

FACTORS INFLUENCING EMPLOYEES WORK COMMITMENT IN IT ORGANISATIONS

GANESH. R*

Senior Lecturer, Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Communications, INTI International University, Nilai, Malaysia.

*Corresponding Author Email: ganeshlr@gmail.com, ganesh.ramasamy@newinti.edu.my

Abstract

Employee commitment, as a form of positive work characterized by zeal and selflessness, is under severe attack in contemporary enterprise organisations. Based on a review of social exchange theory, this study developed a research model that included the following components: promotion speed, professional ability, organisational rewards, organisational identification, and job engagement with the goal of increasing knowledge workers' job engagement in the organisation. The study's objective is to ascertain the effect of promotion speed, professional ability, and organisational rewards on job engagement dimensions and to ascertain how organisational identification altered their relationships. To test the hypothesis, this research used a self-administered questionnaire survey and treated knowledge workers as study subjects by distributing online questionnaires. A total of 168 valid samples were obtained. The aforementioned variables were tested with Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis. The findings indicated that promotion speed, professional ability, and organisational rewards have a positive effect on job engagement, while organisational identification reveals the moderating effect on job engagement. Finally, this paper suggests that information technology organisations should establish a reasonable training, compensation, and promotion system that takes career growth and organisational identification into account, as well as develop an innovative corporate culture that increases knowledge workers' job engagement.

Keywords: Knowledge-workers, promotion speed, professional ability, organization rewards, organizational identification, job engagement

1. INTRODUCTION

As a consequence of digitalization, a growing need arises for organisation management attitude regarding expert knowledge with job engagement for sustainable competitive advantage (Shujahat et al., 2021; Stander & Rothman 2010; Kim & Park 2017). The key characteristics in these modern knowledge work highlights the growth of autonomy and demand for flexibility in work arrangements (Wright et al., 2018; Stoyanova & Iliev, 2017; Kim & Park 2017).

As an occupational group, knowledge workers refer to people who own the special means of production, for example knowledge capital and ability to apply knowledge to novel projects (Del Giudice & Maggioni, 2014; Kianto et al., 2019). This can be interpreted as engaged employees referred as having ability to be innovative and take the initiative in restructuring their job resources in conformity with organizational objectives (Park et al., 2018; Del Giudice & Maggioni, 2014; Kianto et al., 2019). Maintaining these workers for competitive advantage and productivity in the industry poses a challenge to business and its management.

Numerous studies have demonstrated that a high turnover rate among knowledge workers is a natural consequence of today's volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous business environment (Del Giudice & Maggioni, 2014; Kianto et al., 2019; Oliva Fabio et al., 2019; Oliva Fabio and Kotabe, 2019; Park et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2018). Recent empirical studies demonstrate that employee turnover exposes organizations to several knowledge management risks such as knowledge loss and knowledge leakage to other organizations (Park et al., 2018; Sumbal et al., 2020; Wright et al., 2018).

Empirical finding has also shown that only 14% of employees in organizations around the world are fully engaged in their work (Stoyanova and Iliev, 2017). The emergence of this situation shows the need for a high level of work commitment and the finding are worthy of reflection. As shown from the finding the factors of complexity, ambiguous business environment, worker enthusiasm, and self-imposed work commitment, has led to the difficulty for employees to achieve a high level of work engagement and in order to prevent knowledge management risk it is important to emphasise knowledge workers job engagement in organisation. Therefore, there is need to find ways to increase the input of knowledge workers and enhance their job engagement level. Additionally, there is a need to investigate the relationship between business and its leadership and employee relationships, as well as the possibility of employee engagement serving as a mediator for innovative behaviour (Kim & Park, 2017; Stander & Rothmann, 2010; Shujahat et al., 2021; Sumbal et al., 2020).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The economy's rapid development is inextricably linked to the advancement of knowledge. As creators and carriers of knowledge, knowledge workers are critical core resources for enterprises seeking competitive advantages. Knowledge workers are more innovative and have a strong motivation for career advancement, primarily because they place a higher premium on personal career development, are willing to learn, are constantly on the lookout for ways to satisfy individual needs, and are adept at setting and achieving goals (Fok & Yeung, 2016; Kidd, 1994; Shujahat et al., 2021; Kim & Park 2017; Sumbal et al., 2020; Stander & Rothmann, 2010). Demand for knowledge workers continues to grow, and this has a significant impact on job engagement as a critical factor among knowledge workers (Wright et al., 2018; Kianto et al., 2019).

Job engagement is just as critical to employees' well-being as personal work-related engagement. Personal commitment to one's work is a result of motivation, particularly intrinsic motivation (Sumbal et al., 2020; Stander and Rothmann, 2010). This has been conceptualised as an individual's total commitment to a job role (Rich et al., 2010). As such, job engagement is a critical factor in determining successful job performance (Rich et al., 2010), as it affects both individuals and organisations. While the value of job engagement for productive work and employee well-being has been widely recognised (Li, 2018; O'Neill et al., 2014; Del Giudice & Maggioni, 2014), only a few studies have acknowledged it – particularly in the context of knowledge workers in information technology organisations. Indeed, scholars have argued that empirical research on job engagement is lacking in the context of knowledge

workers (Gilson et al., 2015; O'Neill et al., 2014; Del Giudice and Maggioni, 2014; Kianto et al., 2019; Oliva Fabio et al., 2019).

The other essential factor is the professional ability of workers that contributes to job engagement. Professional ability is a psychological element that is additionally analyzed from the work task. Therefore, its acquisition requires the basis of work task analysis from psychological element (Oliva Fabio et al., 2019; Kianto et al., 2019; Gilson et al., 2015). Professional ability is an indispensable factor for any employee. Employee can improve the organization productivity and effectiveness through efficient skill application with minimal resource expenditure. Airila et al. (2014) found that professional ability has a positive relationship with job engagement. Generally, people with high professional ability have higher pursuits and are not satisfied with the status quo. They all have the motivation to improve themselves, and they are constantly learning and strengthening themselves (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Shujahat et al., 2021; Kim & Park 2017).

According to scholars, a job with a high degree of autonomy enables an individual to actively seek out and apply new knowledge (Shujahat et al., 2021; Moreno & Cavazotte, 2015). A job that provides greater job autonomy in knowledge work requires workers to acquire or create knowledge of the methods and task priorities that are chosen (Shujahat et al., 2021; Cabrera et al., 2006). Additionally, knowledge work is more implicit, dynamic, complex, and evolving, requiring workers to constantly consider their job responsibilities (Shujahat et al., 2021; Moreno & Cavazotte, 2015). As a result, professional ability is a critical component of an employee's success.

In the context of promotion speed and organizational rewards there is a relationship between work engagement and career growth (James et al., 2011; Simon, 2012). Scholars have argued in their finding that, career growth can be conceptualized into four factors: career goal, promotion speed and organizational rewards (Weng & McElroy, 2012; Li, 2015; Schaufeli et al., 2002). According to theory of social exchange from Aryee et al., (2002), when an organization gives employees the benefits or promotion, employees will repay the organization, try to return to the organization through full-hearted work, high-quality completion task and give suggestions. Therefore, promotion speed, organisation rewards must be taken into consideration and as it might play a role in determining job engagement.

Studies have also argued on career development from multiple perspectives with work engagement as an area of importance in the field of human resources and organisation competitive advantage (Carasco-Saul et al., 2015; Weer, 2006; Li, 2018). But, substantial evidence are not clearly shown on the relationship between promotion speed, and organisation rewards towards employees job engagement, mainly because these variables are easily subjectively operated and the measurement cycle is too long (Carasco-Saul et al., 2015; Li, 2018; Shujahat et al., 2021).

The other key consideration is the factors in organizational identity which is seen in organisation as a state of mind (Dutton et al., 1994; Rousseau, 1998). This can be understood as the employee's psychological perception of the organization's consistency in values and

goals (Chen et al., 2016). Employees' recognition of the organization will lead to positive work behaviour and proactively solve the difficulties encountered (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Costa et al., 2001). Organizational identification makes employees psychologically aware that their future development is closely linked to the development prospects of the organization. Employees with high organizational identity will make more decisions that are beneficial to the organization (Stander & Rothmann, 2010; Stoyanova & Iliev, 2017). According to Guarana (2010), it has been stated that organizational identification moderated the relationship between workload and job engagement.

Concurrently, Okurame (2012) argued that there is a significant relationship between organizational identification and organizational citizenship behaviour. Crawshaw et al., (2012) pointed out that promotion speed, and organisation rewards as in career growth is a complex dimension. When observing this variable, there should be more independent variables because it will affect many aspects, such as job performance, work attitude, and other employee evaluation factors.

Organizational identification is basically a specific feeling that arises from the interaction between the members and organization which leads to a positive or negative impact on the organization. Therefore, the study of organizational identification is associated with factors related to the behavior of organizational members. Ashforth et al., (2008) generalize organizational identity as individuals define themselves in a particular organization and are part of the collective system.

Scholars have shown that the stronger the organizational identity, the closer the relationship between the individual and the organization and it will improve employee attitudes and produce higher interest level on their job (Kumar & Singh 2012; Riketta, 2005; Crawshaw et al., 2012).

This was confirmed by a meta-analysis of 81 studies, demonstrating that organisational identification can be a highly effective intervention for increasing employee retention (Riketta, 2005). Additionally, current empirical evidence indicates that when employees believe they are a part of the organisation, they will not demand a change in their current position (Bharadwaj & Yameen, 2020).

From the literature view of professional ability development, promotion speed, organizational rewards and organizational identification with its determinants in relations to job engagement the following hypotheses are formulated:

H1: Employee professional ability development has a positive impact on job engagement.

H2: Employee promotion speed has a positive impact on job engagement.

H3: Employee organizational rewards have a positive impact on job engagement.

H4a: The organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between promotion speed and job engagement.

H4b: The organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between professional ability and job engagement.

H4c: Employee organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between organization rewards and job engagement.

3. METHODOLOGY

The mechanism of the influence of knowledge-based employees' on their work input is discussed, and the regulatory role played by organizational identity is demonstrated through empirical tests. Therefore, this paper used quantitative research procedures to propose research hypotheses based on the literature review. The research model is constructed, and appropriate measurement tools are selected for each type of variable and revised in combination with the actual so that the sample data collection is more specified. Then, the collected raw data is analyzed and interpreted by means of statistical analysis tools that is SPSS (Statistical Project of Social Sciences) version 25 to verify the proposed research hypotheses and theoretical model.

The measurement factors included involved include" the 'questionnaire include organizational identification, promotion speed, professional ability, organization rewards, and job engagement. All items in the questionnaire were scored using the 5-level Likert scale.

The information collection channels of this study mainly adopted online where questionnaire were distributed by means of various communication software such as WeChat, email to the employees of the organisation. Although many questionnaires were distributed, only 168 sets were valid to be analysed. Thus, the sample size of this study is taken to be 168.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Reliability Test

The reliability analysis was performed on the constructs of promotion speed, professional ability, organization rewards, organizational identification, and job engagement. The reliability analysis of variables in this study is shown in Table 1. Based on the table, majority of the variables had coefficients exceeding the acceptable level 0.7 as suggested by Kline, (1998). More concretely, promotion speed $\alpha = 0.917$, professional ability $\alpha = 0.930$, organizational identification $\alpha = 0.937$, organization rewards $\alpha = 0.917$ and job engagement $\alpha=0.931$. All of these variables were greater than 0.9. Hence, these data show that there is good internal consistency among the variables, and the reliability of the questionnaire and the scale is verified.

Table 1: Results of reliability test

Variable	Cronbach's	Items
Promotion Speed	0.917	5
Professional Ability	0.930	5
Organization Rewards	0.917	4
Organizational Identification	0.937	5
Job Engagement	0.931	7

4.2 Correlation Analysis

The research model of this paper mainly involved the variables of promotion speed; professional ability; organization rewards; organizational identification; job engagement. The correlation coefficient matrix is presented in Table 2. Based on the results, it is shown that there was a significant positive correlation between organizational identification and job engagement ($r = 0.486$, $p < 0.01$). In addition, there was also have a significant positive correlation between promotion speed and job engagement ($r = 0.369$, $p < 0.01$), followed by professional ability and job engagement ($r = 0.459$, $p < 0.01$) and organization rewards ($r = 0.420$, $p < 0.01$).

Table 2: Results of correlation analysis

		PS	PA	OR	OI	JE
PS	Pearson Correlation	1	.265**	.344**	.209**	.369**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.000	.007	.000
	N	168	168	168	168	168
PA	Pearson Correlation	.265**	1	.352**	.274**	.459**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000	.000	.000
	N	168	168	168	168	168
OR	Pearson Correlation	.344**	.352**	1	.249**	.420**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.001	.000
	N	168	168	168	168	168
OI	Pearson Correlation	.209**	.274**	.249**	1	.486**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.000	.001		.000
	N	168	168	168	168	168
JE	Pearson Correlation	.369**	.459**	.420**	.486**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	168	168	168	168	168

Notes:

1. PS = Promotion Speed; PA = Professional Ability; OR = Organization Rewards; OI = Organizational Identification; JE = Job Engagement
2. ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

4.3 Regression Analysis

Simple linear regression was used to test the effect of promotion speed; professional ability; organization rewards on job engagement. The finding of the regression analysis are highlighted in Table 3 and the Sig. values of the three regression equations all approached zero, indicating that the model can be accepted. The regression coefficient of the independent variable promotion speed to job engagement ($\beta = 0.198$, $p < 0.01$), which indicated that higher post in an organization reflected on higher professional ability. Thus, Hypothesis 2 (H2) is supported.

Based on results, the employee Professional Ability has the greatest impact on employee job engagement ($\beta = 0.325$, $p < 0.001$) and employee organizational rewards also has a positive impact on job engagement ($\beta = 0.229$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1(H1) and Hypothesis 3 (H3) are supported. Meanwhile, this also has the preconditions to test the moderating effect of organizational identification.

Table 3: Coefficients of regression analysis

Variables	Unstandardized coefficient		Standardized coefficient	Sig.
	Beta (β)	Std. error		
(Constant)	1.211	0.444		0.007
PS	0.195	0.071	0.198	0.001
PA	0.314	0.070	0.325	0.000
OR	0.199	0.065	0.229	0.003

Notes:

PS=Promotion Speed; PA=Professional Ability; OR=Organization Rewards;

Dependent Variable: Job Engagement

4.4 Moderating Effect of Organizational Identification

Table 4 highlights the moderating test. The first step was to verify the main effect between promotion speed and job engagement, Standardized Coefficients ($\beta = 0.148$, $p < 0.05$). In the second step, the moderate variable was added, and the main effect relationship was still significant ($\beta = 0.315$, $p < 0.001$). The third step, after adding the interaction item, it is shown the standardized coefficients $\beta = 0.139$ ($p < 0.05$) which indicated that organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between promotion speed and job engagement. Hypothesis 4a is supported.

Next, is to examine the moderating role of organizational identification between professional ability and job engagement. As shown in Model 2, the first step was to verify the main effect between professional ability and job engagement, Standardized Coefficients ($\beta = 0.239$, $p < 0.001$). In the second step, added the moderate variable and the main effect relationship was still significant ($\beta = 0.348$, $p < 0.001$). The third step, after adding the interaction item, the standardized coefficients ($\beta = 0.185$, $p < 0.01$) which signified that organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between promotion ability and job engagement. Hence, hypothesis 4b is supported.

Besides, examining the moderating role of organizational identification between organization rewards and job engagement was also carried out. As shown in Model 3, the first step was to verify the main effect between organization rewards and job engagement, Standardized Coefficients ($\beta = 0.186$, $p < 0.001$). In the second step, added the moderate variable and the main effect relationship was still significant ($\beta = 0.352$, $p < 0.001$). The third step, after adding the interaction item, the standardized coefficients ($\beta = 0.156$, $p < 0.01$) which proved that organizational identification has a significant positive moderating effect between organization rewards and job engagement. Hypothesis 4c is supported.

Therefore, the findings indicates that, the organizational identification has a significant moderating effect between the dependent variable (job engagement) and independent variable (promotion speed, professional ability, organizational rewards).

Table 4: Test result of the moderating effect of organizational identification

Independent variable	Dependent variable : Job Engagement		
	Standardized coefficient beta (β)		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
PS	0.148*	0.183**	0.159*
PA	0.281***	0.239***	0.269***
OR	0.186**	0.203**	0.186**
OI	0.315***	0.348***	0.352***
OI*PS	0.139*		
OI*PA		0.185**	
OI*OR			0.156**
R Square	0.445	0.46	0.45
F	14.069***	14.949***	14.381***

Notes;

1. PS = Promotion Speed; PA = Professional Ability; OR = Organization Rewards; OI = Organizational Identification; JE = Job Engagement.

2. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The empirical analysis in the previous subsections showed that promotion speed, professional ability, organizational rewards have a significant impact on job engagement, and organizational identification plays a moderating role in their relationships. This result is consistent with Liu et al., (2017) findings. This shows that there are two ways to improve job engagement. First is through projecting employee career growth with non-economic remuneration for a direct role in promoting work engagement; second with the application of moderating role of organizational identification can further strengthen the positive role of job engagement. With that information technology organisation can project employee career growth as a positive role in promoting work engagement.

From the regression analysis results, the promotion speed has a significant impact on job engagement ($p < 0.01$). For knowledge workers, they pursue the satisfaction of personal needs and the realization of personal goals, pay attention to personal career development and growth. Promotion speed refers to the space and possibility of knowledge workers position promotion in the organization. When the organization gives employees strong motivation for achievement growth opportunities, it will encourage them to make greater efforts for organizational development. This is also supported by Fok and Yeung (2016), argued that when knowledge workers get a faster promotion speed, it showed that employees efforts in the organization have been recognized, which makes employees involuntarily more active and energetic in doing their work.

The finding on organizational rewards also shows a significant impact on job engagement ($p < 0.001$). Organizational rewards come in many ways, such as salaries or opportunities to study abroad. If the current work is conducive to the realization of employees' career goals and expected salary, it will inevitably stimulate employees' enthusiasm and sense of pride in work and closely integrate their career goals with the strategic development of an organization. When employee faced possible conundrum in the organization, they will make suggestions on their own initiative to prove their dedication to the organization.

Apart from the above the finding reveals that employees' professional ability has a positive impact on job engagement ($p < 0.05$). Professional ability development refers to the promotion of professional knowledge and skills in current positions. The advent of the age of knowledge economy has changed the traditional value chain and capital composition, development of employees' professional ability which is an important means to enhance their self-competitive advantages. When employees are able to accumulate experience, learn new knowledge and skills, and improve their professional ability, they will devote more attention to their work. At the same time, they will have a sense of achievement that will prevent employee from leaving the organisation.

According to the empirical results of moderating effect, the moderating effect of organizational identification is significant, which is consistent with the finding from Karanika-Murray et al., (2015) & Dutton et al., (1994). Knowledge workers' organizational identity is an important situational variable, which has a direct impact on their actual performance. Employees with high organizational identity will form psychological contracts with the organization, and take pride in their work, and will implement more beneficial decisions for the organization. Under the condition of high organizational identity, the career growth of knowledge workers provided by organizations enhances their sense of belonging and stimulates their work potential and vitality. On the contrary, under the condition of low organizational identity, even if the organization gives certain career growth opportunities, it will not necessarily stimulate employees' positive action and job engagement.

In conclusion, this study reveals the importance of job engagement which is directly affected by promotion speed, professional ability and organizational rewards. On the continuing point organizational identification has the indirect influence on job engagement. Therefore, this study suggests that information technology organizations should pay more attention on the needs of

knowledge workers, take the initiative to help employees complete a comprehensive analysis of themselves and understand their interests, strengths, and weaknesses in order to increase job engagement in organisation.

Acknowledgments

This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, nor commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest

The author report no conflict of interest.

References

1. Airila, A., Hakanen, J.J., Schaufeli, W.B., Luukkonen, R., Punakallio, A & Lusa, S. (2014) Are job and personal resources associated with work ability 10 years later? The mediating role of work engagement, *Work & Stress, An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 28(1), 87-105, DOI: 10.1080/02678373.2013.872208
2. Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S. , & Chen, Z. X. 2002. Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 267-286.
3. Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management*, 34, 325-374. doi: 10.1177/ 0149206308316059
4. Bharadwaj, S. and Yameen, M. (2020), Analyzing the mediating effect of organizational identification on the relationship between CSR employer branding and employee retention, *Management Research Review*, 44(5), 718-737.
5. Cabrera, A., Collins, W.C. and Salgado, J.F. (2006), Determinants of individual engagement in knowledge sharing, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2), 245-264.
6. Carasco-Saul, M., Kim, W. & Kim, T. (2015). Leadership and employee engagement: Proposing research agendas through a review of literature. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(1), 38-63.
7. Chen, P., Sparrow, P., & Cooper, C. (2016). The relationship between person-organization fit and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(5), 946-959.
8. Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., and McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81, (2), 322.
9. Crawshaw, J. R., Van Dick, R. & Brodbeck, F. C. (2012). Opportunity, fair process and relationship value: career development as a driver of proactive work behaviour. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(1), 4-20.
10. Del Giudice, M. and Maggioni, V. (2014), Managerial practices and operative directions of knowledge management within inter-firm networks: a global view, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(5), 841-846.
11. Demerouti, E., Bakker, A., & Leiter, M. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: the JD-R approach. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(1), 96-107.
12. Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative science quarterly*, 239-263.
13. Fok, R. H., and Yeung, R. M. (2016). Work attitudes of Generation Y in Macau's hotel industry: management's perspective. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 8(1), 83-96.

14. Gilson, L.L., Maynard, M.T., Jones Young, N.C., Vartiainen, M. and Hakonen, M. (2015), Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities, *Journal of Management*, 41(5), 1313-1337.
15. Guarana, C. L. O. (2010). The Moderator effect of organizational identification on the relationship between work context and workforce engagement/burnout (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
16. James, J. B., McKechnie, S., and Swanberg, J. (2011). Predicting employee engagement in an age-diverse retail workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(2), 173-196.
17. Karanika-Murray, M., Duncan, N., Pontes, H. M. and Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Organizational identification, work engagement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(8), 1019-1033.
18. Kidd, A. (1994). The Marks are on the Knowledge Worker": Proc. ACM CHI'94: Human Factors in Computing Systems, Boston, Mass (24-28 April 1994).
19. Kianto, A., Shujahat, M., Hussain, S., Nawaz, F. and Ali, M. (2019), The impact of knowledge management on knowledge worker productivity, *Baltic Journal of Management*, 14(2), 178-197.
20. Kim, W. and Park, J. (2017), Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organizational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior for sustainable organizations, *Sustainability*, 9(2), 205, doi: 10.3390/su9020205.
21. Kline, R. B. (1998). Software review: Software programs for structural equation modeling: Amos, EQS, and LISREL. *Journal of psychoeducational assessment*, 16(4), 343-364.
22. Kumar, M. and Singh, S. (2012), Roles of perceived exchange quality and organisational identification in predicting turnover intention, *IIMB Management Review*, 24(1), 5-15.
23. Li, Y., Castaño G., & Li. (2018) Linking leadership styles to work engagement The role of psychological capital among Chinese knowledge workers, *Chinese Management Studies* 12(2), 433-452.
24. Liu, J., He, X., & Yu, J. (2017). The relationship between career growth and job engagement among young employees: The mediating role of normative commitment and the moderating role of organizational justice. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 5(1), 83-94.
25. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
26. Moreno, V. and Cavazotte, F. (2015), Using information systems to leverage knowledge management processes: the role of work context, job characteristics and task-technology fit, *Procedia Computer Science*, 55, 360-369.
27. Okurame, D. (2012). Impact of career growth prospects and formal mentoring on organisational citizenship behaviour. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 33(1), 66-85.
28. Oliva Fabio, L. and Kotabe, M. (2019), Barriers, practices, methods and knowledge management tools in startups, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(9), 1838-1856.
29. O'Neill, T.A., Hambley, L.A. and Chatellier, G.S. (2014), Cyberslacking, engagement, and personality in distributed work environments, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 40, 152-160.
30. Park, H.D., Howard, M.D. and Gomulya, D.M. (2018), The impact of knowledge worker mobility through an acquisition on breakthrough knowledge, *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(1), 86-107.
31. Rich, B.L., Lepine, J.A. and Crawford, E.R. (2010), Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 617-635, doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.514 68988.
32. Riketta, M. (2005), Organizational identification: a meta-analysis, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 358-384.

33. Rousseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 19(3), 217-233.
34. 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.
35. Schaufeli, W.B. and Salanova, M. (2008), Enhancing work engagement through the management of human resources, in Näswall, K., Hellgren, J. and Sverke, M., *The Individual in the Changing Working Life*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 380-402.
36. Shujahat, M., Wang, M., Ali, M., Bibi, A., Razzaq, S & Durst, S. (2021). Idiosyncratic job-design practices for cultivating personal knowledge management among knowledge workers in organizations. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 25(4), 770-795.
37. Simón, H. (2012). The gender gap in earnings: an international comparison with European matched employer–employee data. *Applied Economics*, 44(15), 1985-1999.
38. Stander, M.W. and Rothmann, S. (2010), Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and employee engagement, *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(1), 1-8, doi: 10.1177/0972150 91 3515589.
39. Stoyanova, T., & Iliev, I. (2017). Employee engagement factor for organizational excellence. *International Journal of Business and Economic Sciences Applied Research (IJBESAR)*, 10(1), 23-29.
40. Sumbal, M.S., Tsui, E., Durst, S., Shujahat, M., Irfan, I. and Ali, S.M. (2020), A framework to retain the knowledge of departing knowledge workers in the manufacturing industry, *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*. 50 (4), 631-651 DOI:10. /VJIKM S-06-2019-0086
41. Sweetman, D., & Luthans, F. (2010). The power of positive psychology: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, 54-68.
42. Weer, C. H. 2006. The impact of non-work role commitment on employees' career growth prospects. *Drexel University*, 1-217.
43. Weng, Q., & McElroy, J. C. (2012). Organizational career growth, affective occupational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 256-265.
44. Wright, M., Tartari, V., Huang, K.G., Di Lorenzo, F. and Bercovitz, J. (2018), Knowledge worker mobility in context: pushing the boundaries of theory and methods, *Journal of Management Studies*, (55)1, 1-26.