Original Research

Volume 16, No. 3, 2023 OPEN Access

Sustaining Talent: Reducing Employee Turnover at Tax Authority through Value Proposition and Social Identity

*Andy Taufan[®], Riani Rachmawati[®]

Master of Management Program, Faculty Economic & Business, University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

Correspondence*: Address: Jl. Salemba Raya 4, Jakarta Pusat, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia, 10430 | e-mail: andy.taufan21@ui.ac.id

Abstract

Objective: This study aims to investigate the factors influencing employee shortage in the public sector, specifically centering on employee's intentions to either remain in or leave the institution. It also aims to examine the impact of perceived benefits received by the employees, their fitness within the organization's social group, and their attachment to the institution on their decision.

Design/Methods/Approach: This study was carried out on tax authority's staffs through an online survey sent to potential participants and 388 eligible respondents. The data collected was analyzed using Covariance Based Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM).

Findings: The findings reveal that employee value proposition and social identity negatively and significantly affect turnover intention. Both of them also positively and significantly affect employee engagement. Moreover, employee engagement only mediates the relationship between social identity and turnover intention.

Originality/Value: The novelty of this study lies in the simultaneous utilization of employee value proposition and social identity, both influencing turnover intention. Previous studies primarily used social identity as a moderating variable, without combining these two variables, alongside employee engagement as a mediation variable. This study is particularly novel as it analyzes turnover intention among employees in a government institution, whereas prior studies have predominantly focused on the private sector.

Practical/Policy implication: Managers should align their Employee Value Proposition (EVP) with employee expectations. They must provide developmental opportunities and supportive work environments, foster a strong social identity, and prioritize initiatives that enhance employee engagement, like meaningful work and recognition. These measures can effectively reduce turnover intentions.

Keywords: Employee value proposition, Social identity, Employee engagement, Turnover intention

license may be seen at: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

JEL Classification: J63



DOI: https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v16i3.51754 Received: October 20, 2023; Revised: December 5, 2023; Accepted: December 14, 2023; Available online: December 22, 2023 Copyright © 2023, The Author(s) Published by <u>Universitas Airlangea</u>. Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC-BY) International License. The full terms of this

I. Introduction

Sustaining talent in the public sector is crucial for effective governance, service delivery, and societal progress (Kravariti & Johnston, 2020). Retaining skilled individuals within this sector ensures continuity, stability, and efficiency in essential service delivery (Nkala et al., 2021). Talented employees bring valuable expertise, institutional knowledge, and innovative ideas, contributing to improved policy-making, program implementation, and public service provision (Sireesha & Ganapavarapu, 2014). Moreover, sustaining talent in the public sector is instrumental in maintaining institutional memory and continuity in governance, particularly in sectors like taxation, public safety, healthcare, and education, where consistent policies and efficient operations are imperative for long-term success (Fletcher et al., 2016). Additionally, a talented workforce ensures high professionalism, ethical standards, and accountability, fostering a culture of integrity and public service excellence (Lundkvist & Gustavsson, 2018).

By nurturing and retaining a talented workforce, the public sector can enhance its capacity to address complex societal challenges, promote economic development, and foster public trust and confidence in government institutions (Narayanan et al., 2018). Furthermore, sustaining talent in the public sector is essential for driving innovation, maintaining stability, and fulfilling the public's diverse needs while upholding the core values of good governance and effective service delivery (Speed & Kulichyova, 2021). For instance, in the case of the Indonesia Tax Authority Institution, despite a notable increase in tax revenue from 2017 to 2022 by approximately 49.15%, there has been a concerning decline of - 4.20% in its contribution to the nation's income during this period (DGT, 2023). However, certain facets of tax collection within the institution remain suboptimal, notably reflected in the high level of unresolved tax debts among individual taxpayers (DGT, 2023). This predicament predominantly stems from a shortage of state tax collectors, Jurusita Pajak, indicating a scarcity of skilled and competent tax administrators (DGT, 2023). Various factors significantly influence this concern, including employee turnover (Ferreira et al., 2017).

In recent years, the institution has experienced a decline in its workforce, partly due to the upper echelon's implementation of a "minus growth" policy (MOF, 2020). This policy, in effect for five years, restricts the recruitment of new employees and allows for filling vacancies only through transfers within the organization (MOF, 2020). The objective is to streamline the organizational structure and simplify bureaucracy (MOF, 2020). The consequences of this "minus growth" policy include substantially reducing the institution's workforce, with some employees resigning or moving to other institutions (DGT, 2023). To address these challenges, it is crucial to explore the optimal employee turnover rate, particularly in the public sector, and its relevance to the tax administration sector (DGT, 2023). Wang et al. (2012) suggest that an optimal employee turnover rate in the public sector should be lower than that in the private sector due to the higher turnover cost associated with the former. Thus, public organizations must devise effective employee retention strategies (An & Meier, 2022). One method to understand and predict employee turnover is by measuring employee turnover intention, which reflects their desire to leave an organization and seek alternative employment due to inadequate interactions between the employee and the organization (Wang et al., 2020).

Contemporary research indicates that an individual's decision to stay or leave their job is no longer solely determined by salary and job satisfaction (Hom et al., 2017). Nowadays, people are more likely to remain in their jobs when they have a supportive work environment that fosters personal growth, offers a sense of security, maintains work-life balance, values their aspirations, and fosters a strong sense of belonging within the organization. These factors collectively form the Employee Value Proposition (EVP), which has been shown to significantly influence an employee's decision to remain in an organization (Laiyan & Indradewa, 2023; Raj, 2020). Moreover, research by Raj (2020) suggests that social identity can reinforce the influence of EVP on an employee's inclination to stay with an organization. Social identity represents an individual's connection to a particular social group, where members share emotional bonds and significant values (Kwon, 2017). Raj (2020) also confirms that an organization's image and reputation influence an individual's self-concept and social identity. Furthermore, social identity has significantly affected employee turnover intention (Kwon, 2017). This forms the foundation for our research, where we explore how an individual who perceives specific benefits from their work environment and feels an integral part of the social fabric within the organization is more likely to have a reduced intention to leave the organization.

Furthermore, previous studies have explored the influence of employee engagement on employees' intentions to leave an organization. Employee engagement is a state of positive thought that reflects dedication and willingness, contrary to fatigue (Sun & Bunchapattanasakda, 2019). Employee engagement can also be seen as the integration of different behavioral components, such as commitment, involvement, attachment, effort, energy, positive attitudes, and psychological presence (Gupta & Sharma, 2016). Previous research has investigated the relationship between job satisfaction, work engagement have a significant negative impact on turnover intention, revealing that job satisfaction and work engagement have a significant negative impact on turnover intention, while professional identity indirectly influences turnover intention through the mediation of work engagement (Zhang et al., 2018). These findings suggest that employees with high engagement and job satisfaction are less likely to seek employment elsewhere in the private sector. However, further research is needed to examine these dynamics in the public sector to help organizations formulate effective retention strategies that mitigate turnover intentions.

In light of the presented information, this study aims to investigate factors associated with turnover intention, focusing on the Tax Authority Institution. The selected variables, employee value proposition, social identity, and

employee engagement, are based on established theories related to turnover intention. This research will delve deeper into the tendencies of individuals to leave their jobs based on their perceptions of benefits received from the organization, their fit within the organization's social group, and their attachment to the organization. This study is motivated by the critical role of the tax sector in Indonesia's economy as a major source of national revenue. This study also aims to bridge the gap between existing theories and the actual conditions within the public sector.

This study contributes to the existing literature on human resource management and organizational behavior in three ways. First, by empirically elucidating the intricate relationships among employee value proposition, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intention. Second, the study enriches the theoretical understanding of these constructs and their relationships within organizational contexts and supports the recent research (Gupta & Sharma, 2016; Kwon, 2017; Raj, 2020). The findings underscore the multi-dimensional nature of factors influencing employee turnover intentions, emphasizing the need for holistic strategies for employee retention and engagement (Shuck et al., 2014). Finally, the study's insights offer actionable implications for organizations to optimize their retention strategies, emphasizing the strategic alignment of employee value propositions with employee expectations and cultivating a strong social identity to reduce turnover intentions and foster a thriving workplace culture.

This paper's contents include the study's background, a literature review and the development of the hypotheses, the research method, results and discussion, a conclusion, and suggestions for future research.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

2.1. Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory (SET) is a significant framework in organizational behavior, highlighting the reciprocal link between individuals and their workplace (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). It suggests that employees mutually exchange with their organization, offering their skills, time, and effort in return for various rewards and recognition (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). This theory is crucial in comprehending employee engagement dynamics, providing a structure to analyze the mutual relationship between employees and their workplace (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Additionally, social identity theory, which focuses on an individual's self-concept based on their social group memberships, holds significant importance in organizational behavior literature (Ashforth, 2001). It highlights the impact of identifying with the organization on individual satisfaction and the effectiveness of the organization (Ashforth, 2001)

Furthermore, Employee Value Proposition (EVP) is essential to understand the factors that enhance employees' perception of value within the organization. EVP encompasses the benefits and rewards that employees receive in exchange for their contributions to the organization, aligning with the principles of social exchange theory (Theys & Barkhuizen, 2022). By analyzing organizational factors that influence EVP, organizations can enhance the perceived value proposition for employees, thereby impacting their engagement and commitment (Arasanmi & Krishna, 2019).

Moreover, the literature suggests that employee engagement is influenced by various factors such as organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and ethical leadership (Meyer et al., 1993; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Additionally, the study by Theys & Barkhuizen (2022) emphasizes the significance of EVP in attracting, engaging, and retaining scarce skills within organizations, highlighting its impact on employee commitment (Theys & Barkhuizen, 2022). Furthermore, research by Arasanmi & Krishna (2019) indicates that organizations can minimize employee turnover by increasing employee commitment through EVP (Arasanmi & Krishna, 2019). This underscores the critical role of EVP in influencing employee engagement and turnover intention.

2.2. Turnover Intention

Two primary definitions of turnover intention are offered. Initially, it was considered an employee's deliberate efforts to voluntarily leave their job and the organization (Dess & Shaw, 2001). In more recent studies, turnover intention is regarded as an employee's desire to withdraw from their position and transfer to another. The decision to leave an organization is frequently influenced by the lack of interaction and alignment between the employee and their hosting organization (Wang et al., 2020). In essence, turnover intention represents an individual employee's probability or willingness to permanently exit their current job in an organization, often with various underlying reasons. Several behavioral indicators precede or signify an employee's intention to quit (Long & Thean, 2011). These include increased absenteeism in the months or weeks leading up to resignation, a rise in workplace laziness resulting from diminishing motivation, increased rule violations attributed to declining employee engagement, heightened protests against superiors, and observable changes in an employee's behavior compared to their previous conduct.

Turnover intention carries significant consequences for organizations. High levels of employee turnover cause considerable concern for organizations, impacting human resource management and incurring direct and indirect costs (Long & Thean, 2011). Direct costs include those resulting from new employees' recruitment, selection, induction, and training processes. Indirect costs encompass the cost of learning, morale issues, and the pressure experienced by remaining employees. High turnover rates can affect workplace stability, employee consistency, and overall productivity. Turnover can also have a ripple effect, leading to decreased morale and increased workload for remaining employees, eventually pushing them to consider leaving the organization (Siong et al., 2006). Meyer et al. (1993) classified an

employee's intention to leave an organization into three categories: how often they think about leaving their current organization, how likely they are to search for a new job, and how likely they are to leave the organization in the coming year. Indicators measuring an employee's intention to leave their job include questions related to their plans to seek a new job in the next six months, and these have been widely used to measure turnover intention (Colarelli, 1984). More recent research into turnover intention utilizes indicators such as the employee's intent to leave when offered a higher salary and the employee's strength in considering their desire to leave the organization (Wang et al., 2020).

2.3. Employee Value Proposition

Berthon et al. (2005) provided an early definition of employee value proposition, commonly known as EVP, highlighting its role in attracting talent and motivating employees. Additionally, Loasby (2007) emphasized that EVP is a tool for analyzing retention and employee engagement strategies. Moreover, researchers such as Goswami (2015) have described EVP as building job satisfaction and employee performance through organizational culture. Recent research by Raj (2020) has linked EVP analysis to the Social Exchange Theory. According to this theory, employees feel a reciprocal obligation to remain with the organization and repay the support they receive. Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) further emphasized that employees compensate for these benefits through increased commitment and performance. Studies indicate that social exchange within the organization can take on both economic and social dimensions, contributing to the components of EVP (Mishra et al., 2016; Rounak & Misra, 2020). The EVP is a set of psychological, emotional, functional, and economic benefits that employee retention and loyalty.

Several studies underscore the influence of EVP on employee retention and organizational success. Effective human resource management practices, such as training, performance evaluation, transparent communication, feedback, and reinforcement, can mitigate employees' intentions to leave the organization (Chang & Chang, 2009). Furthermore, research by Chew & Chan (2008) indicates that elements like training and development, remuneration, and recognition positively correlate with employee retention. Heger (2007) noted that employees who perceive their expected EVP as unmet are more likely to leave the organization. This sentiment is supported by Raj (2018), who emphasizes the impact of employee expectations on their behavior and support for the organizational brand. Consequently, these findings emphasize that EVP is a vital indicator in shaping the organizational work environment. In a comprehensive understanding, an Employee Value Proposition can be interpreted as a combination of five attributes: social, economic, developmental, attractiveness, and application aspects (Ambler & Barrow, 1996). The dimensions described in Berthon et al. (2005) research, including career and development opportunities, compensation and rewards, challenging job roles, application of knowledge and experience, and social support from leadership, are used as a robust framework for evaluating EVP.

According to Gupta et al. (2021), when employees perceive tangible benefits from the organization, they tend to feel more attached. This is supported by the research of Kunerth & Mosley (2011), which claims that EVP significantly influences HR management practices, especially in enhancing employee attachment to the company. Moreover, when the perceived EVP-employee gap is smaller, it positively affects employee engagement (Gupta et al., 2021). Based on those arguments and findings, this study develops the hypothesis listed below:

HI: Employee value proposition negatively influences employee's turnover intention

H2: Employee value proposition positively influences employee engagement

2.4. Social Identity

According to Tajfel & Turner (1979), social identity is an individual's awareness of their position as a member of a specific group, interconnected with other group members emotionally and with shared values. Greening & Turban (2000) confirmed that the organization's image and reputation influence employees' self-concepts and perceived social identity. A study by Ashforth and Mael (1989) further emphasized the impact of social identity, allowing individuals to shape their self-concepts based on their membership in particular social groups. In an organizational context, an individual's self-concept and identity depend significantly on the reputation of the organization they are part of. Hogg (2023) defines social identity as understanding one's self-concept's role in group membership, processes, and relationships. Furthermore, research has indicated that employees evaluate an organization's attractiveness based on how well it sustains their self-concept and social identity Raj (2020). In summary, social identity is the recognition of an employee as a part of an organization, a social group involving collective identity that enhances motivation for mutual goal attainment.

Haslam (2004) posits that social groups are not merely external characteristics but are internalized by individuals within these groups, contributing to their self-identity. Ashforth et al. (2008) mention that being a member of a specific group helps individuals understand who they truly are, providing them with meaning and self-awareness in their social lives. Employees who strongly identify and affiliate with their organizations are likely to work harder, leading to increased individual and organizational goal achievement and ultimately improving performance. These employees are also more loyal to the organization and are likely to stay committed, even facing challenges (Avanzi et al., 2014). Therefore, their intention to leave the organization or engage in counterproductive behavior is minimal or non-existent.

Research by Blader & Tyler (2009) found that social identity significantly influences workplace behavior. Their study suggests that a strong social identity and a sense of ownership of the organization positively correlate with higher levels of employee engagement. This is in line with findings by Frare & Beuren (2021), which indicate that social identity indirectly influences innovative work behavior through organizational engagement. Consequently, individuals with a strong sense of organizational identification and interpersonal connections with colleagues are likelier to demonstrate higher levels of employee engagement. Based on those arguments and findings, this study develops the hypothesis listed below:

H3: Social identity negatively influences employee's turnover intention

H4: Social identity positively influences employee engagement

2.5. Employee Engagement

The concept of employee engagement, pioneered by Kahn (1990), encapsulates an individual's emotional, cognitive, and physical connection with their work. It refers to the employee's psychological state of involvement, connection, and commitment to their job and the organization. Employee engagement is often seen as a strong intellectual and emotional connection between employees and various aspects of their job, including their organization, colleagues, or supervisors. This connection influences employees to exert discretionary effort beyond their role requirements (Hughes & Rog, 2008). Additionally, it is essential to highlight the overlap between employee engagement and work engagement. Saks & Gruman (2014) suggest that employee engagement encompasses an employee's relationship with their job, professional role, and the organization. On the other hand, work engagement focuses specifically on the employee's relationship with their job tasks and responsibilities. In this context, work engagement is a subset of employee engagement, emphasizing an employee's relationship with their specific job-related duties.

Employee engagement plays a vital role in determining employee turnover intention. Highly engaged employees typically exhibit positive energy and actively immerse themselves in their work, leaving little room for negative thoughts such as leaving the organization. Research shows that employee engagement positively influences organizational commitment and job satisfaction and reduces absenteeism and turnover intentions (Bakker et al., 2008). Furthermore, studies have established a positive correlation between employee engagement and the intent to stay within the organization (Harter et al., 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). An employee with low levels of engagement is more likely to turnover, as supported by research Saks & Gruman (2014) showing that low employee engagement can predict actual turnover (De Lange et al., 2008). Current research reinforces these findings, indicating that high employee engagement variables and turnover intentions, with employee engagement mediating the relationship between independent variables and turnover intentions (Wan et al., 2018). Based on those arguments and findings, this study develops the hypothesis below:

H5: Employee engagement negatively influences employee's turnover intention

2.6. Mediating Role of Employee Engagement

Heger (2007) states that a significant employee value proposition influences employee engagement through the various benefits and support provided by the organization. Cook & Rice (2006) study indicates that social exchange in the organization significantly influences employee attachment and indirectly affects turnover intention.

According to Simbula et al. (2023), employees who perceive social support in the workplace and can rely on superiors for issue resolution are more likely to be engaged in their work, decreasing their intention to leave the organization. Additionally, Lazzari et al. (2022) indicate that social identity indirectly affects turnover intention through employee engagement, emphasizing the mediating role of employee engagement.

In summary, employee engagement also significantly affects employees' intentions to remain in or leave the organization as a mediation variable. Therefore, this study develops the hypothesis listed below:

H6: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between employee value proposition and employee's turnover intention

H7: Employee engagement mediates the relationship between social identity and employee's turnover intention

3. Method

3.1. Sample and Procedure

A sample of 388 respondents working at The Indonesia Tax Authority Institution was selected through snowball sampling. Only employees on the rolls of the institution with a minimum experience of a year of service in their current organization were selected in the sample. All respondents participated in the structured survey, which provided data about their perceptions of EVP, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intention. All participants receive a link to the survey, which contains an agreement form, demographic questions, employee value proposition, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intential and saved for a period of time. To provide a more precise illustration of the conceptual framework employed in the analysis of this study, refer to Figure 1.



Figure 1. Conceptual Model

3.2. Measurement and Operationalization

Each variable is measured by a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where I indicate strongly disagree, and 7 means strongly agree. For turnover intention comprised of three questions (Wang et al., 2020). Employee value proposition uses 5 dimensions such as social, development, interest, economic, and application values, which consist of 5 questions for each dimension (Berthon et al., 2005). Social identity uses 3 dimensions and is comprised of six, four, and five questions. (Cameron, 2004). Lastly, employee engagement uses 3 dimensions, which consist of six, five, and six questions (Schaufeli et al., 2006). All the measurement indicators have a total of 60 questions, as shown in the Appendices.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Result

4.1.1. Respondent Statistics & Descriptive Analysis

In the survey, 388 responses were collected from employees, with 210 (54.12%) being male and 178 (45.88%) females. The majority of respondents were married (66.49%), and a significant portion fell within the 26-30 age range (24.23%). Regarding the highest educational level attained, a majority held a bachelor's degree (38.66%). In terms of organizational tenure, most respondents had been with the organization for 5-10 years (40.98%).

According to descriptive analysis, the majority of respondents expressed agreement that their expectations regarding various benefits provided by the institution were met, as evidenced by an average Employee Value Proposition (EVP) score of 5.59. A similar positive result was observed for Social Identity (SOI), with an average score of 5.49, indicating that most respondents agreed on having strong bonds, shared values, and a common culture within the institution. Employee Engagement (EMP) also yielded a high average score of 5.63, signifying widespread agreement that respondents were actively engaged with the institution. Conversely, Turnover Intention (TOI) scored an average of 2.43, suggesting that most respondents somewhat disagreed with the idea of leaving their current position in the institution shortly.

4.1.2. Validity and Reliability

Overall, the results indicate that the standardized loading factor (SLF) values for each indicator employed in this study exceed 0.5. Therefore, all indicators are deemed valid and representative of latent constructs. The test outcomes for the average variance extracted (AVE) also surpass 0.5 for each dimension or construct (variable) in this study. Additionally, the composite reliability (CR) values are above 0.7, establishing the reliability of the constructs. The results of validity and reliability tests using Lisrel 8.8 can be found in Table 1.

Employee Value Proposition (EVP) IV 0.88 0.94 0.77 EV 0.88 DV 0.88 DV 0.88 Interest Value (IV) N1 0.84 0.89 0.63 Interest Value (IV) N1 0.84 0.89 0.63 Social Value (SV) SVI 0.81 0.91 0.67 Social Value (SV) SVI 0.81 0.90 0.67 Social Value (SV) SVI 0.81 0.90 0.67 Economic Value (EV) EVI 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evid 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evid 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evid 0.81 0.90 0.63 Development Value (DV) DVI 0.80 0.89 0.63 DV3 0.80 DV3 0.89 0.63 DV4 0.78 DV4 0.78 DV5 0.83 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64	First-order Constructs	Second-order Constructs	Indicators	SLF (> 0.5)	CR (> 0.7)	AVE (> 0.5)
$\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Employee Value	IV	0.88	0.94	0.77
$\begin{split} & \text{Interest Value (IV)} & & \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Proposition (EVP)	SV	0.91		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{split} \text{Interest Value (IV)} & V & 0.84 & 0.89 & 0.63 \\ V & 0.78 & V & 0.81 & V & 0.78 & V & 0.83 & V & 0.81 & V &$						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Interest Value (IV)				0.89	0.63
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
Social Value (SV) SV1 0.81 0.91 0.67 SV2 0.79 SV3 0.83 SV3 0.83 SV4 0.83 SV4 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evo 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evo 0.81 0.90 0.67 Evo 0.82 0.79 0.82 Evo 0.82 0.79 0.83 Development Value (DV) DV1 0.80 0.89 0.63 DV2 0.77 0.80 0.89 0.64 Application Value (AV) AVI 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.81 0.91 0.71 Avo 0.83 0.91 0.71 0.91 0.71 Avo 0.83 0.91 0.71 0.91 0.71 Avo 0.83 0.91 0.71 0.91 0.71 Centrality (CE) Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.71 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA 0.82 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA 0.89 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA 0.81 0.91 0.72						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						- ·-
Economic Value (EV) SV3 0.83 SV4 0.83 SV5 0.84 SV5 Ev1 0.81 0.90 0.67 EV2 0.81 0.90 0.67 EV3 0.79 0.90 0.63 Development Value (DV) DV1 0.80 0.89 0.63 DV2 0.77 0.90 0.90 0.64 Application Value (AV) AV1 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.90 0.77 0.90 Av2 0.74 0.91 0.77 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.91 0.77 0.91 0.77 Av2 0.74 0.89 0.91 0.77 AV2 0.74 0.89 0.91 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) F 0.80 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA 0.87 0.91 0.72 IT1 0.	Social Value (SV)				0.91	0.67
$ \begin{split} & \mbox{Economic Value (EV)} & \mbox{Value (EV)} & \mbox{Value (DV)} & Valu$						
Economic Value (EV) SV5 0.84 0.90 0.67 EV2 0.81 0.90 0.67 EV3 0.77 0.85 0.81 EV4 0.85 0.81 0.90 0.63 Development Value (DV) DV1 0.80 0.89 0.63 Application Value (AV) AV1 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.74 0.74 AV2 0.74 0.89 0.64 AV3 0.84 0.89 0.64 AV4 0.80 0.91 0.77 AV1 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.80 0.91 AV3 0.83 0.91 0.71 IT 0.80 0.91 0.71 IT 0.80 0.91 0.71 It 0.82 0.91 0.73 It 0.82 0.91 0.73 It 0.82 0.79 0.91						
Economic Value (EV) EVI EV2 0.81 0.90 0.67 EV2 0.82 EV3 0.79 EV4 0.85 EV3 0.81 Development Value (DV) DV1 0.80 0.89 0.63 DV2 0.77 DV3 0.80 0.89 0.63 Application Value (AV) DV5 0.83 0.89 0.64 AV3 0.84 AV3 0.84 0.89 0.64 AV3 0.84 AV3 0.84 0.89 0.64 Centrality (CE) ECE 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 0.91 0.71 IA 0.82 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) ECE 0.85 0.91 0.71 IA 0.82 0.91 0.73 0.84 IA3 0.89 0.93 0.72 0.73 Igroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA3 0.87 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						o / 7
Development Value (DV) EV3 EV4 EV5 DV1 0.89 DV1 0.89 DV2 0.77 DV3 0.89 DV4 0.89 DV4 0.89 DV4 0.89 DV4 0.89 DV4 0.89 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.89 DV5 0.91 DV5 0.77 DV5 0.91 DV5 0.77 DV5 0.89 DV5 0.91 DV5 0.77 DV5 0.77 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.81 DV5 0.91 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.72 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.71 DV5 0.72 DV5	Economic Value (EV)				0.90	0.67
Development Value (DV) EV4 EV5 DV1 0.89 0.89 0.22 0.77 DV3 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.83 0.83 0.84 AV1 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.83 0.83 0.84 AV2 Application Value (AV) K 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.83 0.89 0.89 0.89 0.83 Application Value (AV) K 0.89 0.83 0.89 0.89 0.83 Application Value (AV) K 0.83 0.91 0.74 0.74 0.83 Av2 0.74 0.80 0.89 0.83 0.91 0.77 0.74 Centrality (CE) E 0.85 0.91 0.91 0.77 0.74 Centrality (CE) E 0.85 0.91 0.91 0.74 0.74 Ingroup Affect (IA) K 0.89 0.72 0.91 0.74 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) K 0.91 0.73 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.72 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.73 0.92 0.72 Int 0.87 0.73 0.92 0.74 0.74 0.74 Int 0.87 0.74 0.73 0.72 0.74 0.74 Int 0.87 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 0.74 Int 0.						
Development Value (DV) EVS DV1 0.81 0V2 0.89 0.63 Application Value (AV) - <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Development Value (DV) DVI 0.80 0.89 0.63 DV2 0.77 DV3 0.80 DV4 0.78 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 DV5 0.83 Avplication Value (AV) AV1 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 AV2 0.74 AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 0.71 AV2 0.74 AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 0.71 AV4 0.80 DV5 0.83 0.91 0.77 Edit dentity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.71 IA 0.88 0.91 0.71 0.72 Centrality (CE) CE1 0.82 0.91 0.74 Ia 0.80 0.79 0.72 0.73 Igroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Iagroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72						
Application Value (AV) DV2 DV3 AVI AVI AVI AVI AVI AVI AV3 AV3 AV3 AV3 AV4 AV3 AV4 AV3 AV4 AV3 AV4 AV3 AV5 B83 0.89 B9 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1 B1					0.00	0.72
Application Value (AV) DV3 DV4 AV1 0.80 DV5 AV1 0.89 AV1 0.89 AV2 0.44 AV2 AV2 0.74 AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 AV4 0.84 AV4 AV4 0.80 AV5 0.83 0.91 0.77 Centrality (CE) Social Identity (SOI) CE IA 0.88 IT 0.90 0.91 0.77 Centrality (CE) CE ICE2 0.83 IT 0.91 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 IA2 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IAI 0.81 IT2 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IAI 0.87 IT3 0.92 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT 0.87 IT3 0.92 0.79 Ingroup Ties (IT) IEmployee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71	Development value (DV))			0.89	0.63
Application Value (AV) DV4 0.78 Avplication Value (AV) AV1 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.83 0.84 AV2 0.74 0.80 0.84 AV3 0.84 0.80 0.77 AV3 0.84 0.80 0.77 AV4 0.80 0.77 0.74 AV4 0.80 0.77 0.74 AV4 0.80 0.91 0.77 IA 0.89 0.91 0.77 IA 0.80 0.91 0.77 IA 0.80 0.91 0.77 IA 0.82 0.91 0.64 Ceta 0.79 0.83 0.91 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.82 0.91 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 0.73 IT3 0.82 0.71 0.73 IT4 0						
Application Value (AV) DVS 0.83 0.84 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.74 0.80 0.87 0.81 0.81 AV3 0.84 0.80 0.80 0.80 0.91 0.77 AV3 0.84 0.80 0.80 0.89 0.91 0.77 AV4 0.80 0.83 0.91 0.77 0.88 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 0.88 0.91 0.77 0.88 0.91 0.77 Centrality (CE) CE1 0.82 0.91 0.64 0.64 0.76 0.91 0.64 Certarity (CE) CE1 0.82 0.91 0.73 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.79 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.79 Ingroup Ties (IT) Employee Engagement (EMP) 0.87 0.81 0.81 0.81 0.93 0.92						
Application Value (AV) AVI 0.79 0.89 0.64 AV2 0.74 0.80 AV4 0.80 AV4 0.80 AV4 0.80 AV5 0.83 Centrality (CE) Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.77 Int 0.90 0.91 0.77 0.90 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) CE2 0.83 0.91 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.91 0.64 CE4 0.76 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT3 0.82 11 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT3 0.82 0.93 0.72 It1 0.87 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.87 0.93						
AV2 0.74 AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 AV5 0.83 Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 1T 0.90 0.91 0.77 Centrality (CE) CE 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.64 0.76 CE4 0.76 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT3 0.82 0.93 0.72 IT4 0.81 0.91 0.73 0.72 IT5 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.74 IT5 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.87 0.93 0.71					0.00	0.44
AV3 0.84 AV4 0.80 AV5 0.83 Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 IT 0.90 0.77 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.76 0.77 CE4 0.76 0.77 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 0.93 0.72 IT3 0.82 173 0.82 0.93 0.72 IT5 0.87 0.87 0.93 0.72 Vigor (VI) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71	Application Value (AV)				0.89	0.64
AV4 AV5 0.80 0.83 Social Identity (SOI) CE IA 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 0.90 0.91 0.77 Centrality (CE) CE CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 Ingroup Affect (IA) CEI 0.83 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 Imployee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) Via 0.88 0.93 0.71						
AV5 0.83 Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 0.90 0.77 IA 0.80 0.79 0.90 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.64 0.64 CE3 0.77 0.91 0.64 CE4 0.76 0.77 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT4 0.81 117 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 117 0.87 IT5 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.79 IMPOyee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						
Social Identity (SOI) CE 0.85 0.91 0.77 IA 0.88 IT 0.90 0.91 0.64 Centrality (CE) CEI 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.76 0.76 CE3 0.79 0.76 0.76 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITS 0.87 0.93 0.72 Imployee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) Vil 0.88 0.92 0.71						
Centrality (CE) IA 0.88 IT 0.90 CE1 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.76 0.76 CE5 0.83 0.77 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.87 0.93 0.72 Imployee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.92 0.71						
Centrality (CE) IT 0.90 0.91 0.64 CE1 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.64 0.76 CE4 0.76 0.77 0.71 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 114 0.82 0.72 IT2 0.89 0.72 0.72 0.72 IT3 0.82 0.73 0.72 0.72 IT4 0.81 0.73 0.72 0.72 IT5 0.87 0.93 0.72 0.79 Vigor (VI) DE 0.81 0.93 0.71 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71		Social Identity (SOI)			0.91	0.77
Centrality (CE) CE I 0.82 0.91 0.64 CE2 0.83 0.79 0.64 0.64 CE3 0.79 0.76 0.76 0.76 Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 0.72 IT4 0.81 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 174 0.81 IT5 0.87 0.92 0.79 0.79 0.79 0.79 Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 0.71 Vigor (VI) Vigor (VI) 0.88 0.93 0.71						
CE2 0.83 CE3 0.79 CE4 0.76 CE5 0.83 CE6 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 IA4 0.82 ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 Employee Engagement VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 AB 0.92 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71						
CE3 0.79 CE4 0.76 CE5 0.83 CE6 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 0.92 0.79 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 115 0.82 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 115 0.81 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 115 0.81 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT5 0.81 115 0.81 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT4 0.81 115 0.92 0.79 Kemployee Engagement VI 0.93 0.92 0.71 Vigor (VI) Vigor (VI) 0.88 0.93 0.71	Centrality (CE)				0.91	0.64
CE4 0.76 CE5 0.83 CE6 0.77 Ingroup Affect (IA) IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 Ingroup Ties (IT) IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 IT5 0.87 IT5 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.92 0.71						
Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.83 0.91 0.73 Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 173 0.82 IT4 0.81 155 0.87 174 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) Vil 0.93 0.92 0.79 174 0.81 175 0.81 175 0.81 175 0.81 175 0.81 175 0.91 174 0.91 174 0.91 174 0.91 175 0.71 175 0.71 174 0.81 175						
Ingroup Affect (IA) CE6 0.77 0.91 0.73 IA1 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 0.89 0.89 IA3 0.89 0.89 0.89 IA4 0.82 0.93 0.72 IT1 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 IT4 0.81 175 0.87 Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 AB 0.92 0.79 0.79 0.79 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71						
Ingroup Affect (IA) IAI 0.81 0.91 0.73 IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 174 0.81 IT5 0.87 0.92 0.79 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71						
IA2 0.89 IA3 0.89 IA4 0.82 ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 (EMP) DE 0.81 Vigor (VI) VI 0.93 0.72 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71			CE6	0.77		
Ingroup Ties (IT) IA3 0.89 Ingroup Ties (IT) ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 IT5 0.87 0.92 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.92 0.71	Ingroup Affect (IA)				0.91	0.73
Ingroup Ties (IT) IA4 0.82 ITI 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 IT4 0.81 175 0.87 Employee Engagement VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 100 100 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.92 0.71						
Ingroup Ties (IT) IT I 0.87 0.93 0.72 IT2 0.89 173 0.82 IT4 0.81 175 0.87 Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71						
IT2 0.89 IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 Employee Engagement VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 AB 0.92 0.71 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71						
IT3 0.82 IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 Employee Engagement VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 (EMP) DE 0.81 48 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71	Ingroup Ties (IT)				0.93	0.72
IT4 0.81 IT5 0.87 Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 AB 0.92 0.71 Vigor (VI) VI 0.88 0.93 0.71						
IT5 0.87 Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 AB 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.92 VII 0.88 0.93 0.71 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71						
Employee Engagement (EMP) VI 0.93 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) DE 0.81 0.92 0.79 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.92 0.71 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71						
(EMP) DE 0.81 AB 0.92 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71 VI2 0.87						
AB 0.92 Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71 VI2 0.87 0.87 0.71					0.92	0.79
Vigor (VI) VII 0.88 0.93 0.71 VI2 0.87		(EMP)				
VI2 0.87						
	Vigor (VI)				0.93	0.71
VI3 0.88						
			VI3	0.88		

Table I. Validity and reliability measurement

	VI4	0.80		
	VI5	0.88		
	VI6	0.76		
Dedication (DE)	DEI	0.86	0.91	0.68
	DE2	0.74		
	DE3	0.68		
	DE4	0.91		
	DE5	0.92		
Absorption (AB)	ABI	0.85	0.92	0.66
	AB2	0.85		
	AB3	0.84		
	AB4	0.73		
	AB5	0.75		
Turnover Intention	TOI	0.83	0.89	0.73
(TOI)	TO2	0.89		
	ТОЗ	0.85		

4.1.3. Goodness of Fit

The structural model is subject to analysis through the scrutiny of the goodness-of-fit (GOF) model criteria to evaluate the appropriateness of the constructed model. The model's appropriateness is gauged by comparing the GOF value of the data in this study. According to Hair et al. (2019), a model is deemed feasible if it satisfies one of the feasibility testing methods. The results of the structural model fit test are presented in Table 2 as follows.

GOF	Criteria	Cut-off Value	Model Test Value	Result
Absolute Fit Indices	GFI	≥ 0.90	0.95	Good Fit
	RMSEA	≤ 0.08	0.041	Excellent Fit
	RMSR	≤ 0.05	0.023	Good Fit
Incremental Fit Indices	NFI	> 0.90	0.99	Good Fit
	NNFI	> 0.90	1.00	Good Fit
	CFI	> 0.90	1.00	Good Fit
	RFI	> 0.90	0.99	Good Fit
	IFI	> 0.90	1.00	Good Fit
	AGFI	> 0.90	0.93	Good Fit

4.1.4. Hypotheses Testing

As per the GOF Test, the structural model demonstrates a satisfactory fit to the data. Significance in the direct effect relationship is determined by t-values greater than the critical t-table values (95% confidence; 1.645 or - 1.645). Therefore, from the path results of the structural model, it is inferred that both Employee Value Proposition (EVP) (t-value = -2,96) and Social Identity (SOI) (t-value = -3,97) exhibit negative and direct effects on Turnover Intention (TOI), thus supporting and confirming the proposed hypotheses HI and H3.

Furthermore, it is observed that both EVP (t-value = 4.50) and SOI (t-value = 6,75) exert positive and direct effects on Employee Engagement (EMP), while EMP demonstrates a negative and direct effect on TOI (t-value = -3.16). Hence, it can be concluded that the proposed hypotheses H2, H4, and H5 find support in this research. The hypotheses formulated for this study were tested based on the model, and the results are illustrated in Figure 2.

To further validate the mediation effect of Employee Engagement in the relationship between EVP and TOI and SOI and TOI, a Sobel mediation test was conducted, significance in the mediation relationship is considered when t-values surpass Z α (95% confidence; 1.96 or – 1.96, assuming a two-tailed z-test) and the results are presented in Table 3. According to the Sobel Mediation Test results presented in Table 3, it is evident that Employee Engagement (EMP) serves as a mediator in the relationship between Employee Value Proposition (EVP) and Social Identity (SOI) to Turnover Intention (TOI). EMP exhibits a mediation effect of -2.62 for the relationship between EVP and TOI and a mediation effect of -2,84 for the relationship between SOI and TOI, surpassing the Z α of -1.96. This supports and substantiates the acceptance of the proposed hypotheses H6 and H7.



Figure 2. Path Result of Structural Model

Table 3. Sobel mediation test

Relationship	Coefficient a	Coefficient b	Std. error a	Std. error b	Test stats	Result
H6: EVP \rightarrow EMP \rightarrow TOI	0.36	-0.27	0.07	0.08	-2,62	Significant
H7: SOI \rightarrow EMP \rightarrow TOI	0.57	-0.27	0.07	0.08	-2.84	Significant

4.2. Discussion

The empirical analysis within this study not only explains the dynamics between various organizational constructs but also contributes significantly to our comprehension of employee behavior within workplace settings. Anchored in established literature, the study's theoretical framework provides a deeper understanding of the intricate relationships among employee value proposition, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intention (Berthon et al., 2005; Kahn, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). These insights are fundamental to devising effective human resource strategies that align with employee expectations and organizational objectives.

Primarily, empirical analysis presented in this study aligns with social exchange theory, which posits that relationships are built on mutual exchanges of resources, benefits, and obligations. Within the organizational context, this theory emphasizes that employees weigh the costs and rewards of their relationship with the organization, influencing their behaviors such as turnover intentions (Cook & Rice, 2006; Raj, 2020). The study also reinforces the pivotal role of employee value proposition in shaping employees' intentions to remain or leave an organization (Chang & Chang, 2009; Raj, 2020). This reaffirms that a robust employee value proposition, encompassing diverse facets such as social, economic, developmental, and application aspects, significantly impacts employees' decisions to stay loyal to an organization (Gupta et al., 2021). The study's findings emphasize the importance of aligning employee value proposition with employee expectations to effectively enhance retention strategies within organizations (Ambler & Barrow, 1996).

Furthermore, the study's revelation of the negative correlation between social identity and turnover intention highlights the intrinsic value of fostering a strong organizational culture that nurtures a sense of belongingness among employees (Ashforth et al., 2008; Haslam, 2004). Strengthening employees' identification with their organization through shared values and a cohesive work environment serves as a vital mechanism to mitigate intentions of leaving (Greening & Turban, 2000). This underscores the significance of cultivating a positive organizational culture as a means of retaining talent and reducing turnover rates.

Moreover, the mediation analysis elucidates the intricate interplay between employee engagement and the influence of employee value proposition and social identity on turnover intention (Blader & Tyler, 2009; Frare & Beuren,

2021). Employee engagement mediates the relationship between employee value proposition and social identity to turnover intention. This nuanced finding suggests that while employee engagement serves as a mediator for studied factors influencing turnover intentions, other mechanisms might impact employees' decisions to leave or stay, showcasing the intricate nature of employee retention dynamics.

The study's revelations underscore the multifaceted nature of factors influencing employee turnover intentions within organizations (Cook & Rice, 2006; Simbula et al., 2023). The multi-dimensional aspects of employee value proposition, social identity, and employee engagement demonstrate the need for comprehensive strategies aimed at employee retention (Heger, 2007; Lazzari et al., 2022). Strategies focusing on organizational culture, skill development, recognition of employees, and fostering meaningful social connections in the workplace are crucial in curbing turnover intentions and retaining top talent.

Furthermore, the study contributes significantly to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence of the nuanced relationships between employee value proposition, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intention (Raj, 2020; Saks & Gruman, 2014). It enhances the theoretical understanding of how these constructs interrelate and influence employees' intentions within an organizational context, thereby enriching the existing frameworks governing employee retention and engagement strategies.

In conclusion, the study's comprehensive insights into the intricate dynamics among organizational constructs and their impact on employees' intentions offer a robust foundation for further exploration and refinement of organizational strategies aimed at fostering employee retention and engagement. These theoretical implications not only contribute to the broader discourse on human resource management and organizational behavior but also provide actionable insights for organizations to optimize their retention strategies and foster a thriving workplace culture.

5. Conclusion

Exploring employee retention and engagement dynamics sheds light on critical elements pivotal in organizational behavior and human resource management. A robust employee value proposition remains pivotal in minimizing turnover intentions, in line with established research (Berthon et al., 2005; Raj, 2020). Aligning organizational benefits with employee expectations significantly reduces the inclination of employees to seek alternative career paths. Additionally, the positive relationship between employee value proposition and heightened employee engagement emphasizes how tangible benefits foster increased employee commitment and dedication to their roles and the broader organizational structure.

Moreover, the study highlights the significant role of a strong social identity in reducing turnover intentions, with employee engagement playing a crucial mediating role in this association (Ashforth et al., 2008). Employees strongly identifying with their organization exhibit reduced tendencies to explore other career options, further reinforced by the mediation of employee engagement in mitigating turnover intentions. This underscores the substantial impact of cultivating a sense of belongingness and a shared organizational identity in reducing turnover rates. Hence, organizations are encouraged to cultivate positive work environments, promote shared values, and foster inclusivity to enhance employees' social identity and reduce turnover risks (Fang et al., 2020). Collaborative work programs and implementing activities that enhance synergy, such as team building, capacity building, or Samapta, will encourage employees to feel more engaged with the organization and other group members, including colleagues and superiors (Everett & Bischoff, 2021).

These findings provide actionable insights for organizations seeking to enhance employee retention and engagement. The strategic alignment of employee value proposition with employee expectations emerges as a key factor in reducing turnover intentions. Managers should continuously communicate and extensively familiarize employees with all the benefits provided by the organization so that employees feel their needs have been fulfilled as expected. They feel more indebted to the organization. This underscores the importance of offering tangible benefits such as opportunities for professional growth, fair compensation, and conducive work environments to bolster employee satisfaction and loyalty (Berthon et al., 2005; Raj, 2020). Moreover, nurturing a strong social identity within the organization is vital. Organizations can implement engagement strategies that promote shared values, foster positive work cultures, and encourage inclusivity to foster belongingness and concurrently diminish turnover intentions (Ashforth et al., 2008).

The study emphasizes the pivotal role of employee engagement as a mediator in the complex relationship between social identity and turnover intentions. Consequently, organizations are encouraged to prioritize initiatives to enhance employee engagement by providing meaningful tasks, recognizing employee contributions, and offering ample opportunities for professional and personal growth (Ashforth et al., 2008). By doing so, organizations can actively influence employees' intent to stay, thus reducing turnover rates and fostering a more engaged workforce.

However, recognizing the study's limitations is crucial. The cross-sectional nature of the research design necessitates caution in establishing causal relationships among the variables studied. Therefore, advocating longitudinal studies is essential for a comprehensive understanding of how changes in employee value proposition, social identity, and engagement influence turnover intentions over time. Additionally, the study's focus on a specific sector or

geographical area may limit the generalizability of the findings. Thus, conducting the study across various industry sectors and cultural contexts would improve external validity and broaden its applicability.

In conclusion, while the study provides valuable insights into the complex relationship among employee value proposition, social identity, employee engagement, and turnover intentions in the public sector, addressing these limitations through further research is essential. Expanding research methodologies and diversifying the scope of study populations would facilitate a more nuanced understanding of these relationships, contributing significantly to developing effective organizational strategies for employee retention and engagement across diverse contexts.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for their useful comments, which allowed to increase the value of this article.

Author Contribution

Author 1: conceptualization, writing original draft, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology. Author 2: review, supervision.

Financial Disclosure

This research was funded by Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

- Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. Journal of Brand Management, 4(3), 185–206. https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.1996.42
- An, S.-H., & Meier, K. (2022). Optimal Turnover Rates and Performance in Public Organizations: Theoretical Expectations. Public Performance & Management Review, 45, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2022.2059769
- Arasanmi, C. N., & Krishna, A. (2019). Linking the employee value proposition (EVP) to employee behavioural outcomes. Industrial and Commercial Training, 51(7–8), 387–395. https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2019-0043
- Ashforth, B. E. (2001). Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective. In Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008a). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. In *Journal of Management* (Vol. 34, Issue 3, pp. 325–374). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316059
- Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008b). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. In *Journal of Management* (Vol. 34, Issue 3, pp. 325–374). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308316059
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. In Source: The Academy of Management Review (Vol. 14, Issue 1). https://about.jstor.org/terms
- Avanzi, L., Fraccaroli, F., Sarchielli, G., Ullrich, J., & van Dick, R. (2014). Staying or leaving: A combined social identity and social exchange approach to predicting employee turnover intentions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 272–289. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2013-0028
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. Work and Stress, 22(3), 187–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649
- Bernard Nkala, Charles Mudimu, & Angelbert Mbengwa Mbengwa. (2021). Human resources for health talent management contribution: A case for health systems strengthening in the public health sector. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 9(2), 192–201. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2021.9.2.0062
- Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Lian Hah, L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. www.warc.com

- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2009). Testing and Extending the Group Engagement Model: Linkages Between Social Identity, Procedural Justice, Economic Outcomes, and Extrarole Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 445–464. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013935
- Cameron, J. E. (2004). A Three-Factor Model of Social Identity. Self and Identity, 3(3), 239–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/13576500444000047
- Chang, C.-P., & Chang, W. (2009). Internal Marketing Practices and Employees' Turnover Intentions in Tourism and Leisure Hotels. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:55621760
- Chew, J., & Chan, C. C. A. (2008). Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay. International Journal of Manpower, 29(6), 503-522. https://doi.org/10.1108/01437720810904194
- Colarelli, S. M. (1984). Methods of communication and mediating processes in realistic job previews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69(4), 633-642. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.4.633
- Cook, K. S., & Rice, E. (2006). Social Exchange Theory. In J. Delamater (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology (pp. 53–76). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-36921-X_3
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An Interdisciplinary review. In *Journal of Management* (Vol. 31, Issue 6, pp. 874–900). https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602
- De Lange, A. H., De Witte, H., & Notelaers, G. (2008). Should I stay or should I go? Examining longitudinal relations among job resources and work engagement for stayers versus movers. Work and Stress, 22(3), 201–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802390132
- Dess, G. G., & Shaw, J. D. (2001). Voluntary Turnover, Social Capital, and Organizational Performance. The Academy of Management Review, 26(3), 446. https://doi.org/10.2307/259187
- DGT. (2023). Directorate General of Tax's Performance Report 2022.
- Everett, J. B., & Bischoff, M. (2021). Creating Connections: Engaging Student Library Employees through Experiential Learning. *Journal of Library Administration*, 61(4), 403–420. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2021.1906543
- Fang, Y. C., Chen, J. Y., Zhang, X. D., Dai, X. X., & Tsai, F. S. (2020). The impact of inclusive talent development model on turnover intention of new generation employees: The mediation of work passion. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(17), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176054
- Ferreira, A., Martinez, L., Lamelas, J., & Rodrigues, R. (2017). Mediation of job embeddedness and satisfaction in the relationship between task characteristics and turnover: A multilevel study in Portuguese hotels. *International Journal* of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29, 248–267. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2015-0126
- Fletcher, H., Flood, A., & Hare, D. (2016). Attachment in Intellectual and Developmental Disability: A Clinician's Guide to Practice and Research.
- Frare, A. B., & Beuren, I. M. (2021). Effects of corporate reputation and social identity on innovative job performance. European Journal of Innovation Management. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:236354179
- Goswami, P. (2015). Employee Value Proposition: A Tool for Employment Branding. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5(12), 263. www.ijsrp.org
- Greening, D. W., & Turban, D. B. (2000). Corporate Social Performance As a Competitive Advantage in Attracting a Quality Workforce. Business & Society, 39(3), 254–280. https://doi.org/10.1177/000765030003900302
- Gupta, N., & Sharma, V. (2016). Exploring Employee Engagement--A Way to Better Business Performance. *Global Business Review*, 17. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150916631082
- Gupta, S., Bhasin, J., & Mushtaq, S. (2021). Employer brand experience and organizational citizenship behavior: mediating role of employee engagement. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 13(3), 357–382. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-08-2020-0287
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate Data Analysis Eighth Edition. www.cengage.com/highered

- Halvarsson Lundkvist, A., & Gustavsson, M. (2018). Conditions for Employee Learning and Innovation Interweaving Competence Development Activities Provided by a Workplace Development Programme with Everyday Work Activities in SMEs. Vocations and Learning, 11(1), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-017-9179-6
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & M Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237670380
- Haslam, S. (2004). Psychology in Organizations: The Social Identity Approach. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446278819
- Heger, B. K. (2007). Linking the Employment Value Proposition (EVP) to employee engagement and business outcomes: Preliminary findings from a linkage research pilot study. 25, 121–132.
- Hogg, M. A. (2023). Walls between groups: Self-uncertainty, social identity, and intergroup leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 79(2), 825–840. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12584
- Hom, P., Lee, T., Shaw, J., & Hausknecht, J. (2017). One Hundred Years of Employee Turnover Theory and Research. Journal of Applied Psychology, 102. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000103
- Hughes, C. J., & Rog, E. (2008). Talent management: A strategy for improving employee recruitment, retention and engagement within hospitality organizations. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20, 743– 757. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810899086
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. In Source: The Academy of Management Journal (Vol. 33, Issue 4). https://about.jstor.org/terms
- Kravariti, F., & Johnston, K. (2020). Talent management: a critical literature review and research agenda for public sector human resource management. *Public Management Review*, 22(1), 75–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2019.1638439
- Kunerth, B., & Mosley, R. (2011). Applying employer brand management to employee engagement. *Strategic HR Review*, 10(3), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.1108/14754391111121874
- Kwon, H. W. (2017). A Social Embeddedness Perspective on Turnover Intention: The Role of Informal Networks and Social Identity Evidence from South Korea. *Public Personnel Management*, 46(3), 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017717459
- Laiyan, Y. A., & Indradewa, R. (2023). The Effect Of Employee Value Proposition (Evp) And Positive Well-Being On Indonesian Retail Company Employees' Intention To Stay: Moderating Role Of Psychological Contract And Social Identity.
- Lazzari, M., Alvarez, J. M., & Ruggieri, S. (2022). Predicting and explaining employee turnover intention. International Journal of Data Science and Analytics, 14(3), 279–292. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41060-022-00329-w
- Loasby, B. J. (2007). The Ubiquity of Organization. Organization Studies, 28(11), 1729–1759. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607082665
- Long, C. S., & Thean, L. Y. (2011). Relationship between leadership style, job satisfaction and employees' turnover intention: A literature review. Research Journal of Business Management, 5, 91–100. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:147400422
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538
- Mishra, U. S., Patnaik, S., & Mishra, B. B. (2016). Zwiększanie potencjału ludzkiego w pracy: Badanie roli własnej skuteczności w zaangażowaniu siły roboczej i zadowoleniu z pracy. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 13(1), 134–144. https://doi.org/10.17512/pjms.2016.13.1.13
- MOF. (2020). Ministry of Finance's Roadmap 2020-2024. www.jdih.kemenkeu.go.id
- Narayanan, A., Rajithakumar, S., & Menon, M. (2018). Talent Management and Employee Retention: An Integrative Research Framework. *Human Resource Development Review*, 18, 153448431881215. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484318812159
- Olaoye, F., & Akinola, A. (2019). Tax Revenue and Budget Implementation in Nigeria. American Journal of Industrial and Business Management, 09, 1219–1233. https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2019.95082

- Pasaribu, G. (2022). Tax Reforms and Financial Performance of the Indonesian Tax Authority between 2017 and 2021: Literature Review. Journal of Finance and Accounting, 6, 11–21. https://doi.org/10.53819/81018102t4105
- Raj, A. B. (2018). Employee Well-being through Internal Branding: An Integrated Approach for Achieving Employeebased Brand Outcomes. *Global Business Review*, 21, 097215091877916. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150918779161
- Raj, A. B. (2020). Impact of employee value proposition on employees' intention to stay: moderating role of psychological contract and social identity. South Asian Journal of Business Studies, 10(2), 203–226. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-10-2019-0183
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.698
- Rounak, S., & Misra, R. (2020). Employee value proposition: an analysis of organizational factors the way to enhance value perception. Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal, ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-09-2019-0216
- Saks, A., & Gruman, J. (2014). What Do We Really Know About Employee Engagement? Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21187
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471
- Shuck, B., Twyford, D., Reio Jr., T. G., & Shuck, A. (2014). Human Resource Development Practices and Employee Engagement: Examining the Connection With Employee Turnover Intentions. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 25(2), 239–270. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21190
- Simbula, S., Margheritti, S., & Avanzi, L. (2023). Building Work Engagement in Organizations: A Longitudinal Study Combining Social Exchange and Social Identity Theories. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020083
- Siong, Z. M. B., Mellor, D., Moore, K. A., & Firth, L. (2006). Predicting intention to quit in the call centre industry: Does the retail model fit? Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(3), 231–243. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610659579
- Sireesha, P., & Ganapavarapu, L. K. (2014). Talent Management: A Critical Review (Vol. 16, Issue 9). Ver. I. www.iosrjournals.org
- Speed, F., & Kulichyova, A. (2021). The role of talent intermediaries in accessing and developing refugee talent pools. Journal of Organizational Effectiveness, 8(4), 407–426. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-01-2021-0023
- Sun, L., & Bunchapattanasakda, C. (2019). Employee Engagement: A Literature Review. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9(1), 63. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i1.14167
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:141114011
- Theys, N. A., & Barkhuizen, E. N. (2022). The Development of An Employee Value Proposition Framework for the South African Water Board Sector. SA Journal of Human Resource Management. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm
- Wan, Q., Li, Z., Zhou, W., & Shang, S. (2018). Effects of work environment and job characteristics on the turnover intention of experienced nurses: The mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 74(6), 1332– 1341. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13528
- Wang, C., Xu, J., Zhang, T. C., & Li, Q. M. (2020). Effects of professional identity on turnover intention in China's hotel employees: The mediating role of employee engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45, 10–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.07.002
- Wang, Y.-D., Yang, C., & Wang, K.-Y. (2012). Comparing Public and Private Employees' Job Satisfaction and Turnover.
- Zhang, W., Meng, H., Yang, S., & Liu, D. (2018). The influence of professional identity, job satisfaction, and work engagement on turnover intention among township health inspectors in China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(5). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15050988.

Appendices

Instrument measurement (Questionnaire) can be seen in Table 4. Table 4. Measurement Instruments

Questions	Reference
Turnover Intention	Wang et al.
I hope to find a new job next year	(2020)
I am always thinking about quitting my current job	
I am planning to quit my job	-
Employee Value Proposition	Berthon et al.
Interest Value	(2005)
My organization produces innovative products and services	
I have an innovative employer with novel work practices/forward thinking	
My organization values and makes use of creativity	
My organization produces high-quality product and services	
I am working in an exciting environment	
Social Value	
I have a good relationship with my colleagues	
I have a good relationship with my superiors	
I have supportive and encouraging colleagues	
I have fun at working environment	
I have a happy work environment	
Economic Value	
My overall compensation package is attractive	
I have an above average basic salary	
have job security within my organization	
l have good promotion opportunities within the organization	
l have hands-on inter-department experience	
Development Value	
l feel more self-confident as a result of working for my organization	
I feel good about myself as a result of working for my organization	
l gain career-enhancing experience in my organization	
I have a springboard for future employment	
I receive recognition/appreciation from management	
Application Value	
I have the opportunity to teach others what I have learned	
I have the opportunity to apply what was learned at a tertiary institution	
My organization is customer-oriented	
I have a humanitarian organization which gives back to society	
I have a feeling of acceptance and belonging at my workplace	
Social Identity	Cameron
Centrality	(2004)
l often think about the fact that I am an ingroup member	
Overall, being an ingroup member has very little to do with how I feel about myself	
In general, being an ingroup member is an important part of my self-image	
The fact that I am an ingroup member rarely enters my mind	
I am not usually conscious of the fact that I am an ingroup member	
Being an ingroup member is an important reflection of who I am	
Ingroup Affect	
In general, I'm glad to be an ingroup member	
l often regret that l am an ingroup member	
I don't feel good about being an ingroup member	
Generally, I feel good when I think about myself as an ingroup member	
Ingroup Ties	
I have a lot in common with other ingroup member	
I feel strong ties to other ingroup member	
I find it difficult to form a bond with other ingroup members	
I don't feel a sense of being "connected" with other	
I really "fit in" with other ingroup member	

Questions	Reference
Employee Engagement	Schaufeli et al.
Vigor	(2006)
At my work, I feel bursting with energy	
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	
I can continue working for very long periods at a time	
At my job, I am very resilient, mentally	
At my work, I always persevere, even when things do not go well	
Dedication	
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	
I am enthusiastic about my job	
My job inspires me	
I am proud of the work that I do	
To me, my job is challenging	
Absorption	
Time flies when I am working	
When I am working, I forget everything else around me	
I feel happy when I am working intensely	
I am immersed in my work	
l get carried away when I am working	
It is difficult to detach myself from my job	