HUMAN, TECHNOLOGIES AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION, 2026
https://doi.org/10.22364/htqe.2026.06

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ADHD TRAITS, ATTITUDES TOWARD AI, AND JOB CRAFTING

Marta L. Ziņģe, Sanita Šaitere[1]

[1] University of Latvia, Latvia

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between ADHD (attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) traits, attitudes towards AI (artificial intelligence) and job crafting. With the growing popularity of neurodiversity in the professional environment, it is important to understand what techniques can be used to help neurodiverse employees.

The study involved 239 employed adults from a nonclinical convenience sample, including 59 men (24.7%) and 180 women (75.3%). The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 70 years (M = 36.14; SD = 12.54). Research method – quantitative research. Research design – non-experimental, cross-sectional, correlation study. Data collection method – surveys. Statistical methods – correlation analysis and regression analysis. The following instruments were used in the study: the Adult Executive Functioning Inventory (ADEXI; Holst & Thorell, 2018), the Approach-Avoidance Job Crafting Scale (Lopper et al., 2023), and the General Attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence Scale (GAAIS; Schepman & Rodway, 2020).

The results of the study suggest a weak positive association between positive attitudes toward AI and the executive functioning indicator of inhibition. Weak to moderate positive associations were found between executive functioning indicators and avoidance job crafting strategies, except for the relationship between inhibition and cognitive avoidance demands crafting. Furthermore, weak positive correlations with inhibition were observed for two of the four approach job crafting strategies, whereas a weak negative correlation was found between working memory and cognitive approach demands crafting. The study hypothesis – "ADHD traits will predict behavioral and cognitive avoidance job crafting strategies related to both resources and demands" – is confirmed, as ADHD traits statistically significantly predict avoidance strategies, although the explained variations are low.

The findings of the study provide practical insights for employers to increase their understanding of work habits and inclusion of neurodiverse employees.

Keywords: *ADHD, attitude towards artificial intelligence, job crafting, neurodiversity*

Introduction

Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is characterized by "a persistent pattern of inattention and/or hyperactivity-impulsivity that interferes with functioning or development" (American Psychiatric Association, 2022, p. 68). The prevalence of ADHD among adults and treatment methods are increasingly being highlighted (Radonjić et al., 2023). Given that most people enter employment as adults, it is important to understand the challenges faced by employees with ADHD and, more importantly, what factors can help these individuals. People with ADHD are at greater risk of experiencing anxiety, depression, inattention, and difficulties at work (French et al., 2023), which in turn can lead to employer dissatisfaction or perceptions of poor job performance.

Most often, a significant part of an adult's daily life is taken up by their professional activities. Research findings indicate that ADHD should be considered not only in clinical assessments, but that self-assessments should ideally be supplemented with a colleague's, manager's, or partner's perspective on work performance and functioning at work (Fuermaier et al., 2021). ADHD directly affects cognitive functions – memory, thinking, attention, decision-making, etc., and studies have shown that adults with ADHD commonly exhibit cognitive impairments across multiple cognitive domains (Fuermaier et al., 2014). Employees who have been diagnosed with ADHD or who experience symptoms of ADHD find it harder to meet the standards they have set for themselves or feel that they are not reaching their full potential; which can lead to concerns about managerial evaluation or even job loss (Fuermaier et al., 2021). ADHD is also associated with a significant economic burden at both the individual and societal levels (Chhibber et al., 2021). It is important for employers to create a safe environment for people experiencing ADHD, because if an employee feels that management is responsive to their needs, they are more likely to reach their full potential in the workplace (Robbins, 2017).

The rapid rise of AI in today's world holds great potential for helping neurodiverse individuals integrate more successfully into the workplace. Practical and professional discussions have also highlighted the potential of AI-based solutions to support both neurodiverse employees and employees with neuropsychiatric disorders in the workplace (Keil & Ketzer, 2024), however, this proposition is currently based primarily on professional discourse and further peer-reviewed empirical research is needed. To avoid placing an additional burden on individuals with ADHD in their professional lives, it is worth investigating these individuals' attitudes toward AI before introducing AI tools into their daily routines. A review of existing research shows that, when discussing the relationship between humans and AI, a significant portion of the focus is on people's attitudes toward it; as people's general attitude toward AI is likely to play a significant role in AI acceptance (Schepman & Rodway, 2020). A study on the use of AI chatbot robots in mental health care highlights the lack of in-depth research on individual human differences (e.g., demographic characteristics or medical history) and how these individuals respond to, in this case, AI chatbots (Boucher et al., 2021). People who use AI-enhanced software to perform tasks tend to work more productively, efficiently, and

enjoyably (Noy & Zhang, 2023), but it has been shown that neurodiverse employees prefer technologies that provide support for working independently, rather than tools that do the work for them (Hall et al., 2024). Research has examined people's general attitudes toward AI, but there is a lack of information on attitudes toward AI among people with ADHD. Rather than representing a categorical condition, ADHD traits have been shown to lie on a continuum within the general population (McLennan, 2016). This supports the relevance of examining ADHD-related traits among individuals without a formal diagnosis. These findings may inform future research on how AI tools can support not only individuals with ADHD, but also those who experience clinically relevant ADHD traits, particularly in the workplace, by improving well-being, facilitating workplace inclusion and aiding in reaching job performance goals.

Job crafting can be defined as "the physical and cognitive changes individuals make in the task or relational boundaries of their work" (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001, p.179). For an employee to make changes in the workplace with the aim of improving the work environment, this may involve physical, social, and cognitive actions (Bruning & Campion, 2018). The use of job crafting strategies helps employees cope with workplace stressors (Kosenkranius et al., 2020), develop their strengths, and identify the professional areas in which they have the strongest personal interest (Laguía et al., 2024). It has been demonstrated that by using job crafting strategies, individuals facing chronic illnesses, disabilities, or other work-limiting factors can improve their performance and self-efficacy (Sundar & Brucker, 2021). Author Ludmila N. Praslova, exploring the concept of neurodiversity in the workplace, notes that for neurodiverse individuals, the ability to integrate into the workplace can be decisive – whether it results in a career filled with unique contributions or chronic unemployment (Praslova et al., 2023). The author also notes that organizational and managerial support in the use of job crafting strategies is an important factor to consider when supporting neurodiverse employees (Praslova et al., 2023). By using job crafting, employees can improve their engagement at work and their job performance (Tims et al., 2014). It has similarly been suggested in professional discourse that working from home and the ability to customize the workplace to individual working conditions and specific needs can provide benefits for neurodiverse employees (Keil & Ketzer, 2024). Given that job crafting strategies address several important factors relevant to employees with ADHD traits, it is important to investigate whether a relationship exists between ADHD traits and job crafting strategies.

Studies have shown that adults with ADHD are more likely to choose avoidance-oriented coping strategies. This is also supported by a 2020 study that confirmed the hypothesis that participants with ADHD were more likely to exhibit avoidance-oriented approaches than the control group (Al-Yagon et al., 2020); additionally, avoidance may serve as a mediator between ADHD traits and emotion regulation (Bodalski et al., 2018). Overall, there is a positive association between ADHD and avoidance of experiences (Bradley et al., 2024). However, there is no clear consensus regarding approach strategies, as one study did not support the idea that children with ADHD tend to choose

approach strategies for positive images and avoidance strategies for negative image (Van Cauwenberge et al., 2016).

By synthesizing existing research on ADHD traits, attitudes toward artificial intelligence, and job crafting strategies, several conclusions can be drawn. First, previous studies have demonstrated that job crafting strategies can support neurodiverse individuals (Praslova et al., 2023); however, there is a lack of research specifically examining the relationship between ADHD traits and job crafting strategies. It is possible to determine whether an employee uses avoidance or approach strategies for job crafting (Lopper et al., 2023), and researchers note that there are unresolved questions about adult ADHD, and further research in this area is needed (Cortese et al., 2025). The existing findings on the relationship between ADHD and avoidance strategies are particularly relevant, as this study aims to examine the relationship between ADHD traits and eight different job crafting strategies based on the model developed by Zhang and Parker (2018). The model includes four approach and four avoidance strategies:

- approach resources crafting (behavioral)
- approach demands crafting (behavioral)
- approach resources crafting (cognitive)
- approach demands crafting (cognitive)
- avoidance resources crafting (behavioral)
- avoidance demands crafting (behavioral)
- avoidance resources crafting (cognitive)
- avoidance demands crafting (cognitive)

The aim of the study was to investigate the relationship between ADHD traits, attitudes towards AI, and job crafting. The study addresses specific research questions and proposes a hypothesis.

Research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between ADHD traits and positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence?
2. Are there statistically significant relationships between ADHD traits and each of the job crafting strategies?

Hypothesis:

1. ADHD traits will predict behavioral and cognitive avoidance job crafting strategies related to both resources and demands.

Methodology

Research method – quantitative research. Research design – non-experimental, cross-sectional, correlational study. Data collection method – surveys. The study employed a quantitative research approach using a non-experimental, cross-sectional, correlational design. Data were collected through a survey method.

Participants

The study included 239 employed adults from a non-clinical convenience sample, including 59 men (24.7%) and 180 women (75.3%). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 70 years (M = 36.14, SD = 12.54).

Methods

To measure employees' attitudes toward AI, the "The General Attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence Scale (GAAIS)" (Schepman & Rodway, 2020) was used. The scale was adapted into Latvian for the first time within the framework of this study. The GAAIS consists of two subscales measuring positive and negative attitudes toward AI. The positive attitudes subscale assesses perceptions of the opportunities, benefits, and positive societal and emotional impacts of AI, whereas the negative attitudes subscale measures concerns and negative emotions related to AI. The negative attitudes subscale needs to be reverse scored, such that higher scores on both subscales reflect more positive attitudes toward AI. The instrument consists of 20 items. A team of three independent experts translated the scale from English to Latvian (the experts represented expertise in both psychology and translation). Two additional independent experts back-translated the questionnaire into the original language, thereby ensuring the back-translation procedure. The translated items were reviewed by a focus group of three experts, evaluating item comprehensibility and making necessary adjustments. The adapted scale was completed by 34 respondents aged 21 to 59 (M = 32.79, SD = 11.70), of whom 9 were men (26.47%) and 25 were women (73.53%). The results showed high internal consistency for both subscales: α = .90 for the positive subscale and α = .92 for the negative subscale. Item response and discrimination indicators were also calculated to gain insight into the difficulty level of the items and how successfully each item differentiates respondents according to the measured trait. For this scale, the critical thresholds for the response index range from 1.8 to 4.2, and the optimal values for the discrimination index range from 0.2 to 0.8. Both indicators fell within the recommended ranges for all items, indicating satisfactory item quality. No further corrections to the item translations were required. The scale demonstrated good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients α = .88 for the positive subscale and α = .83 for the negative subscale in the original version, and α = .85 for the positive subscale and α = .81 for the negative subscale in this study.

To assess self-reported ADHD-related executive functioning difficulties, the self-report version of the Adult Executive Functioning Inventory (ADEXI; Holst & Thorell, 2018; adapted into Latvian by Jakoba, 2022) was used. The instrument was developed to measure self-reported executive functioning abilities. ADEXI has demonstrated sensitivity in differentiating between individuals with ADHD and non-ADHD control groups and has been used to assess ADHD related executive functioning difficulties (Holst & Thorell, 2018). The aim was not to examine a clinical group with a formal ADHD diagnosis, but to assess the association between ADHD traits and working memory and inhibition – two executive functions that are considered fundamental to everyday and

occupational functioning (Diamond, 2013). Given that the overall survey was already extensive (individuals with ADHD traits may find long questionnaires more difficult to complete), a short, easily administered instrument focusing specifically on these two functions was selected. The questionnaire is divided into two subscales – working memory and inhibition. Working memory deficits may represent one of the symptoms of ADHD (Al-Saad et al., 2021), while difficulties with inhibition are also characteristic of ADHD (Sapkale & Sawal, 2023). The original version of the questionnaire demonstrated good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of $\alpha = .91$ for the total scale, $\alpha = .91$ for the working memory subscale, and $\alpha = .77$ for the inhibition subscale. In the adapted Latvian version by Anna Jakoba, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were $\alpha = .85$ for the total scale, $\alpha = .86$ for the working memory subscale, and lower internal consistency, $\alpha = .54$, for the inhibition subscale (Jakoba, 2022). In this study Cronbach's alpha coefficients were $\alpha = .79$ for the total scale, $\alpha = .78$ for the working memory subscale and $\alpha = .52$ for the inhibition subscale (see Table 1).

To assess employees' job crafting strategies "The Approach-Avoidance Job Crafting Scale" (Lopper et al., 2023; adapted into Latvian by Draveniece, 2024) was used. The questionnaire demonstrated good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of $\alpha = .84$ in the original study and $\alpha = .81$ in the adapted version.

Procedure

Survey data were collected electronically in March 2025 using the QuestionPro survey platform. A convenience sampling method was used with two main inclusion criteria: participants had to be at least 18 years old and currently employed. There was no time limit for completing the questionnaire, which was distributed via social media platforms (Facebook, Linkedin) and other communication channels (Whatsapp, Outlook). Information on respondents clinical ADHD diagnosis status was not collected, as the study measured ADHD-related traits within the general population rather than a clinically diagnosed group. Consequently, approval from an ethics committee was not required. Before completing the survey, respondents were informed about the study's purpose, confidentiality, and other aspects related to participation. The collected data were processed and analyzed using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics version 22.

Results

At the beginning of the data analysis, descriptive and inferential statistics were calculated (see Table 1). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to assess the normality of distribution, taking the sample size into account. The results indicated that all variables except one showed a statistically significant deviation from normality ($p < .05$), while only one variable followed a normal distribution ($p > .05$). Therefore, nonparametric statistical methods were used in the subsequent analyses. Throughout this study ADHD traits were operationalized using ADEXI scores which assess ADHD-related executive functioning difficulties.

Table 1. Descriptive and inferential statistics for the Adult Executive Functioning Inventory, the Attitudes toward Artificial Intelligence Scale, and the Job Crafting Strategies Scale (*N* = 239)

Variables	*M*	*SD*	*K-S*	α
Executive functioning (total)	34.1	6.5	.06*	.79
Working memory	20.6	4.54	.07*	.78
Inhibition	13.50	2.98	.09*	.52
Positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence	3.34	0.56	.06	.85
Negative attitudes toward artificial intelligence	2.96	0.65	.08*	.81
Approach resources crafting (behavioral)	4.10	0.60	.16*	.59
Approach demands crafting (behavioral)	3.59	0.80	.07*	.78
Approach resources crafting (cognitive)	4.10	0.66	.11*	.71
Approach demands crafting (cognitive)	3.87	0.73	.10*	.76
Avoidance resources crafting (behavioral)	2.89	0.82	.08*	.75
Avoidance demands crafting (behavioral)	2.81	0.75	.07*	.62
Avoidance resources crafting (cognitive)	2.29	0.85	.08*	.83
Avoidance demands crafting (cognitive)	2.73	0.78	.08*	.66

*$p < .05$ indicates a statistically significant deviation from a normal distribution

Table 2. Spearman's rank correlation analysis of executive functioning and attitudes toward artificial intelligence (*N* = 239)

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Executive functioning (total)	–				
2. Working memory	.90***	–			
3. Inhibition	.79***	.48***	–		
4. Positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence	.08	.02	.16*	–	
5. Negative attitudes toward artificial intelligence	–.03	–.12	.13*	.39***	–

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

To address the first research question – "Is there a statistically significant relationship between ADHD traits and positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence?" – Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was used (see Table 2).

Weak but statistically significant correlations were found between the inhibition subscale and both the positive ($r = .16$, $p < .05$) and negative ($r = .13$, $p < .05$) attitudes toward artificial intelligence subscales.

To examine the second research question – "Are there statistically significant correlations between ADHD traits and each of the job crafting strategies?" – Spearman's rank correlation coefficient was also used (see Table 3).

Table 3. Spearman's rank correlation analysis of executive functioning and job crafting strategies (N = 239)

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Executive functioning (total)	–										
2. Working memory	.90***	–									
3. Inhibition	.79***	.48***	–								
4. Approach resources crafting (behavioral)	.07	–.03	.19**	–							
5. Approach demands crafting (behavioral)	.09	–.03	.24***	.41***	–						
6. Approach resources crafting (cognitive)	–.04	–.11	.08	.39***	.36***	–					
7. Approach demands crafting (cognitive)	–.11	–.21**	.08	.31***	.49***	.46***	–				
8. Avoidance resources crafting (behavioral)	.21**	.15*	.25***	.22**	.01	–.03	.10	–			
9. Avoidance demands crafting (behavioral)	.32***	.28***	.30***	.17**	.09	–.01	.10	.53***	–		
10. Avoidance resources crafting (cognitive)	.20**	.19**	.16*	.20**	–.01	–.01	.03	.61***	.44***	–	
11. Avoidance demands crafting (cognitive)	.13*	.19**	–.02	.03	–.11	–.06	–.23***	.14*	.28***	.34***	–

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$

Regarding the second research question, statistically significant associations were found between executive functioning and avoidance job crafting strategies, except for the relationship between inhibition and cognitive avoidance demands crafting. Although some correlations were moderate in strength, most were weak. Positive correlations were also observed between inhibition and two approach job crafting strategies: behavioral approach resources crafting (r = .19, $p < .01$) and behavioral approach demands crafting (r = .24, $p < .001$). In addition, a statistically significant negative correlation was found between cognitive approach demands crafting and working memory (r = –.21, $p < .01$).

To test the hypothesis that ADHD traits predict avoidance job crafting strategies, regression analysis using the backward method was conducted (see Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7).

Table 4. Regression analysis results for behavioral avoidance resources crafting as the dependent variable and working memory and inhibition as independent variables (*N* = 239)

Independent variable	*B*	*SE B*	β
Step 1			
Working memory	.01	.01	.05
Inhibition	.06	.02	.23*
Step 2			
Inhibition	.07	.02	.26**

Step 1: $R^2 = .07$, $F\ (2, 236) = 8.72$, $p < .05$; *Step 2:* $R^2 = .07$, $F\ (1, 237) = 16.90$, $p < .05$, $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

Table 5. Regression analysis results for behavioral avoidance demands crafting as the dependent variable and working memory and inhibition as independent variables (*N* = 239)

Independent variable	*B*	*SE B*	β
Step 1			
Working memory	.03	.01	.18*
Inhibition	.06	.02	.22**

Step 1: $R^2 = .12$, $F\ (2, 236) = 16.36$, $p < .05$, $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

Table 6. Regression analysis results for cognitive avoidance resources crafting as the dependent variable and working memory and inhibition as independent variables (*N* = 239)

Independent variable	*B*	*SE B*	β
Step 1			
Working memory	.03	.01	.16*
Inhibition	.02	.02	.07
Step 2			
Working memory	.04	.01	.20**

Step 1: $R^2 = .04$, $F\ (2, 236) = 5.33$, $p < .05$; *Step 2:* $R^2 = .04$, $F\ (1, 237) = 9.79$, $p < .05$, $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

Table 4 shows that, in the second step of the regression analysis, behavioral avoidance resources crafting explained 7% of the variance. Inhibition was significantly associated with this job crafting strategy, indicating that inhibition significantly predicted behavioral avoidance resources crafting (β = .26, $p < .01$).

Table 5 shows that the regression model explained 12% of the variance in behavioral avoidance demands crafting. Both working memory (β = .18, $p < .05$) and inhibition (β = .22, $p < .01$) significantly predicted behavioral avoidance demands crafting.

Table 6 shows that, in the second step of the regression analysis, cognitive avoidance resources crafting explained 4% of the variance. Working memory was significantly associated with this job crafting strategy, indicating that working memory significantly predicted cognitive avoidance resources crafting (β = .20, $p < .01$).

Table 7. Regression analysis results for cognitive avoidance demands crafting as the dependent variable and working memory and inhibition as independent variables (N = 239)

Independent variable	*B*	*SE B*	β
Step 1			
Working memory	.05	.01	.27**
Inhibition	–.04	.02	–.15*

Step 1: $R^2 = .06$, $F(2, 236) = 7.22$, $p < .05$, $^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$.

Table 7 shows that the regression model explained 6% of the variance in cognitive avoidance demands crafting. Working memory significantly predicted cognitive avoidance demands crafting (β = .27, $p < .01$), whereas inhibition was negatively associated with this strategy (β = –.15, $p < .05$). This suggests that higher inhibition scores were associated with less frequent use of this strategy.

In summary, the study hypothesis that ADHD traits would predict avoidance job crafting strategies was supported, as ADHD traits significantly predicted avoidance strategies, although the explained variance was low.

Discussion

The aim of the study was to examine the relationships between ADHD traits, measured through adult executive functions (working memory and inhibition), attitudes toward artificial intelligence, and job crafting strategies.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the descriptive statistics presented in Table 1. The results of the executive functioning measure indicate average scores for both working memory and inhibition. Given that lower scores reflect better executive functioning, the findings suggest that the sample was characterized by average levels of executive functioning difficulties. The average scores on the attitudes toward artificial intelligence scales suggest that participants' attitudes toward AI were generally neutral rather than distinctly positive or negative. Both subscales reflect positive attitudes toward AI, as the items in the negative attitudes subscale were reverse scored. The authors of the original scale do not recommend calculating a total score. Higher scores on the negative attitudes subscale indicate greater tolerance toward the limitations of AI, whereas higher scores on the positive attitudes subscale reflect greater enthusiasm toward AI and stronger perceptions of its personal and societal benefits. The average scores on the job crafting scale suggest that respondents used approach job crafting strategies more frequently than avoidance strategies. The findings related to inhibition subscale should be interpreted with caution, because its internal consistency coefficient in the present study was relatively low (α = .52).

A positive correlation was found between inhibition and positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence (for both the positive and negative attitudes subscales). Higher scores on the inhibition subscale were associated with more positive attitudes toward AI.

According to the ADEXI, higher inhibition scores indicate greater executive functioning difficulties, which may reflect ADHD-related traits. These findings could tentatively be interpreted as an indication that individuals exhibiting ADHD traits may be more inclined to hold positive attitudes toward AI, although this interpretation should be treated with caution. One possible explanation is that neurodivergent employees may be particularly receptive to AI-based solutions, given that research has proposed such tools, for example, can help reduce sensory overload and align job roles with individual strengths (George et al., 2026). However, no significant correlation was found between the total ADEXI score and positive attitudes toward AI, nor between working memory and positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence. These findings suggest inconsistencies regarding the relationship between positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence and specific executive functioning indicators. One possible explanation is that working memory represents a cognitive function that may be improved through AI-based tools, while no direct relationship exists between working memory and attitudes toward AI as a construct.

Another explanation for the relationship between ADHD traits and a positive attitude toward AI might be the potential of AI-based tools to support neurodiverse individuals in their daily lives, for example, by helping structure tasks or providing reminders about important activities. This aligns with the information summarized in the theory – individuals using AI to perform tasks do so more productively, effectively, and with greater enjoyment (Noy & Zhang, 2023). It is possible that the use of AI helps compensate for the difficulties caused by features of ADHD. Furthermore, it should be noted that higher scores on the positive attitude's subscale reflect greater enthusiasm toward AI and stronger perceptions of its usefulness, while the scale also captures emotional aspects, such as whether AI contributes to happiness and improved well-being (Schepman & Rodway, 2020). Given that neither the total ADEXI score nor the working memory subscale was associated with positive attitudes toward AI, the observed relationship between inhibition and positive attitudes toward AI should be interpreted cautiously. It should be noted that the instrument used in this study was a self-report measure, and it is possible that some respondents provided socially desirable responses. Future research is encouraged to use measures with higher internal consistency.

The results related to the second research question indicate that the overall executive functioning score was associated only with avoidance job crafting strategies. Thus, as ADHD-related difficulties increased, the use of avoidance strategies also increased. These findings are consistent with previous research summarized in the literature review, suggesting that individuals with ADHD are more likely to adopt avoidance-oriented approaches (Al-Yagon et al., 2020) and that ADHD is positively associated with experiential avoidance (Bradley et al., 2024). It may be assumed that employees exhibiting ADHD traits are more likely to use avoidance strategies because of difficulties with decision-making, task organization, and sustained attention. As a result, employees with ADHD traits may display more passive workplace behavior, such as avoiding additional tasks or showing less initiative, because existing responsibilities may already feel overwhelming. Such

behavior may be perceived by employers as laziness, incompetence, lack of motivation, or disinterest in work, which may further increase the burden experienced by neurodiverse employees. This interpretation is also supported by previous research suggesting that the use of avoidance strategies may be perceived negatively by managers or supervisors, which may, in turn, reduce employees' motivation to engage in job crafting behaviors (Fong et al., 2021). However, it is also possible that avoidance strategies function as a coping mechanism for managing difficulties associated with ADHD.

The results indicate a negative correlation between working memory and cognitive approach demands crafting. Thus, higher scores on this strategy were associated with lower working memory scores (and vice versa), which, in turn, indicate better working memory functioning, as lower scores on the questionnaire reflect fewer working memory difficulties. This might suggest that individuals with better working memory are more likely to engage in this approach strategy, for example through active problem-solving or seeking help when faced with uncertainty. Working memory was correlated with all avoidance job crafting strategies, suggesting that individuals with poorer working memory functioning might rely more on avoidance strategies in workplace settings. This may result in more passive and potentially maladaptive work-related behaviors. Previous research has demonstrated that older employees tend to avoid tasks requiring rapid working memory processing and instead prefer tasks that rely more on task-related knowledge (Kooij et al., 2014).

Inhibition was associated with both behavioral approach job crafting strategies – approach resources crafting and approach demands crafting. This suggests that individuals with poorer inhibitory control may be more likely to engage in proactive behaviors aimed at improving work outcomes through direct action. Furthermore, inhibition was associated with three of the four avoidance job crafting strategies – behavioral avoidance resources crafting, behavioral avoidance demands crafting and cognitive avoidance resources crafting. Although these findings may initially appear contradictory, it is important to note that positive associations with inhibition were observed only for the two behavioral approach strategies. These findings might suggest that both proactive and passive strategies may be used to achieve desired work outcomes. However, given that positive associations with inhibition were observed specifically for behavioral approach strategies, it may be inferred that job crafting in this context is achieved more through direct action than through changes in thoughts or perceptions. These findings further support previous research suggesting that job crafting may enhance employee engagement and work performance (Tims et al., 2014). It is likely that active engagement helps reduce stress associated with uncertainty and problem-solving in workplace settings. The finding from the literature review – that there is no clear answer regarding approach strategies – since the idea that children with ADHD choose approach strategies for positive images and avoidance strategies for negative images was not confirmed (Van Cauwenberge et al., 2016), suggests that there is also no clear answer in this sample (of working adults), as a positive association is found with the executive function "inhibition" in two cases, but not with the total ADEXI score or the working memory subscale.

The results of the regression analyses indicate that both working memory and inhibition significantly predicted the two avoidance job crafting strategies related to demands crafting. Thus, these findings relate to work aspects that require sustained physical, cognitive, or emotional effort. In contrast, inhibition predicted behavioral avoidance resources crafting, whereas working memory predicted cognitive avoidance resources crafting. It is reasonable that working memory predicted both cognitively oriented job crafting strategies, given that memory itself is a cognitive process. Previous research has identified working memory as one of the primary cognitive dysfunctions associated with ADHD (Ramos et al., 2019). In all four cases, the explained variance was relatively low, ranging from 4% to 12%. Thus, ADHD-related difficulties appear to be significant predictors of avoidance job crafting strategies; however, the models explained only a small proportion of the variance, indicating that they account for only a limited part of human behavior. These findings suggest that the remaining unexplained variance may be associated with factors not included in the model, such as other executive functioning indicators, the severity of ADHD traits, or environmental influences.

One limitation of this study is the use of self-report questionnaires, particularly for the assessment of ADHD-related traits, as respondents may provide socially desirable responses or may be unable to evaluate themselves objectively. In addition, ADHD as a clinical diagnosis should be assessed using validated clinical instruments. A self-report measure assessing only two executive functioning indicators provides a limited insight into ADHD-related traits within the sample. It should also be noted that difficulties with executive functioning does not necessarily indicate ADHD, as they may also be associated with other factors, such as age, sleep quality, anxiety, depression. Another limitation of this study is relatively low explained variance observed in the regression analyses. It is also important to acknowledge the uneven gender distribution within the sample, as women constituted 75.3% of respondents, limiting the representativeness of the findings. In three job crafting strategy subscales and the inhibition subscale, Cronbach's alpha coefficients did not reach the recommended psychometric threshold ($\alpha > .70$). Given that these subscales, particularly inhibition, were important for addressing the study aim, they were retained in the analyses. Nevertheless, the obtained internal consistency coefficients may limit the reliability and interpretation of the findings.

The strengths of this study lie in its relevance both from the perspective of AI and in terms of neurodiversity, as the findings can contribute to the inclusion of neurodiversity in the workplace. Furthermore, the interdisciplinarity of the topic allows the findings to be applied across clinical, academic, and professional contexts.

Conclusions

Regarding the first research question, a weak association was found between positive attitudes toward artificial intelligence and only one executive functioning indicator – inhibition. Regarding the second research question, no statistically significant association was found between inhibition and cognitive avoidance demands crafting; however, all

other associations between executive functioning and avoidance job crafting strategies were statistically significant. In addition, positive correlations with inhibition were identified for two of the four approach job crafting strategies, although these relationships were weak to moderate in strength.

The study hypothesis was confirmed, as ADHD traits significantly predicted avoidance job crafting strategies; however, the explained variance of the regression models was relatively low. This suggests that the four regression models accounted for only a limited proportion of the variance in avoidance job crafting strategies through the predictors working memory and inhibition, with explained variance ranging from 4% to 12%. Thus, from a practical perspective, employees' use of avoidance strategies cannot be explained solely by ADHD-related traits. It is likely that avoidance strategies are also influenced by other factors, such as work overload, personal life difficulties, or conflicts with colleagues.

It can be concluded that ADHD-related traits are associated with the use of avoidance job crafting strategies in workplace settings, a finding supported both by the studies reviewed in the theoretical section and by the empirical results of the present study. Similarly, the findings may tentatively suggest that neurodiverse employees may be more inclined towards using AI-based tools or integrating artificial intelligence into their work environment. However, both interpretations should be treated with caution as the present study did not provide sufficient evidence to draw firm conclusions about this relationship. Future research should aim to verify this association using instruments with higher internal consistency to draw more reliable conclusions. Also, subsequent research on this topic should examine not only ADHD-related traits within the context of neurodiversity, but also other forms of neurodiversity, such as autism spectrum disorder and dyslexia. This could contribute to a broader understanding of neurodiverse conditions from both individual and organizational perspectives. Given the broad range of opportunities offered by AI, future research should move beyond attitudes toward AI and examine the actual use of AI-based tools among neurodiverse employees.

The practical implications of these findings extend across multiple fields, including team management, human resource management, education, and professionals working with ADHD as a clinical condition. In workplace settings specifically, the findings highlight the importance of promoting diversity through personalized approaches to neurodiverse employees, greater understanding from colleagues and managers, and the adaptation of work environments to individual needs. Similarly, to emphasize the strengths of neurodiverse employees in workplace settings – which in some cases may even exceed those of other employees – the integration of AI-based tools into daily work should be considered. In this context, AI should not be viewed as a replacement for human work, but rather as a supportive tool.

Furthermore, the findings of this study may be particularly valuable for individuals who themselves experience ADHD-related traits. The conclusions drawn from the study may help neurodiverse employees better understand behaviors that are often perceived as dysfunctional in workplace settings. In many cases, such behaviors may reflect strategies used to cope more effectively with work-related demands rather than laziness or low

motivation. Finally, this study represents only a small contribution to understanding the workplace behaviors and coping strategies of neurodiverse employees. Nevertheless, both the identified limitations and the findings consistent with previous theory and research provide valuable insights for improving the professional well-being of neurodiverse employees and promoting diversity and inclusion in workplace settings.

REFERENCES

Al-Saad, M. S. H., Al-Jabri, B., & Almarzouki, A. F. (2021). A review of working memory training in the management of attention deficit hyperactivity Disorder. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2021.686873

Al-Yagon, M., Lachmi, M., & Shalev, L. (2020). Coping strategies among adults with ADHD: The mediational role of attachment relationship patterns. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 102, 103657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2020.103657

American Psychiatric Association. (2022). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, Text Revision (DSM-5-TR)*, *5*(5). https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425787

Bodalski, E. A., Knouse, L. E., & Kovalev, D. (2018). Adult ADHD, Emotion Dysregulation, and Functional Outcomes: Examining the role of emotion Regulation Strategies. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 41(1), 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-018-9695-1

Boucher, E. M., Harake, N. R., Ward, H. E., Stoeckl, S. E., Vargas, J., Minkel, J., Parks, A. C., & Zilca, R. (2021). Artificially intelligent chatbots in digital mental health interventions: a review. *Expert Review of Medical Devices*, 18(sup1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/17434440.2021.2013200

Bradley, W. J., Bodalski, E. A., De Arellano, A., Looby, A., Taylor, S. G., Canu, W., Serrano, J. W., & Flory, K. (2024). The relation between ADHD symptoms and alcohol and cannabis use outcomes in a cross-sectional study of college students: The mediating role of experiential avoidance. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 31, 100727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2024.100727

Bruning, P. F., & Campion, M. A. (2018). A role-resource approach-avoidance model of Job crafting: A multimethod integration and extension of job crafting theory. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 499–522. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2015.0604

Chhibber, A., Watanabe, A. H., Chaisai, C., Veettil, S. K., & Chaiyakunapruk, N. (2021). Global Economic Burden of Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder: A Systematic Review. *PharmacoEconomics*, 39(4), 399–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-020-00998-0

Cortese, S., Bellgrove, M. A., Brikell, I., Franke, B., Goodman, D. W., Hartman, C. A., Larsson, H., Levin, F. R., Ostinelli, E. G., Parlatini, V., Ramos-Quiroga, J. A., Sibley, M. H., Tomlinson, A., Wilens, T. E., Wong, I. C., Hovén, N., Didier, J., Correll, C. U., Rohde, L. A., & Faraone, S. V. (2025). Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) in adults: evidence base, uncertainties and controversies. *World Psychiatry*, *24*(3), 347–371. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21374

Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *64*(1), 135–168. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143750

Draveniece, E. E. (2024). *Darba pārstrukturēšanas stratēģiju saistība ar psiholoģiskajām pamatvajadzībām un uztverto organizācijas kultūru* [Maģistra darbs, Latvijas Universitāte]. LU DSpace. https://dspace.lu.lv/items/0ea54535-c50b-4f62-a9ff-3f94b73610fa

Fong, C. Y. M., Tims, M., Khapova, S. N., & Beijer, S. (2021). Supervisor Reactions to Avoidance Job Crafting: The role of political skill and approach job crafting. *Applied Psychology*, 70(3), 1209–1241. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12273

French, B., Daley, D., Groom, M., & Cassidy, S. (2023). Risks Associated with Undiagnosed ADHD and/or Autism: A Mixed-Method Systematic Review. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 27(12), 1393–1410. https://doi.org/10.1177/10870547231176862

Fuermaier, A. B. M., Tucha, L., Butzbach, M., Weisbrod, M., Aschenbrenner, S., & Tucha, O. (2021). ADHD at the workplace: ADHD symptoms, diagnostic status, and work-related functioning. *Journal of Neural Transmission*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-021-02309-z

Fuermaier, A. B. M., Tucha, L., Koerts, J., Aschenbrenner, S., Kaunzinger, I., Hauser, J., Weisbrod, M., Lange, K. W., & Tucha, O. (2014). Cognitive impairment in adult ADHD-Perspective matters! *Neuropsychology*, 29(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000108

George, G., Kulkarni, M., & Varghese, B. (2026). AI in creating inclusive work environments for neurodiverse employees. *Advances in Autism*, *12*(1), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.1108/aia-05-2025-0046

Hall, K., Arora, P., Lowy, R., & Kim, J. G. (2024). Designing for Strengths: Opportunities to Support Neurodiversity in the Workplace. CHI '24: Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 74, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642424

Holst, Y., & Thorell, L. B. (2018). Adult executive functioning inventory (ADEXI): Validity, reliability, and relations to ADHD. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 27(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1567

Jakoba, A. (2022). *Vadības funkciju un ruminēšanas saistība ar sociālās trauksmes rādītājiem kibervidē un klātienē* [Maģistra darbs, Latvijas Universitāte]. LU DSpace. https://dspace.lu.lv/items/2d722224-b971-41cc-8f25-91a2e3a1423f

Keil, M. V., & Ketzer, D. (2024). *Neurodivergent employees: AI's role in new work challenges*. MSM Online Academic Conference: "The Future of Work: Challenges and Opportunities in a Disrupted World" https://madoc.bib.uni-mannheim.de/67343/

Kooij, D. T. a. M., Tims, M., & Kanfer, R. (2014). Successful aging at work: The role of job crafting. *In Springer eBooks* (pp. 145–161). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08007-9_9

Kosenkranius, M. K., Rink, F. A., De Bloom, J., & Van Den Heuvel, M. (2020). The design and development of a hybrid off-job crafting intervention to enhance needs satisfaction, well-being and performance: a study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8224-9

Laguía, A., Topa, G., Da Silva Pocinho, R. F., & Muñoz, J. J. F. (2024). Direct effect of personality traits and work engagement on job crafting: A structural model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 220, 112518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2023.112518

Lopper, E., Horstmann, K. T., & Hoppe, A. (2023). The Approach-Avoidance Job Crafting Scale: Development and validation of a measurement of the hierarchical structure of job crafting. *Applied Psychology*, 73(1), 93–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12466

McLennan J. D. (2016). Understanding attention deficit hyperactivity disorder as a continuum. *Canadian family physician Medecin de famille canadien*, *62*(12), 979–982. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5154646/

Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), 187–192. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586

Praslova, L., Bernard, L., Fox, S., & Legatt, A. (2023). Don't tell me what to do: Neurodiversity inclusion beyond the occupational typecasting. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 16(1), 66–69. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2022.105

Radonjić, N. V., Bellato, A., Khoury, N. M., Cortese, S., & Faraone, S. V. (2023). Nonstimulant Medications for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in Adults: Systematic review and Meta-analysis. *CNS Drugs*, 37(5), 381–397. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40263-023-01005-8

Ramos, A. A., Hamdan, A. C., & Machado, L. (2019). A meta-analysis on verbal working memory in children and adolescents with ADHD. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist, 34(5)*, 873–898. https://doi.org/10.1080/13854046.2019.1604998

Robbins, R (2017). The untapped potential of the ADHD employee in the workplace. Cogent Business & Management, 4(1), 1271384. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2016.1271384

Sapkale, B., & Sawal, A. (2023). Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) Causes and diagnosis in Adults: A review. *Cureus*. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.49144

Schepman, A., & Rodway, P. (2020). Initial validation of the general attitudes towards Artificial Intelligence Scale. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports,* 1, 100014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100014

Sundar, V., & Brucker, D. (2021). "Today I felt like my work meant something": A pilot study on job crafting, a coaching-based intervention for people with work limitations and disabilities. *Work*, 69(2), 423–438. https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-213488

Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2014). Job crafting and job performance: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 914–928. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432x.2014.969245

Van Cauwenberge, V., Sonuga-Barke, E. J. S., Hoppenbrouwers, K., Van Leeuwen, K., & Wiersema, J. R. (2016). Regulation of emotion in ADHD: can children with ADHD override the natural tendency to approach positive and avoid negative pictures? *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 124(3), 397–406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-016-1631-5

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. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011

Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2018). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 40(2),* 126–146. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2332