

Optimizing Government Workforce Performance: A Study of Employee Engagement, Organizational Commitment, and Knowledge Sharing

Deddy Mulyana ^{1*} Eeng Ahman ² Janah Sojanah ³ Budi Santoso ⁴

^{*1,2,3,4} Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Jawa Barat, 40154, Indonesia

Email

deddymulyana@upi.edu ^{1*}

Received: July, 23, 2024

Revised: August, 31, 2024

Accepted: September, 15, 2024

Abstract

The organization must preserve balance by establishing mutually beneficial relationships with its employees, who are its most valuable assets. Several essential aspects are required to maintain this equilibrium, including organizational commitment, employee engagement, and information exchange. We use social exchange theory to investigate the effects of commitment, knowledge sharing, and employee engagement on civil servant performance outcomes (ASN). This study uses a cross-sectional design and includes 115 civil servants from Tasikmalaya. Data analysis utilizes Stata/MP 17.0 for descriptive, bivariable, and multivariable analyses. The research findings indicate a positive impact of employee engagement, affective and normative commitment, and knowledge sharing on ASN performance. However, the negative effect of tenure exceeding five years and continuance commitment on ASN performance is negative. These findings illustrate that while employees are generally expected to have high organizational commitment, continuous commitment to material benefits may be detrimental. The results serve as a basis for discussion among researchers to conduct further longitudinal studies for more accurate conclusions.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Organizational Commitment, Social Exchange Theory, Knowledge Sharing, Performance.

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.57178/atestasi.v7i2.958>

p-ISSN : 2621-1963

e-ISSN : 2621-1505

© Copyright: ATESTASI: Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi (2024)

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Site Using OJS 3 PKP Optimized.

Introduction

Organizations rely on human resources to gain and maintain a competitive advantage, and they are regarded as one of the most important strategic resources a business may create (Collins, 2021; Delery & Roumpi, 2017; Hamadamin & Atan, 2019). The relationship between employees and the business can be understood through social exchange theory, which explains human behavior as pursuing maximum rewards at the lowest possible cost (Ahmad et al., 2023; Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018; Collins, 2021). According to social exchange theory, social exchange will not occur unless both sides (workers and the organization) obtain adequate compensation (Ahmad et al., 2023; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2015). Employees and the company can attain equilibrium by establishing mutually beneficial and

long-term exchange relationships in the workplace. (Blau, 1964; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2015; Yin, 2018)

A recent meta-analysis of organizational justice research spanning 25 years delineated several variables associated with social exchange theory (Ahmad et al., 2023; Colquitt et al., 2013). Relevant variables include organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and leader-member exchange critical in the relationship between justice, task performance, and citizenship behavior (Adler et al., 2016; Chernyak-Hai & Rabenu, 2018; Colquitt et al., 2013). Theoretically, the bond strength between an employee and the organization evolves through repeated social exchanges with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Zhao et al., 2020).

According to social exchange theory, organizations can cultivate employees' positive attitudes and behaviors through commitment-oriented approaches (Cesário & Chambel, 2017; Xu & Payne, 2016). The objective is to make employees feel part of their work environment so that high commitment leads to improved performance (Harinoto et al., 2018; Martini et al., 2020; Sungu et al., 2019). However, not all types of commitment have a positive impact on performance; therefore, in this study, we examine the three components of commitment separately: affective, normative, and continuance (Galanaki, 2020; Wang et al., 2022).

Employee engagement in the public sector organization constitutes the core of the organization-leader-employee relationship in the workplace, revealing potential for enhanced performance and transforming employee working conditions (Byrne et al., 2016; MacLeod & Clarke, 2009; Ugaddan & Park, 2017). When employees are engaged, they exhibit active and initiative-driven behaviors and a willingness to interact with others (Byrne, 2022; Saks, 2022). Conversely, employees who experience work fatigue display negative and passive behaviors, demonstrating apathy toward their work (Meira & Hancer, 2021; Yin, 2018). According to social exchange theory, employee engagement is crucial in achieving a balance between employees and the organization (Ali et al., 2022; Meira & Hancer, 2021).

Knowledge sharing constitutes a generalized form of social exchange, as individuals have expectations regarding the benefits of sharing knowledge, which can persist throughout the duration of team cooperation, which is a form of long-term relationship (Fulk et al., 1996; Obrenovic et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2018). In the workplace, when employees share knowledge and experiences, they will have higher confidence in what they do, thus enhancing self-efficacy (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002; Kmiecik, 2021; Zhang et al., 2018).

Social exchange theory assumes that the principle of human behavior is to maximize benefits and minimize costs (Ali et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2016). Social exchange occurs because of long-term vested interests, not one-off interactions (Molm, 1997; Zhang & Liu, 2021). We apply social exchange theory to analyze the benefits of commitment, knowledge sharing, and employee engagement on ASN performance outcomes. This research also examines the interrelationships among independent variables after controlling for age, gender, and work experience.

Literature Review

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is employees' physical, cognitive, and emotional involvement while performing organizational tasks. According to Kahn (1990), when performing functions,

employees express and employ themselves in three different ways: emotionally, cognitively, and physically. The "cognitive" aspect refers to the mental representation of the organization in the employee's mind, while the "emotional" element relates to the employee's feelings towards these three factors. The third factor, the "physical" element, relates to the energy employees exert to achieve their goals. Employee engagement is the physical, intellectual, and emotional commitment to the organization and employees' efforts to achieve their goals (Nazir & Islam, 2017). Employee engagement affects factors such as performance and mental health (Inam et al., 2023; Tisu et al., 2020).

Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling state of mind related to work, characterized by dedication (i.e., intense involvement, enthusiasm, pride, and meaningful experience), vigor (i.e., high levels of energy and mental resilience), and absorption (full concentration and difficulty detaching from work) (Inam et al., 2023). Vigor is characterized by having high levels of energy and mental resilience while working; dedication is characterized by feeling significant, enthusiastic, proud, and inspired by work; and absorption is characterized by total immersion in one's work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). These definitions imply that work engagement is primarily focused on the meaningfulness and usefulness (eudaimonia) of work for individuals (particularly the dedication dimension) and not just happiness (hedonia) with work. Accordingly, these definitions imply that work engagement is an active and energetic attitude, not a passive and calm attitude like hedonic job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Borst et al., 2019).

Experts argue that employees experiencing high levels of work engagement are physically healthier, more satisfied with their psychological needs, and more hedonic well-being, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, compared to employees with low levels of work engagement (Borst, 2018; Borst et al., 2019). Engaged employees are expected to perform their job-related tasks with a sense of investment, energy, and enthusiasm, which should translate into higher levels of performance in both role and extra-role behaviors (Borst et al., 2019).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the psychological attachment of individuals to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Galanaki, 2020). Allen and Meyer proposed that employees' experiences of organizational commitment have three dimensions reflecting affective (emotion-based), continuance (cost-based), and normative (obligation-based) patterns of thinking. This model has been the subject of extensive empirical and theoretical research (Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Meyer et al., 2015; Xu & Payne, 2016) and has been used to study organizational commitment as well as commitment to other foci such as work, supervisors, teams, and jobs (Jaros, 2017; Morin et al., 2010).

According to the dominant approach, I distinguish between two forms of organizational commitment: affective commitment, which reflects "an individual's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization, such that strong commitment is characterized by an individual's enjoyment and fulfillment from being a member of the organization" (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and continuance commitment, which refers to the bond between individuals and their organization as a result of considering the consequences (costs) of not being committed (by considering alternatives to commitment).

Affective commitment is the sense of ownership and emotional connection to the job, organization, or both (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Affective commitment emphasizes employees' emotional relationship with their work and aligns with the emotional quality of engagement (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Saks, 2006), including conditions such as meaningfulness and security, which parallel attachment conditions (Kahn, 1990). These emotional qualities can stimulate employees to be willing to engage in behaviors directed towards desired organizational outcomes, focusing on the emotional satisfaction experienced by employees as a result of engagement (Shuck & Wollard, 2009). Emotional fulfillment is crucial to job engagement and indicates engaged employees (Galanaki, 2020).

Continuance commitment refers to the tendency to remain in the current organization due to fear of loss or costs associated with leaving the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The concept of continuance commitment highlights the importance of personal gain, as it is typically motivated by the fear of potential personal losses resulting from resignation (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Wang et al., 2022). Continuance commitment can act as a buffer against the depletion of positive energy resources when supervisors pressure employees to go beyond their job responsibilities (Cates et al., 2010). Employees with high levels of commitment tend to be concerned about the security of their jobs and strive to comply with organizational directives to maintain their employment (Wang, 2015). When pressured to perform additional tasks voluntarily, employees with high continuance commitment tend to see it as an opportunity, thus responding positively to such pressure to gain benefits and receive favorable performance evaluations. In this context, high continuance commitment may mitigate the negative impact of pressure experienced by employees on task performance fatigue, which in turn can positively impact their job performance (De Clercq et al., 2021).

Normative commitment is the perceived 'obligation to stay' felt by individuals (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Its construct has undergone conceptual reconfigurations over time (Wayne et al., 2009), most recently positioned as a 'moral obligation' (Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010). The implication is that 'normative commitment is an important motivational force that has been overlooked and underutilized', particularly the potentially 'strong' and 'beneficial' implications because it is 'experienced as a moral obligation rather than a debt obligation' (Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010). Therefore, a volunteer 'may feel immoral if leaving the organization because of the organization's mission' is so pressing (Boezeman & Ellemers, 2007) and aligns with individual personal values (McCormick & Donohue, 2019; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Stephens et al., 2004). According to (Mowday et al., 1979), organizational commitment is the identification and involvement strength of individuals in the organization and is conceptualized as personal attachment fostered with the organization. It is conceptualized as the extent to which an employee embraces the organization's goals and values and explains whether employees "want," "need," or "feel they should" stay in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Normative commitment refers to internal pressures to align individual goals with organizational values and interests (Meyer & Allen, 1997). This seems fitting for this study as self-leadership influences commitment where employees use self-leadership strategies such as goal setting and mental imagery (Cranmer et al., 2019). Since employees tend to align personal goals with organizational goals, this is likely to increase normative commitment, which also refers to aligning personal and organizational goals and interests (Inam et al., 2023).

Knowledge sharing

Knowledge-sharing behavior significantly influences team cohesion, work creativity, group performance, and knowledge integration processes (Mesmer-Magnus & DeChurch, 2009; Obrenovic et al., 2020; Obrenovic et al., 2015). Knowledge sharing significantly impacts firm performance, organizational productivity, absorptive capacity, innovation, and competitive advantage (Le et al., 2020; Lei et al., 2020). It can be broken down into two main types: explicit knowledge sharing and tacit knowledge sharing. According to Le et al. (2020), tacit knowledge-sharing involves invisible and informal knowledge-sharing processes that employees possess, such as experiences and expertise, uncommon understandings, insights, and intuition. On the other hand, explicit KS refers to sharing codified knowledge and formal information captured and transmitted within an organization, such as documents and reports, procedures and policies, or handbooks (Cao et al., 2022). Tacit and explicit knowledge sharing lead to innovative ideas (Jackson & Knight, 2006) and enhance task efficiency and organizational performance (Adenfelt, 2010; Obrenovic et al., 2020).

Tacit knowledge is experiential and intuitive (Faith & Seeam, 2018), subjective, context-specific, and challenging to capture (Razak et al., 2016), thus highly valuable for organizational growth. Such knowledge sharing is more challenging as it is not readily accessible and cannot be directly transformed into formal language but requires frequent face-to-face interactions. Tacit knowledge transmission and acquisition occur exclusively due to internal motivations, such as socializing and during social interactions (Lee & Choi, 2003). This process is described as "learning by doing." For example, knowledge sharing evolves during employees' interactions with their colleagues and when employees face tasks (Nonaka & von Krogh, 2009). Tacit knowledge sharing creates bonds and facilitates social communication among employees (Käser & Miles, 2002; Nonaka & von Krogh, 2009; Osterloh & Frey, 2000), leading to success and contributing to organizational productivity (Obrenovic et al., 2020; Reychar & Weisberg, 2009; Small & Sage, 2006).

Explicit knowledge is the knowledge that has been expressed, formalized, documented, and codified in the form of visual artifacts (e.g., text, tables, diagrams, or documents) (Alavi & Leidner, 2001; Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002; Nickols, 2013). Therefore, explicit knowledge is relatively more straightforward to search for and share with others than tacit and implicit knowledge (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002). Documented best practices, formal standards, mathematical formulas, training manuals, instructions, or simple factual information are typical examples of explicit knowledge (Epstein, 2000; Nickols, 2013; Park & Gabbard, 2018; Zack, 1999). Implicit knowledge is implicit in experience, practical skills, and knowledge, yet unlike tacit knowledge, implicit knowledge can be articulated and modified adequately like explicit knowledge (Nickols, 2013; Park & Gabbard, 2018).

Research aims and hypothesis

This study aims to examine a model of civil servant performance hypothesized by exploring the relationships among the research variables: employee engagement, affective, continuance, normative commitment, and knowledge sharing. In previous research, organizations often used these five constructs in internal communication messages to employees as critical success factors for achieving higher performance. However, are these five factors significantly related to employee performance? Moreover, if so, do they have the

same strength and intensity as predictors of individual performance? Unfortunately, these five constructs have taken independent positions. To date, few studies have examined the combined effects of these variables on individual job performance. In hypotheses considering the combined effects, we combine the three types of commitment into organizational commitment. We aim to identify significant variables in the bivariate analysis of ASN performance; subsequently, significant types of commitment will be used as control variables. To answer these two research questions, six hypotheses are tested:

- H₁: There is a significant relationship between affective, continuance and normative commitment, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing on employee performance.*
- H₂: After controlling for commitment organizational, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing, affective commitment will predict unique variance in employee performance.*
- H₃: After controlling for commitment organizational, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing, continuance commitment will predict unique variance in employee performance.*
- H₄: After controlling for commitment organizational, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing, normative commitment will predict unique variance in employee performance.*
- H₅: After controlling for commitment organizational, and knowledge sharing, employee engagement will predict unique variance in employee performance.*
- H₆: After controlling for commitment organizational, and employee engagement, knowledge sharing will predict unique variance in employee performance.*

Research Design and Method

We used a cross-sectional research design, a type of observational study, to look at data from a population or a representative subset at a certain time (May et al., 2004; Varma et al., 2005). The questionnaire asked about performance, commitment, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing. The questionnaire was translated into a language that respondents could easily understand from various sources. Affective, normative, and continuance commitment were the three categories that made up the commitment variable, which Meyer and Allen (2004) adapted from their TCM Employee Commitment Survey questionnaire. The commitment questionnaire consisted of 6 items for affective commitment, four for continuance commitment, and 4 for normative commitment.

Items in the knowledge-sharing questionnaire referred to the questionnaire developed by Yi (2015) and modified into 8 statement items. The statements regarding knowledge sharing assessed two types of knowledge: tacit knowledge and explicit knowledge. Employee engagement utilized the UWES (UTRECHT Work Engagement Scale) questionnaire of 17 items developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004). The dependent variable, performance, used a questionnaire adapted and modified from the questionnaire developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). The performance questionnaire comprised 37 items measuring indicators, including work quality and quantity, job knowledge, creativity, initiative, teamwork, reliability, and personal quality.

We conducted validity and reliability tests for all items in the questionnaire used. The validity of a questionnaire item is determined based on the item-test correlation value or the calculated r-value, which must exceed the correlation value listed in the r table. The correlation value in the r table for a sample size (n) of 115 is 0.1832. An item's validity can be confirmed if the item-test correlation value (r-value) exceeds 0.1832. Additionally, we estimated the questionnaire's reliability by calculating the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A Cronbach's alpha value exceeding the threshold of 0.6 indicates adequate reliability (Mohamad et al., 2015). Our analysis results indicate that, as shown in Table 1, all questionnaire items can be considered valid because their validity values exceed the established threshold of 0.1832, with values ranging from 0.49 to 0.89. Furthermore, all questionnaire items demonstrate adequate reliability, as the Cronbach's alpha values recorded exceed the threshold of 0.6, ranging from 0.67 to 0.97 (Table 1).

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Constructs

Variables	Item	Item- test correlation	Cronbach alpha
Employee Engagement	20	0.49 – 0.84	0.9533
Affective Commitment	6	0.67 – 0.79	0.7992
Continuance Commitment	4	0.62 – 0.86	0.7820
Normative Commitment	4	0.59 – 0.83	0.6751
Knowledge Sharing	8	0.57 – 0.77	0.8388

Based on the results of validity and reliability tests, it was found that the research instrument is valid and reliable, thus suitable for data collection. Data was collected through an online Google Forms survey from May to June 2022. The research respondents were civil servants in the Tasikmalaya City Government, totaling 115 individuals. Respondents were selected through simple random sampling involving the education department in Tasikmalaya City. The education department was chosen due to having the highest number of employees and having performance categorized as less satisfactory in the past five years based on the recapitulation of scores from the Government Performance Accountability System/Sistem Akuntabilitas Kinerja Instansi Pemerintahan (SAKIP).

The data analysis process began with cleaning all demographic data and questionnaire responses. Data were then grouped into two categories based on the median value to facilitate the analysis process. Analysis was conducted using Stata/MP 17.0 software for descriptive, bivariate, and multivariable analyses.

Descriptive analysis was performed to present demographic data of respondents, including age (<43 years and ≥ 43 years), gender (Male and Female), and educational background (Secondary School – Diploma – bachelor's degree, and Master's Degree or higher). The duration of employment initially consisted of six categories: <2 years, 2-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and >20 years; however, for simplicity of analysis, these categories were merged into two groups: ≤ 5 years, >5 years. For the variables of employee engagement, commitment, knowledge sharing, and performance, a cut-off of \geq median was used.

The results of the descriptive analysis were presented in the form of frequencies and percentages based on low and high-performance groups. Subsequent bivariate analysis was conducted by presenting odds ratio and 95% CI. Variables significant in bivariate analysis

were then adjusted in multivariable analysis for each variable. In multivariable analysis, models were created for all significant variable combinations, but only combinations deemed relevant to the research objectives were presented. All results of the multivariable analysis are available in supplementary files.

Results and Discussion

Result

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, the number of respondents with low and high performance is almost equal (57:58). The data presented in Table 2 only show one category of variables with column percentage display. Demographic data of respondents with low performance indicate that the majority of them are aged ≥ 43 years (54.4%), male (57.9%), with education ranging from high school to bachelor's degree (61.4%), and have work experience of more than five years (63.2%). The proportion of variables related to employee engagement, commitment, and knowledge sharing with high categories is lower in respondents with low performance, except for continuance commitment, which shows a higher proportion (63.2%).

Demographic data of respondents showing high performance indicate a balanced proportion between age groups (50%:50%), with the majority being male (70.7%), having educational backgrounds ranging from high school to bachelor's degree (55.2%), and having work experience of more than five years (55.2%). The proportion of each variable of employee engagement, commitment, and knowledge sharing with high categories is higher in respondents with high performance.

The results of the respondents' demographic analysis indicate no significant differences in demographic characteristics between respondents with low and high performance. However, there are significant differences in employee engagement, affective and normative commitment, and knowledge sharing between respondents with low and high performance. Only the level of continuance commitment does not have a significant difference between low and high performance. The level of employee engagement has the highest Odds Ratio among other variables, which is 15.24 (95% CI: 6.05, 38.39).

After adjusting for significant variables, we conducted a multivariable analysis to examine the relationships between variables. Several models were developed, but we only present relevant models for our discussion; the whole model can be found in the supplementary file.

Based on the results of the multivariable analysis, it is evident that work experience exceeding five years shows a significant association with employee performance. However, the analysis yields negative results, indicating that respondents with more than five years of experience decreased their performance by 74% (AOR: 0.26; 95% CI 0.09, 0.08). The variable of work experience became significant after adjusting for engagement and normative commitment. This suggests that despite having good attachment and normative commitment, respondents with over five years of experience demonstrate a decline in performance as their tenure in the organization increases (Table 3).

Employee engagement emerges as the most influential factor affecting employee performance. Respondents with high employee engagement can enhance performance by 9-12 times compared to those lacking organizational attachment (Table 3). This analysis result

was obtained after adjusting for affective, knowledge-sharing, and normative commitment variables. This indicates that employee engagement strongly and significantly influences other variables before and after adjustment.

Affective and normative commitment variables influence employee performance after adjusting for each other and knowledge sharing. However, affective and normative commitment variables become insignificant when adjusted for employee engagement. Nevertheless, the multivariable analysis results indicate that respondents with exemplary affective and normative commitment can improve performance compared to those with poor affective and normative commitment (AOR AC: 2.7 – 3.6; AOR NC: 3.9 – 5.2, respectively) (Table 3).

Continuance commitment is another variable that negatively affects ASN performance. Continuance commitment becomes significant after adjusting for engagement, affective and normative commitment, and knowledge-sharing variables. Continuance commitment can decrease performance by 69% - 73% and is statistically significant (Table 3). This indicates that although respondents have affective and normative commitments and good engagement and knowledge sharing, respondents with high continuance commitment can decrease employee performance.

The analysis of knowledge-sharing variables remains consistent before and after adjustment with engagement and commitment variables. Respondents who habitually share knowledge among colleagues can improve performance by 3.4 – 4.5 times better than those without such habits. The influence of knowledge sharing is more potent when combined with affective commitment, meaning respondents who habitually share knowledge and have high affective commitment can improve performance by 4.5 times (Table 3).

Table 2. Demographic and Bivariable Analysis of Factor related to Civil Servants' Performance

Variables	Low Perform (N=57)	High Perform (N=57)	Total (N=115)	OR	95%CI
	Freq (%)	Freq (%)			
Age, ≥43 years	31(54.4)	29(50.0)	60(52.2)	0.84	[0.40,1.74]
Sex, Female	24(42.1)	17(29.3)	41(35.7)	0.57	[0.26,1.23]
Education, High	22(38.6)	26(44.8)	48(41.7)	1.29	[0.61,2.72]
Work period, >5 years	36(63.2)	32(55.2)	68(59.1)	0.72	[0.34,1.51]
Employee Engagement, high	15(26.3)	49(84.5)	64(55.7)	15.24***	[6.05,38.39]
Affective Commitment, high	19(33.3)	40(69.0)	59(51.3)	4.44***	[2.03,9.72]
Continuance Commitment, high	36(63.2)	31(53.4)	67(58.3)	0.67	[0.32,1.41]
Normative Commitment, high	22(38.6)	47(81.0)	69(60.0)	6.80***	[2.92,15.84]
Knowledge Sharing, high	25(43.9)	47(81.0)	72(62.6)	5.47***	[2.36,12.66]

Notes:

OR: Odd Ratio

95% CI: 95% Confident Interval

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 3. Multivariable Analysis of Factor related to Civil Servants' Performance

Variables	Model 1 AOR[CI 95%]	Model 2 AOR[CI 95 %]	Model 3 AOR[CI 95 %]	Model 4 AOR[CI 95%]	Model 5 AOR[CI 95%]
Age, ≥43 years	0.76 [0.35,1.68]	0.84 [0.38,1.87]	0.57 [0.22,1.46]	0.62 [0.26,1.45]	0.57 [0.21,1.52]
Sex, Female	0.63 [0.28,1.44]	0.47 [0.20,1.09]	0.39 [0.14,1.06]	0.53 [0.22,1.29]	0.36* [0.13,0.99]
Education, High	1.17 [0.53,2.59]	1.19 [0.53,2.65]	1.09 [0.43,2.73]	1.09 [0.47,2.55]	1.05 [0.41,2.69]
Work period, >5 years	0.6 [0.27,1.35]	0.81 [0.36,1.81]	0.26* [0.09,0.80]	0.42 [0.17,1.06]	0.31* [0.10,0.97]
Employee Engagement	11.92*** [4.60,30.88]	12.50*** [4.81,32.47]	-	9.02*** [3.24,25.13]	-
Affective Commitment	-	3.61** [1.57,8.26]	2.04 [0.78,5.34]	-	1.89 [0.71,5.04]
Continuance Commitment	0.57 [0.25,1.28]	0.58 [0.25,1.31]	0.31* [0.10,0.93]	0.29* [0.11,0.80]	0.31* [0.10,0.94]
Normative Commitment	4.85*** [1.99,11.86]	5.20*** [2.14,12.61]	-	-	-
Knowledge Sharing	4.50*** [1.87,10.81]	-	3.44* [1.27,9.36]	3.65** [1.46,9.15]	-

Notes:

All variables are adjusted to each other with significant variables.

Model 1: Adjusted with Affective Commitment

Model 2: Adjusted with Knowledge Sharing

Model 3: Adjusted with Engagement and Normative Commitment

Model 4: Adjusted with Affective and Normative Commitment

Model 5: Adjusted with Engagement, Affective Commitment and Knowledge sharing

95% CI: 95% Confident Interval

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Based on the results of the multivariable analysis, it can be concluded that there are three hypotheses (H3, H5, H6) accepted in total, and there is 1 hypothesis (H1, H2; H4) partially accepted. Among the hypotheses accepted in total, there is a significant influence of continuance commitment, employee engagement, and knowledge sharing after being analyzed together with affective and normative variables. In the first hypothesis, almost all variables significantly impact ASN performance, except for continuance commitment, which does not have a significant influence before being adjusted with other variables. The second and third hypotheses, affective and normative commitment, are only influenced when controlled by the knowledge-sharing variable. However, affective and normative commitment become insignificant when controlled by employee engagement.

We can address both research questions examined in this study based on the results of the analysis. Firstly, nearly all variables significantly influence civil servants' performance except for continuance commitment, yet continuance commitment does have an effect after being adjusted with other variables. Secondly, each variable demonstrates different strengths and intensities regarding civil servants' performance.

Based on the results of the multivariable analysis, this study can highlight several noteworthy findings. The first finding pertains to the negative impact of respondents who have worked for more than five years and continuance commitment on ASN performance after adjusting for engagement, commitment, and knowledge-sharing variables. Another finding is that affective commitment becomes insignificant after adjustment for employee

engagement. However, affective commitment remains significant even when adjusted for knowledge sharing and normative commitment variables.

The low performance among respondents who have worked for more than five years is related to organizational culture (Allard, 2010). The connection between these two relationships must be carefully inferred because employees who have worked for a long time do not immediately decrease their performance. Long tenure affects the cultural differences between employees and the organization towards organizational performance (Allard, 2010; Pawirosumarto et al., 2017). Organizational culture is considered a system that highlights the interaction of people within the organization, organizational structure, and control systems to produce behavioral norms. Further research should examine organizational culture to draw more accurate conclusions regarding the association between tenure and performance.

Another interesting finding is the negative influence of continuance commitment on ASN performance. The findings (Stanley & Meyer, 2016) found a negative correlation between continuance commitment and task performance ($p = -0.04$). The findings in the study support Wang et al. (2022), stating that there is a significant relationship between continuous commitment and emotional exhaustion ($B = 0.31, p < 0.01$). Employees with high continuance commitment must meet performance standards to keep their jobs (Meyer et al., 2002; Nangoli et al., 2020). This situation makes employees feel trapped in the organization because they fear losing income even though they have other ambitions that have not been achieved for fear of bearing financial losses (Qureshi et al., 2019). Ultimately, this situation forces employees to expend more energy because they have tasks to complete while suppressing their ambitions (Meyer et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2022).

Self-control depletion leads to emotional exhaustion in employees, resulting in passive behavior (De Clercq et al., 2021; Hobfoll, 2011). Indirectly, continuance commitment is associated with employees' passive behavior, and emotional exhaustion mediates the relationship between these two variables (indirect effect = 0.10, 95% CI = [0.04, 0.20]) (Wang et al., 2022). Passive behavior is often used as a defense strategy to avoid excessive resource expenditure, leading employees to remain silent about issues that may arise within the organization (Knoll et al., 2019; Morrison, 2011; Xu et al., 2015). The combination of various emotions experienced by employees with high continuance commitment leads to a negative relationship between continuance commitment and employee performance (Wang et al., 2022).

Subsequent analysis regarding affective and normative commitment becomes insignificant when adjusted for employee engagement. This implies that the influence of employee engagement is much more robust, so an employee with strong engagement with the organization is sufficient to enhance their performance.

The influence of employee engagement (EE) on employee performance is the highest compared to the influence of other variables. EE is the simultaneous contribution of physical, cognitive, and emotional energy in performing work roles (Kahn, 1990; Motyka, 2018; Rich et al., 2010). Engaged employees tend to demonstrate higher productivity, profitability, and lower levels of stress (Harter et al., 2002) and provide a competitive advantage for the organization (Bates, 2004; Baumruk, 2004; Council, 2004; Dhir & Shukla, 2019; Harter et al., 2002; Richman, 2006; Vijayanthi et al., 2011). EE is a process to create job satisfaction for employees so that they not only physically present at the workplace but also significantly

contribute to the organization's growth through personal effectiveness improvement (Rich et al., 2010; Smith & Bititci, 2017). EE is considered a tool to drive better performance in various employee roles (Dhir & Shukla, 2019).

The social identity theory also supports that when employees feel a strong identity and affiliation with the organization, it fosters greater involvement and accountability toward their work (Bryant & Vorderer, 2006; Tajfel et al., 1979; Trepte, 2013). This essentially fulfills employees' inherent needs to be part of something meaningful and feel pride and belongingness associated with that identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). When employees identify as part of the organization, they feel responsible for allocating all their energy to their roles, enhancing their engagement and greater job satisfaction (Dhir & Shukla, 2019; Karanika-Murray et al., 2015).

The results of the multivariable analysis indicate that knowledge sharing significantly influences civil servants' performance and consistently yields results both before and after adjustment with engagement and affective and normative commitment variables. Knowledge sharing leads to better employee engagement, effective decision-making, reduced knowledge loss, and stimulated innovation, ultimately resulting in better individual job performance and competitive advantage for the organization (Kwahk & Park, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2021; Razmerita et al., 2016). As a result, organizations have actively pursued various means to promote knowledge sharing to enhance individual performance and organizational competitiveness (An et al., 2014; Deng et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2020).

This study found that knowledge sharing has a more substantial influence when combined with affective commitment. Research by (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022) indicates that affective ($\beta = 0.416$, $p < 0.01$) and normative ($\beta = 0.222$, $p < 0.01$) commitments positively affect knowledge-sharing behavior (KSB) performance. However, compared to normative commitment, affective commitment was found to have a more substantial influence on KSB ($\beta = 0.416$, $t\text{-values} = 5.251$). This suggests that emotional attachment to the organization is more important than feelings of obligation to the organization in driving knowledge-sharing behavior in the workplace. Thus, if employees have a strong emotional attachment or are emotionally committed to the organization, they will likely be more active in sharing knowledge. Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that affective commitment to the organization is also developed through job experiences that meet employees' needs and align with their values (Mohd Rasdi & Tangaraja, 2022).

Conclusions

The research findings indicate a positive relationship between employee engagement, organizational commitment, and knowledge sharing on civil servant performance. Employee engagement emerges as the variable with the most decisive influence, while knowledge sharing maintains a consistent effect before and after adjusting for engagement and commitment variables. Several intriguing findings emerge from this study, which could serve as discussion points for future research. The first finding relates to the negative impact of tenure on performance, which could be linked to organizational culture. Another noteworthy finding is the negative effect of continuance commitment on civil servant performance and how employee engagement diminishes the significance of affective and normative

commitment on performance. Longitudinal research could be used to find the time-dependent relationships between variables in order to get more accurate results. This would allow researchers to look at the relationship between employee engagement and affective and normative commitment, as well as the relationship between continuance commitment and civil servant performance. For practitioners, these findings can guide the creation of a positive work environment and culture to enhance engagement and knowledge-sharing culture, thereby maintaining a balance for social exchange. It is important to note that while employees are generally expected to have high organizational commitment, continuous material-related organizational commitment may prove detrimental.

Reference

- Adenfelt, M. (2010). Exploring the performance of transnational projects: Shared knowledge, coordination and communication. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(6), 529-538. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.10.004>
- Adler, S., Campion, M., Colquitt, A., Grubb, A., Murphy, K., Ollander-Krane, R., & Pulakos, E. D. (2016). Getting Rid of Performance Ratings: Genius or Folly? A Debate. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 219-252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2015.106>
- Ahmad, R., Nawaz, M. R., Ishaq, M. I., Khan, M. M., & Ashraf, H. A. (2023). Social exchange theory: Systematic review and future directions [Systematic Review]. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.101592>
- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961>
- Ali, S., Shahzad, F., Hussain, I., Yongjian, P., Khan, M. M., & Iqbal, Z. (2022). The Outcomes of Organizational Cronyism: A Social Exchange Theory Perspective [Original Research]. 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.805262>
- Allard, I. N. (2010). Examining the relationship between organizational culture and performance: Moderators of culture gap (Publication Number 3420667) [Ph.D., Northcentral University]. Publicly Available Content Database. United States -- California. <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/examining-relationship-between-organizational/docview/749945161/se-2?accountid=13771>
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252-276. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>
- An, X., Deng, H., Chao, L., & Bai, W. (2014). Knowledge management in supporting collaborative innovation community capacity building. *Journal of Knowledge*

- Management, 18(3), 574-590. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-10-2013-0413>
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4278999>
- Bates, S. (2004). Getting engaged. *HR magazine*, 49(2), 44-51.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success. In (Vol. 47, pp. 48-52): *Workspan*.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in Social Exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193-206. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1964.tb00583.x>
- Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2007). Volunteering for charity: pride, respect, and the commitment of volunteers. *J Appl Psychol*, 92(3), 771-785. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.771>
- Borst, R. T. (2018). Comparing Work Engagement in People-Changing and People-Processing Service Providers: A Mediation Model With Red Tape, Autonomy, Dimensions of PSM, and Performance. *Public Personnel Management*, 47(3), 287-313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026018770225>
- Borst, R. T., Kruiyen, P. M., Lako, C. J., & de Vries, M. S. (2019). The Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Performance Outcomes of Work Engagement: A Comparative Meta-Analysis Across the Public, Semipublic, and Private Sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 40(4), 613-640. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19840399>
- Bryant, J., & Vorderer, P. (2006). *Psychology of Entertainment* (1st ed.). Routledge <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203873694>
- Byrne, Z. S. (2022). *Understanding employee engagement: Theory, research, and practice*. Routledge.
- Byrne, Z. S., Peters, J. M., & Weston, J. W. (2016). The struggle with employee engagement: Measures and construct clarification using five samples. *J Appl Psychol*, 101(9), 1201-1227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000124>
- Cabrera, A., & Cabrera, E. F. (2002). Knowledge-Sharing Dilemmas. *Organization Studies*, 23(5), 687-710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840602235001>
- Cao, T. T., Le, P. B., & Nguyen, N. T. M. (2022). Impacts of high-involvement HRM practices on organizational innovation capability: the mediating mechanism of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 14(5), 733-749. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-05-2021-0091>
- Cates, D. A., Mathis, C. J., & Randle, N. W. (2010). A Positive Perspective of Citizenship Pressure Among Working Adults. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 22(3), 330-344. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20798915>
- Cesário, F., & Chambel, M. J. (2017). Linking Organizational Commitment and Work Engagement to Employee Performance. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 24(2), 152-158. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1542>
- Chernyak-Hai, L., & Rabenu, E. (2018). The New Era Workplace Relationships: Is Social Exchange Theory Still Relevant? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 11(3), 456-481. <https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2018.5>
- Collins, C. J. (2021). Expanding the resource based view model of strategic human resource management. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*,

- 32(2), 331-358. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1711442>
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. (2013). Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199-236. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031757>
- Council, C. L. (2004). Driving performance and retention through employee engagement. In: Washington, DC: Corporate Executive Board.
- Cranmer, G. A., Goldman, Z. W., & Houghton, J. D. (2019). I'll do it myself: self-leadership, proactivity, and socialization. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(6), 684-698. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2018-0389>
- De Clercq, D., Suhail, A., Azeem, M. U., & Haq, I. U. (2021). Citizenship pressure and job performance: roles of citizenship fatigue and continuance commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 59(3), 482-505. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12241>
- Delery, J. E., & Roumpi, D. (2017). Strategic human resource management, human capital and competitive advantage: is the field going in circles? *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12137>
- Deng, H., Duan, S. X., & Wibowo, S. (2023). Digital technology driven knowledge sharing for job performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 27(2), 404-425. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-08-2021-0637>
- Dhir, S., & Shukla, A. (2019). Role of organizational image in employee engagement and performance. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 26(3), 971-989. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2018-0094>
- Epstein, L. D. (2000). Sharing knowledge in organizations: How people use media to communicate. University of California, Berkeley.
- Faith, C. K., & Seem, A. K. (2018). Knowledge sharing in academia: A case study using a SECI model approach. *Journal of Education*, 9, 53-70.
- Fulk, J., Flanagan, A. J., Kalman, M. E., Monge, P. R., & Ryan, T. (1996). Connective and Communal Public Goods in Interactive Communication Systems. *Communication Theory*, 6(1), 60-87. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00120.x>
- Galanaki, E. (2020). Effects of employee benefits on affective and continuance commitment during times of crisis. *International Journal of Manpower*, 41(2), 220-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-08-2018-0270>
- Hamadamin, H. H., & Atan, T. (2019). The Impact of Strategic Human Resource Management Practices on Competitive Advantage Sustainability: The Mediation of Human Capital Development and Employee Commitment. *Sustainability*, 11(20).
- Harinoto, H., Sanusi, A., & Triatmanto, B. J. A. o. S. M. J. (2018). Organizational culture and work commitment mediate the Islamic work ethos on employee performance. 17(5), 1-8.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>

- Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 116-122.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02016.x>
- Inam, A., Ho, J. A., Sheikh, A. A., Shafqat, M., & Najam, U. (2023). How self leadership enhances normative commitment and work performance by engaging people at work? *Current Psychology*, 42(5), 3596-3609. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01697-5>
- Jackson, J. S., & Knight, K. M. (2006). Race and self-regulatory health behaviors: the role of the stress response and the HPA axis in physical and mental health disparities. *Social structures, aging, self-regulation in the elderly*, 189-239.
- Jaros, S. (2017). A critique of normative commitment in management research. *Management Research Review*, 40(5), 517-537. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2016-0200>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>
- Karanika-Murray, M., Duncan, N., Pontes, H. M., & Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Organizational identification, work engagement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(8), 1019-1033. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-11-2013-0359>
- Käser, P. A. W., & Miles, R. E. (2002). Understanding Knowledge Activists' Successes and Failures. *Long Range Planning*, 35(1), 9-28.
[https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301\(02\)00020-1](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(02)00020-1)
- Kmiecik, R. (2021). Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: empirical evidence from Poland. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(5), 1832-1859. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134>
- Knoll, M., Hall, R. J., & Weigelt, O. (2019). A longitudinal study of the relationships between four differentially motivated forms of employee silence and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 24(5), 572-589.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000143>
- Kwahk, K.-Y., & Park, D.-H. (2016). The effects of network sharing on knowledge-sharing activities and job performance in enterprise social media environments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 55, 826-839.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.09.044>
- Le, P. B., Lei, H., Le, T. T., Gong, J., & Ha, A. T. (2020). Developing a collaborative culture for radical and incremental innovation: the mediating roles of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing. *Chinese Management Studies*, 14(4), 957-975.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-04-2019-0151>
- Lee, H., & Choi, B. (2003). Knowledge Management Enablers, Processes, and Organizational Performance: An Integrative View and Empirical Examination. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(1), 179-228.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2003.11045756>
- Lei, H., Ha, A. T. L., & Le, P. B. (2020). How ethical leadership cultivates radical and incremental innovation: the mediating role of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing.

- Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 35(5), 849-862.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-05-2019-0180>
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1), 3-30.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x>
- MacLeod, D., & Clarke, N. (2009). Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement: a report to government.
- Malik, A., Froese, F. J., & Sharma, P. (2020). Role of HRM in knowledge integration: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Business Research*, 109, 524-535.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.029>
- Martini, I. A. O., Supriyadinata, A. A. N. E., Sutrisni, K. E., & Sarmawa, I. W. G. (2020). The dimensions of competency on worker performance mediated by work commitment. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1794677.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1794677>
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1348/096317904322915892>
- McCormick, L., & Donohue, R. (2019). Antecedents of affective and normative commitment of organisational volunteers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(18), 2581-2604.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1166388>
- Meira, J. V. d. S., & Hancer, M. (2021). Using the social exchange theory to explore the employee-organization relationship in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 33(2), 670-692.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2020-0538>
- Mesmer-Magnus, J. R., & DeChurch, L. A. (2009). Information sharing and team performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 94(2), 535-546.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013773>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
[https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage publications.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2004). *TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide 2004*.
- Meyer, J. P., & Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 323-337. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.007>
- Meyer, J. P., Morin, A. J. S., & Vandenberghe, C. (2015). Dual commitment to organization and supervisor: A person-centered approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 56-72. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.02.001>
- Meyer, J. P., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*,

- 20(4), 283-294. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.09.001>
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Mohamad, M. M., Sulaiman, N. L., Sern, L. C., & Salleh, K. M. (2015). Measuring the Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 164-171. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.08.129>
- Mohd Rasdi, R., & Tangaraja, G. (2022). Knowledge-sharing behaviour in public service organisations: determinants and the roles of affective commitment and normative commitment. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(3/4), 337-355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-02-2020-0028>
- Molm, L. D. (1997). Coercive power in social exchange [doi:10.1017/CBO9780511570919]. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511570919>
- Morin, A. J. S., Morizot, J., Boudrias, J.-S., & Madore, I. (2010). A Multifoci Person-Centered Perspective on Workplace Affective Commitment: A Latent Profile/Factor Mixture Analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(1), 58-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109356476>
- Morrison, E. W. (2011). Employee Voice Behavior: Integration and Directions for Future Research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 373-412. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2011.574506>
- Motyka, B. (2018). Employee engagement and performance: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Management and Economics*, 54(3), 227-244. <https://doi.org/doi:10.2478/ijme-2018-0018>
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- Nangoli, S., Kemboi, A., Lagat, C., Namono, R., Nakyeyune, S., & Muhumuza, B. (2020). Strategising for continuance commitment: the role of servant leadership behaviour. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 17(1), 51-61. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-01-2020-0008>
- Nazir, O., & Islam, J. U. (2017). Enhancing organizational commitment and employee performance through employee engagement. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 98-114. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-04-2016-0036>
- Nguyen, M., Malik, A., & Sharma, P. (2021). How to motivate employees to engage in online knowledge sharing? Differences between posters and lurkers. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(7), 1811-1831. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-08-2020-0649>
- Nickols, F. (2013). The tacit and explicit nature of knowledge: The knowledge in knowledge management. In *The knowledge management yearbook 2000-2001* (pp. 12-21). Routledge.
- Nonaka, I., & von Krogh, G. (2009). Perspective—Tacit Knowledge and Knowledge Conversion: Controversy and Advancement in Organizational Knowledge Creation

- Theory. Organization Science, 20(3), 635-652.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0412>
- Obrenovic, B., Jianguo, D., Tsoy, D., Obrenovic, S., Khan, M. A. S., & Anwar, F. (2020). The Enjoyment of Knowledge Sharing: Impact of Altruism on Tacit Knowledge-Sharing Behavior [Original Research]. 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01496>
- Obrenovic, B., Obrenovic, S., & Hudaykulov, A. (2015). The value of knowledge sharing: impact of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing on team performance of scientists. International Journal of Management Science Business Administration, 1(2), 33-52.
- Osterloh, M., & Frey, B. S. (2000). Motivation, Knowledge Transfer, and Organizational Forms. Organization Science, 11(5), 538-550.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.5.538.15204>
- Park, J., & Gabbard, J. L. (2018). Factors that affect scientists' knowledge sharing behavior in health and life sciences research communities: Differences between explicit and implicit knowledge. Computers in Human Behavior, 78, 326-335.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.09.017>
- Pawirosumarto, S., Sarjana, P. K., & Gunawan, R. (2017). The effect of work environment, leadership style, and organizational culture towards job satisfaction and its implication towards employee performance in Parador Hotels and Resorts, Indonesia. International Journal of Law and Management, 59(6), 1337-1358.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-10-2016-0085>
- Qureshi, H., Lambert, E. G., & Frank, J. (2019). When Domains Spill Over: The Relationships of Work-Family Conflict With Indian Police Affective and Continuance Commitment. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 63(14), 2501-2525.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X19846347>
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Kock, N., & Ramayah, T. (2015). A revised framework of social exchange theory to investigate the factors influencing residents' perceptions. Tourism Management Perspectives, 16, 335-345.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.10.001>
- Razak, N. A., Pangil, F., Zin, M. L. M., Yunus, N. A. M., & Asnawi, N. H. (2016). Theories of Knowledge Sharing Behavior in Business Strategy. Procedia Economics and Finance, 37, 545-553. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)30163-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30163-0)
- Razmerita, L., Kirchner, K., & Nielsen, P. (2016). What factors influence knowledge sharing in organizations? A social dilemma perspective of social media communication. Journal of Knowledge Management, 20(6), 1225-1246.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2016-0112>
- Reychav, I., & Weisberg, J. (2009). Going beyond technology: Knowledge sharing as a tool for enhancing customer-oriented attitudes. International Journal of Information Management, 29(5), 353-361.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2008.11.005>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698-714.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>

- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- Richman, A. (2006). Everyone wants an engaged workforce how can you create it. In (Vol. 49, pp. 36-39): Workspan Bengaluru.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Saks, A. M. (2022). Caring human resources management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100835.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100835>
- Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2004). UWES UTRECHT Work Engagement Scale
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Shuck, B., & Wollard, K. (2009). Employee Engagement and HRD: A Seminal Review of the Foundations. *Human Resource Development Review*, 9(1), 89-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484309353560>
- Small, C. T., & Sage, A. P. (2006). Knowledge management and knowledge sharing: A review. *Information Knowledge Systems Management*, 5, 153-169.
- Smith, M., & Bititci, U. S. (2017). Interplay between performance measurement and management, employee engagement and performance. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 37(9), 1207-1228.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-06-2015-0313>
- Stanley, D. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2016). Chapter 15: Employee commitment and performance. In *Handbook of Employee Commitment*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784711740.00027>
- Stephens, R. D., Dawley, D. D., & Stephens, D. B. (2004). Commitment on the Board: A Model of Volunteer Directors' Levels of Organizational Commitment and Self-reported Performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(4), 483-504.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40604465>
- Sungu, L. J., Weng, Q., & Xu, X. (2019). Organizational commitment and job performance: Examining the moderating roles of occupational commitment and transformational leadership. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 27(3), 280-290.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12256>
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C., Austin, W. G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organizational identity: A reader*, 56-65.
- Tisu, L., Lupşa, D., Virgă, D., & Rusu, A. (2020). Personality characteristics, job performance and mental health: the mediating role of work engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 153, 109644.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109644>
- Trepte, S. (2013). Social identity theory. In *Psychology of entertainment* (pp. 255-271). Routledge.

- Ugaddan, R. G., & Park, S. M. (2017). Quality of leadership and public service motivation: A social exchange perspective on employee engagement. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(3), 270-285. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-08-2016-0133>
- Vaijayanthi, P., Shreenivasan, K., & Prabhakaran, S. (2011). Employee Engagement predictors: A study at GE Power & Water. *International Journal of Global Business*, 4(2), 60-72.
- Varma, A., Srinivas, E. S., & Stroh, L. K. (2005). A comparative study of the impact of leader-member exchange in US and Indian samples. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 12(1), 84-95. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13527600510797971>
- Wang, X., Guo, Y., & Duan, J. (2022). When does commitment backfire: Linking employee continuance commitment to silence behavior. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 72(6), 100797. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2022.100797>
- Wang, Y. (2015). Examining organizational citizenship behavior of Japanese employees: a multidimensional analysis of the relationship to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(4), 425-444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.560882>
- Wayne, S. J., Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., Eisenberger, R., Liden, R. C., Rousseau, D. M., & Shore, L. M. (2009). Social Influences. In H. J. Klein, T. E. Becker, & J. P. Meyer (Eds.), *Commitment in Organizations: Accumulated Wisdom and New Directions* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203882122>
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and In-Role Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700305>
- Xu, A. J., Loi, R., & Lam, L. W. (2015). The bad boss takes it all: How abusive supervision and leader-member exchange interact to influence employee silence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(5), 763-774. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.03.002>
- Xu, X., & Payne, S. C. (2016). Predicting Retention Duration From Organizational Commitment Profile Transitions. *Journal of Management*, 44(5), 2142-2168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316643166>
- Yan, Z., Wang, T., Chen, Y., & Zhang, H. (2016). Knowledge sharing in online health communities: A social exchange theory perspective. *Information & Management*, 53(5), 643-653. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.02.001>
- Yi, J. (2015). A Measure of Knowledge Sharing Behavior: Scale Development and Validation. In J. S. Edwards (Ed.), *The Essentials of Knowledge Management* (pp. 213-245). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137552105_10
- Yin, N. (2018). The influencing outcomes of job engagement: an interpretation from the social exchange theory. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 67(5), 873-889. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2017-0054>
- Zack, M. H. J. S. m. r. (1999). Managing codified knowledge. 40(4), 45-58.
- Zhang, X., & Liu, S. (2021). Understanding relationship commitment and continuous

knowledge sharing in online health communities: a social exchange perspective. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(3), 592-614. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2020-0883>

- Zhang, X., Zhang, Y., Sun, Y., Lytras, M., Ordonez de Pablos, P., & He, W. (2018). Exploring the effect of transformational leadership on individual creativity in e-learning: a perspective of social exchange theory. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(11), 1964-1978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1296824>
- Zhao, P., Xu, X., Peng, Y., & Matthews, R. A. (2020). Justice, support, commitment, and time are intertwined: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 120, 103432. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103432>