

The Effect of Knowledge Management, Employee Engagement, and Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance with Organizational Culture as a Moderating Variable

Abdul Muslim¹, Luhut Indra², Hara Ibnufauzi Lystiardi³, Sarfilianty Anggiani⁴

¹Institute of Social Sciences and Management, STIAM Indonesia

^{2,3,4} Universitas Trisakti Indonesia

abdulmuslim78@gmail.com, luhut09@yahoo.com, haralysti@gmail.com, Sarfilianty@trisakti.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to obtain an overview of how the influence of knowledge management, employee involvement, and intrinsic motivation is moderated by organizational culture on employee performance. This study uses an associative quantitative approach using regression techniques. The sample of this study amounted to 199 people where the majority consisted of employees engaged in services (46.7%) and trade & manufacturing (22.1%). Research data was collected through a questionnaire instrument designed using a Likert scale which was first tested for validity and reliability. Based on the research results, there is a positive and significant influence of knowledge management and intrinsic motivation on employee performance. Otherwise, there is no positive and significant effect of employee engagement on employee performance. Meanwhile, organizational culture cannot be used as a moderating variable to improve employee performance because of the dominance of this variable on employee performance. This finding shows that if an organization wants to improve the performance of its employees, it can be done by implementing optimal knowledge management and providing consistent intrinsic motivation.

Keywords

knowledge management;
employee engagement; and
intrinsic motivation



I. Introduction

An organization or company was founded because it has a goal to be achieved. To achieve its goals, every organization or company is influenced by the behavior and attitudes of the people in the organization. In addition, organizations or companies need resources to achieve the goals themselves. Resources include natural resources, financial resources, and human resources, besides that there are also scientific and technological resources as a complement to these resources. Of all these resources, human resources are the most important because they are used as a driving force and synergize other resources to achieve organizational goals. Without competent and dedicated human resources, an organization can't maximize its productivity and profit.

The higher the company's leverage, the company tends to generate less cash, this is likely to affect the occurrence of earning management. Companies with high debt or leverage ratios tend to hold their profits and prioritize the fulfillment of debt obligations first. According to Brigham and Ehrhardt (2013), the greater the leverage of the company, it tends to pay lower dividends in order to reduce dependence on external funding. So that the greater the proportion of debt used for the capital structure of a company, the greater the number of

liabilities that are likely to affect shareholder wealth because it affects the size of the dividends to be distributed. (Yanizzar, et al. 2020)

Another factor that must be considered is employee engagement. Gallup in Dernoersk (2008) defines employee engagement as the contribution and enthusiasm of employees in doing their work. In the concept of employee engagement, between employees and the company, there is a two-way or reciprocal relationship. According to Stephen Young Yang in Markos and Sridevi (2010) revealed that the determinant of company performance is employee involvement and not just job satisfaction. In today's era, employee involvement has been considered as a catalyst for companies to compete competitively and a determinant of the success of company management. Engaged employees will work hard with positive thoughts, so they get things done faster or more at work.

Another factor that affects employee performance is work motivation. Work motivation greatly affects employee morale and has the potential to optimize company performance. Therefore, it is necessary to have a pusher from the company so that employees want to move and show their potential so that the work being done will be completed more quickly and precisely without reducing the existing discipline if it is supported by the participation of a leader or leader. In this case, superiors must always provide direction, knowledge, foster and motivate subordinates in completing the work given to achieve the goals set by the organization or company. This must always be pursued by a leader by providing motivation and a balance of wages for the work that the employee has done. The application of motivation can be in any form depending on the standards of each company. Some companies use a motivational seminar system so that employees have high work motivation to occupy a higher position in the organization or company, some companies provide job training that can make these employees capable, capable, skilled, and committed to the work given by the company.

Organizational culture should also be seen as one of the variables that affect employee performance. Organizational culture grows through the process of creating and developing ideas by leaders and then implementing them to all members of the organization. Environmental developments and organizational needs will greatly affect organizational culture. The organization will not develop into a developed organization without maintaining its culture. A strong culture influences the strategies carried out in achieving the goals that have been set.

Based on the research background and the phenomena above, the researchers are interested in carrying out research entitled "The Effect of Knowledge Management, Employee Engagement, and Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance with Organizational Culture as a Moderating Variable". This research is expected to provide comprehensive but easy-to-understand insights regarding the effect of knowledge management, employee engagement, and intrinsic motivation on employee performance with organizational culture as a moderating variable.

II. Review of Literature

2.1. Knowledge Management

Knowledge management is a way for organizations to identify, create, represent, distribute, and enable the adaptation of insights and experiences. Insights and experiences consist of knowledge sourced from individuals and knowledge inherent in organizational methods or standard procedures. Knowledge management is an effort to increase useful knowledge in organizations, including promoting communication between personnel, providing learning opportunities, and promoting knowledge sharing. According to Davenport and Prusak (1998), knowledge management is a structured experience, values,

The forming factor of knowledge management as the basis for measurement in this study is the concept of Becerra-Fernandez and Sabherwal (2010) which involves 4 dimensions, namely: 1) Knowledge Discovery; 2) Knowledge Capture; 3) Knowledge Sharing; and 4) Knowledge Application. Tiffin in Sutrisno (2011: 76) argues that employee attitudes towards their work, work situations, and cooperation between leaders and fellow employees are closely related to job satisfaction. Fadlallah (2015), Shaju (2017), Tamriatin Hidayah et al. (2018), Shaju and Subhashini (2017), and Wibowo in Yanidrawati et al. (2012) stated that job satisfaction has a significant effect on employee performance.

2.2. Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is generally defined as the level of responsibility and participation of an employee towards their organization and its values. When an employee is involved, he is aware of his responsibility in the business goals and motivates his colleagues together, for the success of the organization's goals. Kahn (1990) defines employee engagement as the relationship of individuals in the organization to their work; where they can express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally. According to Sharma and Anupama (2001), employee involvement is a commitment from members of the organization where they will make every effort to achieve the goals, vision, and mission of the organization. Meanwhile, Robbins and Judge (2014) argue that employee engagement is a condition where employees feel a deep connection in the organization and have a passion to work in it.

Absorption or absorption is an aspect that refers to a sense of focus and sincerity in work enjoy work to the point of forgetting time, and find it difficult to get out of the work being done (Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006). A sense of involvement and enthusiasm that is conveyed by the interest and pride in the work being done (Dicke et al., 2007). Absorption or absorption is an aspect that refers to a sense of focus and sincerity in work. Enjoy work to the point of forgetting time, and find it difficult to get out of the work being done (Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006). a sense of involvement and enthusiasm that is conveyed by the interest and pride in the work being done (Dicke et al., 2007). Absorption or absorption is an aspect that refers to a sense of focus and sincerity in work. Enjoy work to the point of forgetting time, and find it difficult to get out of the work being done (Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006).

About employee performance, Macey and Schneider (2008) and Rich et al., (2010) reveal that employee performance will increase with employee engagement. Employees who are involved will feel bound to work, are ready to sacrifice more time and energy for their work, and are more active in achieving work goals (Macey et al., 2009). Meanwhile, employees with low levels of involvement tend not to have passion in work, feel unhappy, are less enthusiastic about the work given, have low motivation and initiative, and are easy to be distracted and not focused on their work so that it hurts other employees and the achievement of goals organization (Gallup, 2013).

Previous studies have shown that there is a positive and significant effect of employee engagement on employee performance (Anitha, 2014; Sendawula et al., 2018; Ayub and Islam, 2018; Wahyu, Agnes and Setiawan, 2017; Gunawan and Wardana, 2018; Chandra and Remiasa, 2018; Aisyah and Pradana, 2020). Research (Christian et al., 2011; Fleming and Asplund, 2007; Rich et al., 2010; Richman, 2006; Macey and Schneider, 2008; Holbeche and Springett, 2003; Leiter and Bakker, 2010) also show higher levels of employee engagement. High levels of work performance, tasks, organizational behavior, productivity, discretionary efforts, affective commitment, continuance commitment, level of psychological climate, and customer service meanwhile, and other studies have shown a positive but not significant effect (Munparidi and Sayuti)

2.3. Intrinsic Motivation

According to Sulistiyani and Rosidah (2009: 76), motivation is defined as "the energy that moves individuals to try to achieve the expected goals". Islam and Ismail (2008) argue that motivation is an important aspect in influencing others to work towards company goals. Meanwhile, Garg and Rastogi (2006) suggest that to compete effectively in the global market, companies must be able to design jobs so that employee stress can be reduced and employee motivation and satisfaction including performance can be increased. It is very important to give motivation to employees because motivation acts as a driver and motivator for employees to be able to do the best possible work so that the targets set by the company can be achieved.

In understanding motivation, McCormick and Tiffelin in Akanbi (2011) suggest that motivation can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation comes from the motivation that is inherent in the work itself and that is enjoyed by individuals as a result of completing a task or achieving its goals. While extrinsic motivation is motivation outside of work tasks, such as salary, working conditions, benefits, security, promotions, work contracts, work environment, and working conditions. .

Based on the results of the study by Hamdani, Mulyanti, and Abdillah (2019) which tested the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on the performance of Grabbike drivers in Bogor City, it showed that intrinsic motivation had a positive and significant effect on the performance of drivers (employees). Research conducted by Akbar (2012), Prahiawan and Simbolon (2014), and Putra (2013) also showed positive and significant results from the intrinsic motivation variable on employee performance. However, a study conducted by Akanbi (2011) on the employees of Flour Mills of Nigeria in Lagos, Nigeria showed the opposite result, namely that there was no significant effect between intrinsic motivation and the performance of the company's employees.

2.4. Organizational Culture

Early research on OCB tended to focus on helping (often labeled "altruism") and general compliance, which was less interpersonal and involved behaviors such as following rules, showing up regularly and on time, and not wasting time at work (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). Organ (1988) discusses five types of OCB – altruism (helping others), conscientiousness (punctual and reliable), sportsmanship (restraint) of complaining, courtesy (touching ground with others), and civic virtues (being engaged) – and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed a 24-item scale to measure these behaviors. Moorman and Blakely (1995) identified four types of OCB that overlap substantially with behaviors identified in previous jobs interpersonal assistance, individual initiative (frankly), personal industry (punctual and careful in their work), and loyal boosterism (defending and promoting the company) and developing a 20-item scale to measure it.

At least two attempts have been made to combine different types of OCB into a more narrow set. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) argue that these OCBs fall into seven dimensions: helpful behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and voice. Personal industry (being punctual and careful in their work), and loyal boosterism (defending and promoting the company) – and developed a 20-item scale to measure it. At least two attempts have been made to combine different types of OCB into a more narrow set. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) argue that these OCBs fall into seven dimensions: helpful behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and voice. Personal industry (being punctual and careful in their work), and loyal boosterism (defending and promoting the company) – and developed a 20-

item scale to measure it. At least two attempts have been made to combine different types of OCB into a more narrow set. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bachrach (2000) argue that these OCBs fall into seven dimensions: helpful behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and voice.

Based on meta-analytical lytic findings, Podsakoff et al. (2009) concluded that the relationship between, “OCBs and job performance ratings is, for the most part, quite comparable to the relationship between task performance and job performance ratings” (p. 129). In a study of faculty working at research universities using an outcomes-based reward system, Bergeron, Ostroff, Schroeder, and Block (2014) found that internally directed OCB in service to universities was negatively related to short and long-term research performance indicators (i.e., the number of publications) and career advancement; However, externally directed OCB in service to the profession was positively associated with these outcomes.

III. Research Method

This research is an associative type with a quantitative approach. Associative or relationship is research that aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables and how the level of dependence between the independent variable and the dependent variable. Research with a quantitative approach uses Regression Analysis with Moderating Variables using the smartPLS application whose analysis output is divided into two, the outer model and the inner model. The outer model includes validity and reliability tests, while the inner model focuses on feasibility testing and identification of the influence between research variables.

Table 1. Demographics

Characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Man	107	53.8
Woman	92	46.2
Education		
SMA/SMK/MA	18	9.0
Diploma (D1-D4)	17	8.5
Bachelor degree)	113	56.8
Master (S2)	50	25.1
Doctoral (S3)	1	0.5
Business fields		
ASN	19	9.5
Trading & Manufacturing	44	22.1
Infrastructure & Construction	5	2.5
Agriculture & Plantation	1	0.5
Information Technology	3	1.5
Education	4	2.0
Other Services	93	46.7
Other	30	15.1
Position		
Staff	97	48.7
Supervisor	27	13.6
Manager	42	21.1
director	33	16.6

Length of work		
<3 years	55	27.6
3 to 5 years	25	12.6
5 to 10 years	31	15.6
>10 years	88	44.2

The total number of respondents used in the study was 199 (table 1). Collecting data using a questionnaire instrument designed using a Likert scale and first tested for validity and reliability.

The results of the validity test for each indicator use a loading factor and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The loading factor of each indicator is more than 0.7 with the lowest value of 0.7072 belonging to the statement (construct variable) KM3 as a constituent of the Knowledge Management (KM) variable. While the AVE value for each variable is greater than 0.5 with the lowest AVE value owned by the Knowledge Management (KM) variable as well. The two tests are sufficient to prove that the indicators used by each variable are valid as a variable measuring instrument.

The results of the reliability test for Cronbach alpha and composite reliability get the value of these two test sizes for each variable that is more than 0.7. The lowest Cronbach alpha value is owned by the Knowledge Management (KM) variable of 0.897, while the lowest composite reliability value is also owned by the Knowledge Management (KM) variable of 0.919 (Table 4). Based on the two tests, it can be concluded that the instrument used to measure the research variables can be said to be reliable.

After analyzing the outer model, the next step is to analyze the inner model. The results of the analysis of the inner model obtain a coefficient value that shows the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable and the effect of the moderating variable. In addition, there are also t-statistics and p-values. Where t-statistics and p-value are used to test whether the effect is significant or not.

IV. Result and Discussion

Based on the sample data collected, the final score for each indicator that makes up the research variables is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Research Variable Indicator Scores

Variable	Indicator	Score
<i>Knowledge</i>	Kaptur or Knowledge Creation	4.09
<i>Management</i>	Knowledge Sharing and Transfer	4.36
(KM)	Knowledge Acquisition and Application	3.89
<i>Employee</i>	Strength	4.22
<i>Engagement</i>	Devotion	4.26
(EE)	Absorption	4.16
Intrinsic	Physiological Needs	3.87
Motivation	Safety Needs	4.26
(MI)	Social Needs	4.23
	Self esteem needs	4.24
	Self-actualization Needs	4.28
Organizationa	Self-awareness	4.44
l Culture	Aggression	4.38
(BO)	Personality	4.41
Employee	Quality of Work	4.49
Performance	Quantity of Work	4.46

(KK)	Punctuality (Promptness)	4.35
	Ability to cooperate (Teamwork)	4.43
	Communication	4.47

The results of the outer model data processing are presented in Table 3 and 4. The model validity test is presented in Table 3, while the reliability test is presented in Table 4. Table 3 is a validity test for all valid statements (construct variables), namely 40 statements out of a total of 63 statements which are available.

Table 3. Outer Model: Construct Validity

Variable	Indicator Code	Loading Factor	AVE
Knowledge Management (KM)	KM3	0.7072	0.619
	KM5	0.7397	
Employee Engagement (EE)	KM6	0.8147	0.673
	KM7	0.8030	
	KM8	0.8427	
	KM10	0.7839	
	KM11	0.8088	
	EE1	0.8099	
Intrinsic Motivation (MI)	EE2	0.8571	0.627
	EE3	0.8515	
	EE4	0.8338	
	EE5	0.7850	
	EE8	0.8350	
	EE9	0.7784	
	EE10	0.8369	
	EE12	0.8791	
	EE16	0.7232	
	MI4	0.8518	
Organizational Culture (BO)	MI5	0.7733	0.652
	MI6	0.7807	
	MI7	0.7420	
	MI8	0.8015	
	MI9	0.8558	
	MI10	0.7304	
	BO1	0.8409	
	BO2	0.8427	
	BO6	0.8497	
	BO7	0.7844	
Employee Performance (KK)	BO8	0.8736	0.687
	BO9	0.7852	
	BO10	0.7322	
	BO11	0.8032	
	BO13	0.8190	
	BO15	0.7338	
	KK3	0.7675	
	KK4	0.8087	
KK5	0.8618		
KK6	0.8741		
KK7	0.8562		
KK8	0.7987		

Table 4. Outer Model: Construct Reliability

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
<i>Knowledge Management (KM)</i>	0.897	0.919
<i>Employee Engagement (EE)</i>	0.946	0.953
<i>Intrinsic Motivation (MI)</i>	0.901	0.922
<i>Organizational Culture (BO)</i>	0.940	0.949
<i>Employee Performance (KK)</i>	0.908	0.929

The test results for the moderating variable Organizational Culture (BO) in moderating the three independent variables, none of which has a p-value less than 0.05 and t-statistics greater than 1.96 so it can be concluded that Organizational Culture (BO) does not moderate Knowledge Management (KM), Employee Engagement (EE), and Intrinsic Motivation (MI) on Employee Performance (KK).

Table 5. Inner Model: R-Square

Endogenous Variable	R2	Adjusted R2
Employee performance	0.733	0.723

Table 5 shows the results of the coefficient of determination which the results are relatively large (more than 70%). As for the simultaneous test, it can be concluded from the results in Table 5 which shows that only one has an effect, so it can be concluded that simultaneously the variables in the model affect the dependent variable.

V. Conclusion

There have been many previous studies examining the influence of Knowledge Management, Employee Engagement, and Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance in an organization. From the results of this research, Knowledge Management and Intrinsic Motivation affect Employee Performance. Meanwhile, employee involvement has no positive and significant effect on employee performance. Meanwhile, organizational culture cannot be used as a moderating variable to improve employee performance because of the dominance of these variables on employee performance compared to the three variables tested (Knowledge Management, Employee Engagement, and Intrinsic Motivation).

These findings indicate that to improve the performance of its employees, an organization must strive to increase knowledge that is useful to employees including familiarizing communication between personnel, providing opportunities to learn and promoting various knowledge either through internal training, seminars, and external training or through employee involvement in the organization and professional association. Intrinsic motivation is also a very important aspect to be given to employees because motivation acts as a driver and motivator for employees to be able to do the best possible work so that the targets set by the company can be achieved. Companies must be able to consistently provide recognition or awards to employees who excel (recognition).

References

- Akanbi, PA (2011). "Influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employees' performance". Oyo State: Ajayi Crowther University.
- Akbar, FN (2012), "The Influence of Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance at PT Perkebunan Nusantara XII Surabaya", Malang: FEB Universitas Brawijaya.
- Anitha, J. (2014). "Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance", *IJPPM*, Vol. 63, No. 3, pp. 308-323
- Ayub, N. & Islam, MK (2018). "The effects of employee engagement on employee performance in the hotel industry in Kelantan", *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 828-838.
- Chandra, C. & Remiasa, M. (2018). "The effect of employee engagement on employee performance at PT Intiland Grande, AGORA, Vol. 6, No. 1.
- Coon, D. & Mitterer, JO 2010. *Introduction to psychology: Gateways to mind and behavior with concept maps*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Dernovsek D. (2008). *Creating highly engaged and committed employee starts at the top and ends at the bottom line* Credit Union Magazine, May 2008. Credit Union National Association, Inc.
- Dicke, Holwerda, & Kontakos. (2007). "Employee engagement: What do we really know? what do we need to know take action". Paris: Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies (CAHRS).
- gallup. (2013). *How Employee Engagement Drives Growth*. Business Journal. Retrieved March 11, 2016, from: <http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/163130/employee-engagementdrves-growth.aspx>
- Garg, P., Rastogi, R. (2006), "New model of job design: motivating employees performance", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 572-587.
- Gunawan, H. & Wardana, AW (2018) "Knowledge sharing as a mediation between employee engagement and the performance of Gojek drivers in Yogyakarta", *Mercu Buana University Yogyakarta*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 411-424.
- Hamdani, Mulyanti, RY, Abdillah, F. (2019), "The influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on the performance of Grabbike drivers", *Ecobis Journal: Economics, Business and Management*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 89-103.
- Hwang, DY, Lin, YC, & Lyu, J. 2008. *The Performance Evaluation of SCOR Sourcing Process—The Case Study of Taiwan's TFT-LCD Industry*. *International Journal of Production Economics*. 115: 411– 423.
- Iqbal N et al. 2013. *Impact of performance appraisal on employee's performance involving the moderating role of motivation*. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* 3(1): 37–56.
- Islam, R., Ismail, AZH (2008), "Employee motivation: a Malaysian perspective", *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 344-362.
- Kahn, WA (1990). "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 692-724.
- Luthans, F. (2011). *"Organizational Behavior: An Evidence-Based Approach"*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Macey, WH & Schneider, B. (2008). "The meaning of employee engagement", *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 3-30.
- Macey, WH, Schneider, B., Barbera, KM & Young, SA (2009) "Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage".

- Malik S et al. 2014. Impact of Performance Appraisal on Employee Performance. *Journal of Resources Development and Management* 3(1): 23.
- Markos, S., & Sridevi, MS (2010). Employee Engagement: The Key To Improving Performances. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 No. 12, 89-96.
- Munparidi & Sayuti, AJ (2020) "The effect of employee engagement on employee performance through job satisfaction as a mediating variable", *Journal of Management and Business Applications*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 36-46.
- Nkeobuna, John. 2020. Performance Appraisal and its Effect on Employees' Productivity in Charitable Organizations. *Business, Management and Economics Research* Vol. 6, Issues. 12, pp: 166-175.
- Pradana, M. & Aisyah, F. (2020) "The effect of employee engagement on employee performance in the parent unit of the West Kalimantan region PT (Persero) the State Electricity Company", *Telkom University*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 6411-6420.
- Prahiawan, W., Simbolon, N. (2014), "The influence of intrinsic motivation and work environment on employee performance at PT Intimas Lestari Nusantara", *Journal of Economics*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 35-41.
- Putra, AK (2013), "The influence of intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation on job satisfaction (Case Study of PT Semen Gresik Persero)", *Journal of Management Science*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 377-387.
- Rich, BL, et. al. (2010), "Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp. 617-635.
- Robbins, SP & Judge, TA (2015). "Organizational behavior". Jakarta: PT Salemba Empat.
- Schaufeli, WB, Bakker, AB, & Salanova, M. (2006). "The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study". *Educational and psychological measurement*, Vol. 66, pp. 701 – 716.
- Schaufeli, WB, et. al. (2002). "The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 71-92.
- Sendawula, K. et. al. (2018). "Training, employee engagement and employee performance: Evidence from Uganda's health sector", *Cogent Business & Management*.
- Setyawan, J., Rusdianti, E. and Widhiastuti, H. (2021). "The effect of satisfaction, compensation and teamwork on employee performance is mediated by employee engagement", *Journal of Economics and Business Research*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 133-143.
- Sharma, BR & Anupama R. (2010) "Determinants of Employee Engagement in a Private Sector Organization: An Exploratory Study", *Advances in Management*, Vol.3, No.10, pp. 52-59.
- Sulistiyani and Rosidah (2003). "Human Resource Management". Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Suwatno, Priansa, D. (2011). "HR Management in Public and Business Organizations". Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tajuddin, Sukma Juwati. 2012. The Effect of Employee Performance Assessment on Career Development at PT Semen Tonasa Pangkep Regency. Thesis is not published. Makassar: Hasanuddin University.
- Wahyu, H., Agnes & Setiawan, R. (2017) "The effect of employee engagement on employee performance at PT Tirta Rejeki Dewata, AGORA", Vol. 5, No. 1.
- Yannizar, et al. (2020). Analysis of Good Corporate Governance, Free Cash Flow, Leverage towards Earning Management, and Shareholder Wealth in Service Sector Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*.P. 2567j-2567v.