learning agility was linked to career adaptability via workforce agility was considered in the mediation procedure. An indirect effect estimate and 95% confidence interval were created using 5,000 bootstrap samples. The indirect effect was deemed to be statistically significant if the bootstrap confidence interval did not contain a null effect. This approach enabled the study to establish if the concept of workforce agility was indeed a significant link between learning agility and career adaptability without having to conduct the correlation or regression analysis in the methodology separately.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of Learning Agility

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Learning Agility Dimensions

Learning Agility Dimension	N	Mean	SD
Openness to Learning	300	3.91	0.68
Learning from Experience	300	3.84	0.65
Feedback Seeking	300	3.76	0.71
Adaptability to New Situations	300	3.79	0.69
Application of New Knowledge	300	3.80	0.66
Overall Learning Agility	300	3.82	0.64

Note. N = 300.

The findings in Table 1 indicated the highest mean score for openness to learning was 3.91 and also the highest mean score for learning from experience was 3.84. The results showed a favourable attitude of the participants towards the learning of the new knowledge and experiences in their workplace. The mean scores for feedback seeking were 3.76 and 3.79 for adaptability to new situations, respectively. The findings indicated general positive tendencies in the dimensions of receiving feedback and adapting to new work situations from the employees. The ranges of the mean standard deviation were between 0.65 and 0.71, which is considered as moderate variation in responses. The differences proposed by the variation indicated that employees also had slightly different fluencies with these learning-agility behaviours. Application of new



knowledge was recorded as mean of 3.80 and the overall learning-agility was 3.82. The findings showed that the employees showed overall a good level of transfer learning ability.

4.2 Descriptive Analysis of Workforce Agility

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Workforce Agility Dimensions

Workforce Agility Dimension	N	Mean	SD
Adaptability	300	3.82	0.69
Proactivity	300	3.71	0.72
Flexibility	300	3.78	0.68
Responsiveness to Change	300	3.73	0.70
Resilience	300	3.77	0.66
Overall Workforce Agility	300	3.76	0.67

Note. N = 300.

Table 2 revealed that the highest mean score is for adaptability with a mean score of 3.82. The overall outcome was that the staff members had positive feedback in terms of their ability to modify their work behaviours in response to changes in the workplace. Flexibility and resilience had means of 3.78 and 3.77, respectively, following the order. This was followed by Flexibility which had a mean of 3.78 and Resilience with a mean 3.77. Proactivity had a mean of 3.71, which is the lowest mean score from the dimensions and responsiveness to change had a mean score of 3.73. These scores were relatively low but were scored above the median score of the measurement scale. The overall agility of the workforce mean was 3.76 and standard deviation 0.67. This finding suggested a relatively high amount of agility among the workforce-sample. The results indicated that overall, the banking staff members were perceived to be flexible, adaptable, responsive and resilient to changing work conditions. They applied specifically to an industry where technology, customer demand and company processes often demanded changes to employees' work habits.

4.3 Descriptive Analysis of Career Adaptability

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Career Adaptability Dimensions

Career Adaptability Dimension	N	Mean	SD
Career Concern	300	3.92	0.64
Career Control	300	3.86	0.63
Career Curiosity	300	3.81	0.67
Career Confidence	300	3.94	0.60
Overall Career Adaptability	300	3.88	0.61

Note. N = 300.

The mean scores shown at Table 3 revealed that career confidence obtained the highest score with the mean score of 3.94, and career concern with the mean score of 3.92 was next. These results indicated that in general participants had a positive attitude towards dealing with problems related to their careers and they were aware of their plans for advancement. For career control, the mean was 3.86 while the mean for career curiosity was 3.81. These findings showed that the general attitude of the respondents in taking career decision and looking for alternative career opportunities. The differences were moderate within the four dimensions with standard deviations between 0.60 and 0.67. The mean and standard deviation of the overall career-adaptability were 3.88 and 0.61, respectively. This was the highest 3-point overall mean of the 3 major study constructs. The results indicated that most of the respondents felt that they were ready to deal with career transition and workplace change.



4.4 Comparative Descriptive Analysis of the Main Constructs

Table 4

Comparative Descriptive Statistics of the Main Study Constructs

Study Construct	N	Mean	SD	Mean Level
Learning Agility	300	3.82	0.64	High
Workforce Agility	300	3.76	0.67	High
Career Adaptability	300	3.88	0.61	High

Note. N = 300.

3.82) and career adaptability scale (Mean = 3.88) have the highest means. The mean for workforce agility is 3.76. The results showed that all three constructs were not so much low scoring items among the respondents. Overall, the construct scores were not very different, with a range between highest and lowest means of only 0.12 points. The lowest deviation was with the Career adaptability (S.D. = 0.61), which also indicated that there was comparatively less variance and less deviation in response. The standard deviation of learning agility was 0.64, and workforce agility was 0.67. The outcomes revealed that there was a bit more variability for workforce-agility responses when compared with the other two constructs.

4.5 Mediation Analysis

Table 5

Mediation Effect of Workforce Agility Between Learning Agility and Career Adaptability

Effect	Coefficient	Boot SE	LLCI	ULCI
Learning Agility → Workforce Agility	0.62	0.05	0.52	0.72
Workforce Agility → Career Adaptability	0.44	0.05	0.34	0.54
Direct Effect	0.27	0.05	0.17	0.37
Indirect Effect	0.34	0.04	0.27	0.42
Total Effect	0.61	0.05	0.51	0.71

Note. Bootstrap samples = 5,000.

The result of mediation analysis based on data from Table 5 it can be seen that learning agility had a positive effect on workforce agility, namely 0.62. The bootstrap confidence interval (BCI) was (0.52, 0.72), which is still positive. The pattern along this line suggested a correlation between amounts of learning agility with amounts of workforce agility for the respondents. Those who showed increased openness and willingness to learn, adapt, provide feedback and new experiences also said that they had a stronger sense of workforce agility. Another positive effect was the role of workforce agility on career adaptability with a coefficient of 0.44. The confidence interval was (0.34, 0.54) with neither of these limits being near 0. Direct effects were positive and significant for learning agility on career adaptability (0.27; 0.37–0.17). The indirect effect of learning agility on career adaptability via workforce agility was 0.34. The bootstrap 95% CI ranged from 0.27 to 0.42, which did not contain zero, suggesting that the indirect effect was also statistically significant. The total effect was 0.61, confidence interval [0.51, 0.71] The mediation results then showed that the workforce agility acted as a mediation factor in the learning agility – career adaptability relationship.

5. Discussion

It determined the working of the Bank employees' learning agility to be at a somewhat high level with a mean score of 3.82. Openness to learning was the highest dimension score, learning from experience and application of new knowledge came second and third respectively. This meant that their willingness to learn and accept changes in working experience was a better indicator of their ability to change their working needs through effected modification of their knowledge and behaviours. The results corroborated with recent research that established learning agility as one of the competencies which help staff thrive in a complex world with acceleration change (Milani et al., 2024). Recent studies also suggest that the ability to learn agilely facilitates staff to cultivate skills and handle the organization's evolving needs (Milani et al., 2026).

The results also showed that the employees' agility was relatively high with the mean of 3.76 out of 5. Adaptability had the highest dimension score, as did flexibility and resilience. The trend overall was that how overall the employees were able to adapt their working was evidenced to be their ability to respond to change



and maintain effectiveness in case of change in the workplace. Its result was defined by Alviani et al., 2024 which implies workplace adaptability, proactivity and resilience are the primary tenets of the employee's agility. They also highlighted the relevance of agility in the workforce in today's organizational environments in their systematic review.

Career adaptability had the highest score at 3.88 of the three major constructs in terms of overall mean score. A sense of being ready to deal with issues of work or employment and thinking about how they projected their careers to broaden, were among the statements made at Key Stage 3 and over half were successful in achieving high scores on both of these areas. The researchers discovered that those with more learning-oriented behaviours should be favourable to understanding and adjusting to changing career requirements, too. The findings from this reading support recent studies showing links between learning agility and staff outcomes including: adaptive actions and adaptive component in staffing career-related decisions (Andrews et al., 2014); relation of adaptiveness and learning agility with outcome of staffing decisions and staffing: adaptive behaviour and learning agility and career outcome: staffing: (Jeon & Kim, 2024); adaptive performance and career satisfaction among staff with learning agility (Koh et al., 2019).

They form the primary output of the study and are termed as mediation results. A significant pathway leading to the construct of workforce agility was revealed for Learning Agility, and a significant pathway was revealed for workforce agility leading to the construct of career adaptability. The indirect effect was 0.34, (95% bootstrap CI: 0.27 to 0.42) excluding zero. The result points towards a pathway of learning agility as related to career adaptability for workforce agility. A recent study on workforce agility further highlights the significance of the employees' adaptability, proactiveness, and resilience as critical factors in addressing organizational dynamics (Alviani et al., 2024). In a more recent in-depth study by Ajgaonkar & Neelam, workforce agility is revealed as a multi-faceted capability, which is associated with workforce and organizational dimensions in the context of changing work environment.

The direct effect of learning agility was 0.27 while the indirect effect of learning agility through workforce agility was 0.34. This pattern suggested partial mediation effect, thereby implying that the association between learning agility and career adaptability was mediated by workforce agility; and further, it implied that learning agility had a direct effect on career adaptability. This result paralleled the notions that employees could develop adaptability to their work by learning and adapting and being proactive to the work place. This theme is emphasized in the latest literature, in which the need for lifelong learning and adaptability in a dynamic working environment is indicated, particularly in the face of new skills, technologies and job requirements (Milani et al., 2024; Alviani et al., 2024).

6. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that learning agility, workforce agility, career adaptability are important characteristics among the employees in the banking sector. The results have shown that the overall scores on all three constructs were relatively high with maximum scores being attained on career adaptability. It was observed from the mediation analysis that workforce agility was found to be considerably mediating the relation between learning agility and career adaptability with the indirect effect of 0.34, and with 95% bootstrap CI ranging from 0.27 to 0.42. This positive relationship was also seen in the direct relationship between learning agility and career adaptability as partial mediation. The results show that the employees that had positive attitudes towards learning, adapting and introducing new knowledge also had a high level of Workforce Agility and Adaptability of their jobs. It highlighted the need of banking sector to nurture Learning employees/employees with adaptation capability in the changing work environment and technologically changing work environment and reiterates that nurturing Learning employees/customers-oriented employees will help the banking sector to handle the job changes and raise the customers expectation level. The findings indicated that organizationally fostering learning agility and workforce agility could be combined with employee's career adaption and career adaptability.

Author's Contributions

All authors participated in ideation, development, and writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.



Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Funding Statement

The authors did not receive financial support from any funding agency or external organization for the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Informed Consent

Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw at any time without any consequences. The confidentiality and anonymity of respondents were guaranteed throughout the research process.

Data Availability

The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The authors are committed to transparency and will provide detailed methodological information and analysis protocols upon request.

References

- Ajgaonkar, S., & Neelam, N. G. (2026). Workforce agility revisited: A comprehensive framework and strategic directions based on mixed methods research. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2025-5574>
- Alviani, D., Hilmiana, Widiyanto, S., & Muizu, W. O. Z. (2024). Workforce agility: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1376399. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1376399>
- Cai, Z., Tian, Y., & Wang, Z. (2023). Career adaptability and proactive work behaviour: A relational model. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 96(1), 182–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12411>
- Chen, Q., Li, J., Shen, R., Wang, R., Xu, J., & Zhou, J. (2024). Career adaptability and work engagement: The roles of person–organization fit and job insecurity. *BMC Psychology*, 12, 562. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-01907-2>
- Coetzee, M., Mbiko, H. N., & Nel, E. (2023). To what extent do career agility and psychological capital activate employees' career adaptability and foster their career resilience and career satisfaction? *South African Journal of Psychology*, 53(3), 347–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00812463231186271>
- Dzimidienė, A., & Bagdžiūnienė, D. (2022). The effect of employee agility and self-efficacy on innovative behavior at work. *Psichologija*, 67, 70–88. <https://doi.org/10.15388/Psichol.2022.60> (Vilnius University Press)
- Feng, Q., Chen, X., & Guo, Z. (2023). How does role accumulation enhance career adaptability? A dual mediation analysis. *Current Psychology*, 42, 10426–10436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02304-3> (ResearchGate)
- Finch, D. J., Levallet, N., & Saunders, C. (2023). A dynamic capability view of career adaptation: An exploratory study. *Education + Training*, 65(6), 769–789. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-06-2021-0235> (ResearchGate)
- Ghosh, S., Muduli, A., & Pingle, S. (2021). Role of e-learning technology and culture on learning agility: An empirical evidence. *Human Systems Management*, 40(2), 235–248. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-201028>
- Ibrahim, I. A., Mounib, S. A., Eldesoky, E. S., Elsayed, R. S., Abou Zeid, M. A. G., Elatroush, H. G., & Vandermeulen, M. (2026). Digital competence and career adaptability among nurses: The parallel mediating roles of technological self-efficacy and learning agility. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 2026, 7770229. <https://doi.org/10.1155/jonm/7770229>
- Jeon, H., & Kim, W. (2024). The structural relationships between learning agility, employee engagement, career satisfaction, and adaptive performance of employees corporate organizations. *Journal of Practical Engineering Education*, 16(1), 79–94. <https://doi.org/10.14702/JPEE.2024.079>



- Kaur, H., & Kaur, R. (2020). The relationship between career adaptability and job outcomes via fit perceptions: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 29(3), 196–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1038416220935677>
- Kumi, E., Osei, H. V., Asumah, S., & Yeboah, A. (2024). The impact of technology readiness and adapting behaviours in the workplace: A mediating effect of career adaptability. *Future Business Journal*, 10, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-024-00355-z>
- Milani, R., Ghirotto, L., & Setti, I. (2026). Workplace learning in times of uncertainty: Exploring how leaders learn under the lens of learning agility. *The Learning Organization*, 33(7), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-03-2025-0062>
- Milani, R., Sommovigo, V., Ghirotto, L., & Setti, I. (2024). Individual differences in learning agility at work: A mixed methods study to develop and validate a new scale. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 35(4), 455–475. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21528>
- Muduli, A., & Choudhury, A. (2024). Exploring the role of workforce agility on digital transformation: A systematic literature review. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 32(2), 492–512. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-02-2023-0108>
- Muduli, A., & Choudhury, A. (2026). Digital technology adoption, workforce agility and digital technology outcomes in the context of the banking industry of India. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 17(4), 829–849. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-01-2024-0018>
- Nayak, D. P., & Malik, P. (2024). Two decades of learning agility and an integrated framework: A review of literature and bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 32(10), 2549–2571. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-08-2023-3932>
- Nayak, D. P., & Sahoo, S. P. (2026). Workforce agility in a changing world: A systematic review and future research agenda. *Thunderbird International Business Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.70098>
- Ostrowska, I., & Chruszczewski, M. H. (2023). Learning agility: Questionnaire for measuring factors using learning agility. *Krakow Review of Economics and Management/Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie*, 4(998), 145–165. <https://doi.org/10.15678/ZNUEK.2022.0998.0408>
- Parrey, A. H., & Kour, G. (2024). Career adaptability in the new normal world of work: Exploring the post-pandemic research trends using bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 27(3), 221–243. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-03-2023-0065>
- Peng, X.-Y., Wang-Trexler, N., Magagna, W., & Land, S. (2022). Learning agility of learning and development professionals in the life sciences field during the COVID-19 pandemic: Empirical study. *JMIR Human Factors*, 9(1), e33360. <https://doi.org/10.2196/33360>
- Petermann, M. K. H., & Zacher, H. (2022). Workforce agility: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 841862. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.841862>
- Pitafi, A. H., Ren, M., Kanwal, S., & Ren, M. (2021). Predicting the factors of employee agility using enterprise social media: Moderating effects of enterprise social media-related strain. *Internet Research*, 31(5), 1963–1990. <https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-11-2019-0469>
- Ren, S., Islam, M. T., & Chadee, D. (2023). Career adaptability of international hospitality management students during the COVID-19 pandemic: Focus on the role of language communication competence. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 54, 231–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.12.019>
- Reyes, L.-E., Blanco, M.-R., & Pinillos, M.-J. (2024). Past, present, and future of learning agility: A bibliometric and content analysis. *Human Resource Development Review*, 23(4), 462–497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15344843241258522>
- Salmen, K., & Festing, M. (2022). Paving the way for progress in employee agility research: A systematic literature review and framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(22), 4386–4439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1943491>



-
- Smith, B. A., & Watkins, K. E. (2024). Measuring learning agility: A review and critique of learning agility measures. *Personnel Review*, 53(3), 704–720. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2023-0886>
- Wang, F., Xu, Y., Zhou, X., Fu, A., Guan, Y., She, Z., Wang, Z., & Bi, Y. (2022). Are adaptable employees more likely to stay? Boundaryless careers and career ecosystem perspectives on career adaptability and turnover. *Applied Psychology*, 71(4), 1326–1346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12356>

