

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v5i6>

Received: 24 August 2024, Revised: 28 August 2024, Publish: 2 September 2024

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Influence of Work Flexibility and Trust, and Transparency, on Employee Attachment of *Creative Agency Companies* in Jakarta: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment

Putri Larasati¹, Justine Tanuwijaya^{2*}, Andreas Wahyu Gunawan³

¹ Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Trisakti, putrilarasati1390@gmail.com

² Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Trisakti, justine@trisakti.ac.id

³ Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Trisakti, andreaswg@trisakti.ac.id

Corresponding Author: justine@trisakti.ac.id

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of Flexibility and Trust, and Transparency on Organizational Commitment; to determine the effect of Organizational Commitment on Employee Engagement; and to determine Flexibility and Trust, Transparency on Employee Engagement through the mediating role of Organizational Commitment. This research uses a quantitative approach. The sample used is employees of agency companies in Jakarta. Researchers used data testing methods in this study including three main steps, namely Validity Test, Reliability Test and Model Feasibility Test. And the analysis method used in this study uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with software such as AMOS. The results of the study state that Flexibility and Trust have a positive influence on Employee Engagement, Flexibility and Trust have a positive influence on Organizational Commitment, Transparency has no positive effect on Employee engagement, Transparency has a positive effect on Organizational Commitment, Organizational Commitment has a positive effect on Employee engagement, Flexibility and Trust has a positive effect on Employee engagement through the mediating role of Organizational Commitment, Transparency has no positive effect on Employee engagement through the mediating role of Organizational Commitment.

Keywords: Work Flexibility and Trust, and Transparency, Mediation Role Organizational Commitment

INTRODUCTION

Flexibility and trust are interconnected concepts referring to a work environment that offers flexibility and fosters trust. Employees who can manage their own schedules and determine how they accomplish their tasks are considered trusted. When employees feel trusted to carry out their responsibilities, they are more inclined to take risks, which can lead to increased innovation and problem-solving. This sense of trust and autonomy often boosts employee engagement, as they perceive the company as supportive and appreciate being valued (Stranzl et al., 2024).

When *Flexibility and Trust* have an effect and produce a positive result, there must be a measurement of *Transparency*. According to Rawlins (2008) that Transparency in organizations is a deliberate effort to open all legally releasable information to the public including; providing important information, recognizing their space for improvement or introspection, and being open to feedback from the public. Being transparent means being open to engaging in critical communication, both positive and negative (Lee *et al.*, 2023; Morsing, 2017).

Employee engagement is regarded as a key method for achieving sustainable development within an organization (Alam et al., 2021). It is viewed as a crucial element for the success of an organization (Choi et al., 2015; Iddagoda, Dissanayake, and Bagienska, 2023). Research indicates that employee engagement impacts organizational productivity (Sungu et al., 2019) and plays a vital role in enhancing financial performance (Baig et al., 2019). Employees who are engaged and maintain a strong connection with the organization are less likely to leave or resign (Yue, 2021). Moreover, employees who actively contribute to improving outcomes and perform their jobs more effectively can boost the company's customer satisfaction (Schneider et al., 2018; Iddagoda, Dissanayake, and Bagienska, 2023). Employees who are committed tend to exhibit high levels of energy, mental resilience, enthusiasm, pride, deep focus on their tasks, and dedication (Rabiul et al., 2022).

In public research, commitment is often conceptualized as part of the *employee-organization relationship* construct which is defined as "the extent to which the organization and its employees trust each other, agree on who has legitimate power to influence and feel satisfaction with each employee's commitment to the other" (Men and Stacks, 2014, p.307).

Meyer and Allen (1991) define organizational commitment as a distinct psychological concept that centers on an employee's personal emotional connection with the organization. This concept is assessed using six indicators, such as the employees' feelings toward the organization, their emotional attachment, their willingness to remain with the organization, and their perception of organizational problems as shared or personal issues. Essentially, it reflects how deeply an employee feels and identifies with the organization.

By looking at the phenomena listed above, *Organizational Commitment* can function as a mediator for *Flexibility and Trust*, *Transparency*. Based on the description above, the topic of this research is entitled "The Effect of Work Flexibility and Trust, and Transparency, on Employee Attachment to Creative Agency Companies in Jakarta: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment"

METHOD

The research method used is to use quantitative methods, namely by using calculations that are described. This study uses *cross sectional* data, namely data collected from several objects in a certain period. Independent variables in this study, namely *Flexibility and Trust*, and *Transparency* on *Organizational Commitment* as a mediating variable on *Employee Engagement* as the dependent variable. Later the indicator will be used as an illustration in making a list of questions or statements in the form of a questionnaire. To measure this research, all variables use a scale that has been tested in previous researchers. *Flexibility and Trust* from research conducted by Kafetzopoulos, Psomas and Bouranta (2022); and Yun Lee, Jing Lee, Chau and Deng (2024). *Transparency* from research conducted by Stofberg, Bussin and Mbaso (2022). *Transformational Leadership*, *Organizational Commitment* and *Employee Engagement* from research conducted by Sudha, Azam and Jacqueline (2023).

The data collection process was carried out by distributing questionnaires using *Google Forms* to employees of agency companies in Jakarta. Using non-probability sampling method. Researchers used data testing methods in this study including three main steps: Validity Test, Reliability Test and Model Feasibility Test. As well as the analysis method used in this study using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis with software such as

AMOS , This allows researchers to link theory with existing data, thus allowing for strong empirical testing of research hypotheses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research involves collecting data from employees in 3 Creative Agency companies in Indonesia. Respondents in this study totaled 124 people randomly selected from various 3 Creative Agency companies.

Results of *Flexibility and Trust* Analysis for Employees at *Creative Agency*

Descriptive analysis shows a description and descriptive of the dependent and independent variables.

Table 1. *Flexibility and Trust* Descriptive Statistics

Dimensions	Indicator	n	Mean
<i>Flexibility, trust</i>	1. The management level of the company tends to be flat	123	3,3
	2. Resource capability in the company is good	123	4,28
	3. Employees can respond quickly to client requests	123	4,26
	4. High flexibility of company management	123	4,08
	5. Project-related decisions are made by the team	123	4,29
	Total Mean	123	4,04
<i>Strategic Flexibility</i>	6. I can easily change the current plan	123	3,84
	7. I can control changes in strategy	123	4,17
	8. I can proactively develop new projects	123	4,24
	9. I am ready to react in a modified way that is feasible for the company.	123	4,33
	Total Mean	123	4,15
<i>Competence trust among team members</i>	10. I believe that my teammates are doing a very good job	123	4,25
	11. Most of my teammates are competent in their field of expertise	123	4,39
	12. I feel comfortable that my team members are professionals for the team tasks.	123	4,33
	Total Mean	123	4,32
<i>Goodwill trust among team members</i>	13. My teammates care deeply about the well-being of others	123	4,23
	14. My teammates are honest in their dealings with others	123	4,3
	15. I feel that I will be able to rely on team members to help if I cannot handle the task.	123	4,18
	Total Mean		4,24

Source: Data processed

The table above displays descriptive statistics for the *Flexibility and Trust* (FNT) variable which is measured through four modified dimensions: *Flexibility in the Organization*, *Strategic flexibility*, *competence trust among team members* and *goodwill trust among team members*.

In the *Flexibility and Trust* dimension, the average value on these five indicators is 4.04, this shows that employees feel a level of flexibility and trust without any obstacles in

adapting to environmental changes. In the *Strategic flexibility* dimension with a total average value (*mean*) of 4.15. This shows that the company can cope with frequent changes in the business environment because the company makes relevant strategies to maintain a competitive advantage. In the *Competence trust among team members* dimension, the average value (*mean*) is 4.32. This shows that employees have enough competence and trust in their teammates. The last dimension is *Goodwill trust among team members* with a total average value (*mean*) of 4.24. This shows that the level of mutual care and reliance on each other is quite good.

Overall, the results of these descriptive statistics show that employees have a high level of flexibility and trust in the company and coworkers. Able to adapt to changes in the business environment that can change over time. This shows that there is a positive and supportive organizational environment.

Results of the *Transparency Analysis on Employees in the Creative Agency Industry*

Table 2. *Transparency Descriptive Statistics*

Dimensions	Indicator	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>
<i>Pay Transparency</i>	1. I know my job level	123	4,10
	2. My employer provided some information on the factors considered when the salary range was determined.	123	4,12
	3. My employer provided some information on how to interpret salary relative to the salary range.	123	4,26
	4. My employer provides information on how much is spent on annual salary increases	123	4
	5. My employer provides information about the actual salary paid.	123	4,25
	6. My boss divides the salaries of all employees	123	4,46
Total Mean			4,2

Source: Data processed

The table above displays descriptive statistics for the *Transparency* variable which is measured only through one dimension: *Pay Transparency*. the overall average (*mean*) value is 4.2. This shows that supervisors are transparent in providing information related to the salaries given to their employees and in accordance with the *values of* their employees. So that it has a fairly good level of transparency, so there are aspects that need to be considered by the employer.

Results of *Organizational Commitment Analysis on Employees in the Creative Agency Industry*

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Commitment*

Dimensions	Indicator	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>
<i>Affective Commitment</i>	1. I am excited to continue working with this organization in the future.	123	4,13
	2. I feel a close personal connection with the organization.	123	4,16
	3. I can easily develop close relationships with other organizations as I did with this organization.	123	4,19

	4.	I honestly feel that I am to blame for the problems faced in the Company.	123	3,21
	Total Mean		123	3,92
<i>Continuance Commitment</i>	5.	Even if I wanted to, it would be difficult for me to leave my current company	123	3,96
	6.	I left an organization that required me to incur large personal costs	123	4,08
	7.	I would leave the organization if I had a lot of stress in my life.	123	4,15
	Total Mean			4,06
<i>Normative Commitment</i>	8.	I tend not to change jobs too often	123	4,03
	9.	I think staying in an organization is very important	123	4,37
	10.	I think it would be better if employees work for one company during their career.	123	4,11
	11.	Even if there is another job, I don't want to quit this job.	123	4,04
	Total Mean		123	4,14

Source: Data processed

The descriptive statistical results above show that employees have a level of attachment to the organization because of moral values with all three affective indicators, ongoing commitment and normative at a fairly good level. This shows that employees feel a sense of closeness and attachment to the company.

Results of Employee Engagement Analaisis on Employees in the Creative Agency Industry

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Employee Engagement

Dimensions	Indicator	n	Mean
<i>Physical engagement</i>	1. I put everything I have into my work	123	4,16
	2. I am a person who perseveres in my work	123	4,37
	Total Mean	123	4,26
<i>Cognitive engagement</i>	3. I take pride in the work I do	123	4,6
	4. I am highly motivated by the work I am doing.	123	4,29
	5. I really like the job I've taken	123	4,25
	Total Mean	123	4,34
<i>Emotional engagement</i>	6. I am satisfied with my work	123	4,4

7. I can concentrate while at work	123	4,41
Total Mean		4,4

Source: Data processed

The results of these descriptive statistics show that employees have a high level of attachment to their work by working physically, mentally and emotionally. Employees have a sense of enthusiasm at work, this shows that there is a positive indication of activity and productivity in the workplace.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis Test Results

Table 5. Research Hypothesis Testing

	Hypothesis	Estimate	C.R.	P	Summary
H ₁	Flexibility and Trust affect Employee engagement	0.443	3.533	0.000**	Hypothesis supported
H ₂	Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on Organizational Commitment	0.514	4.742	0.000**	Hypothesis supported
H ₃	Tranparancy has a positive effect on Employee engagement	0.046	0.325	0.162	Hypothesis not supported
H ₄	Tranparancy affects Organizational Commitment	0.192	1.509	0.066*	Hypothesis supported
H ₅	Organizational Commitment affects Employee engagement	0.305	2.958	0.001**	Hypothesis supported
H ₆	Organizational Commitment mediates the positive effect of Flexibility and Trust b on Employee Engagement	0.099	1.460	0.072*	Hypothesis supported
H ₇	Organizational Commitment mediates the positive effect of Transparency on Employee Engagement.	0.058	1.146	0.126	Hypothesis not supported

Source : data processed

Results of validity and reliability testing of *Flexibiioity and Trust Variables*

Validity testing for the *Flexibility and trust* dimension which consists of 5 indicators resulted in the conclusion that only three indicators are valid because they produce an outer loading value > 0.5. A total of 2 indicators must be removed because they have an outer loading value < 0.5, namely the FT11 and FT13 indicators. The AVE value of $0.511 = 5 > 0.5$ shows that there is a proven relationship between the three indicators that make up the flexibility and trust dimension. The reliability test results are shown with a Cronbach alpha value of 0.757, which means it is proven that the three indicators of the flexibility and trust dimension are consistent.

Table 6. Validity and Reliability Testing of *Flexibility and Trust Variables*

	Item	Outer loading	AVE	Composite Reliability
<i>Flexibility and trust</i>	FNT11	0.132		
	FNT12	0.669		
	FNT13	0.474		
	FNT14	0.699		
	FNT15	0.729		
<i>Improvements</i>				

	FNT12	0.624		
	FNT14	0.741	0.515	0.757
	FNT15	0.771		
	FNT21	0.648		
	FNT22	0.784	0.419	
	FNT23	0.508		
	FNT24	0.620		
<i>Strategic Flexibility</i>				
	FNT21	0.664		
	FNT22	0.814	0.508	0,758
	FNT24	0.647		
	FNT31	0.702		
	FNT32	0.781	0.509	0,755
	FNT33	0.650		
	FNT41	0.799		
	FNT42	0.771	0.499	
	FNT43	0.513		
<i>Improvements</i>				
	FNT41	0.855	0.701	0.824
	FNT42	0.820		

Source : data processed

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the *Transparency Variable*

The results of processing validity testing for the *Transparency* variable which consists of 6 indicators resulted in the conclusion that only four indicators were proven to be valid and reliable, namely each indicator TR2, TR3, TR4 and TR5 which produced an outer loading value > 0.5 , an AVE value of $0.527 > 0.5$ and a Cronbach alpha value of $0.815 > 0.7$. Two other indicators, namely TR1 and TR6, must be eliminated because they do not meet the validity criteria, namely the outer loading value < 0.5 and cause the AVE value < 0.5 . For more details can be seen in table 4.

Table 7. Validity and Reliability Testing of *Transparency Variables*

Dimensions	Item	Outer Loading	AVE	Composite Reliability
	TR1	0.533		
	TR2	0.639		
	TR3	0.636		
	TR4	0.792		
	TR5	0.650		
	TR6	0.296		
	TR1	0.533		
Remedy 1				
	TR1	0.540		
	TR2	0.648	0.439	
	TR3	0.619		
	TR4	0.816		
	TR5	0.658		
Improvement 2				
	TR2	0.688	0.527	0.815
	TR3	0.682		
	TR4	0.830		
	TR5	0.692		

Source : data processed

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the *Organizational Commitment Variable*

The results of processing validity testing for *Organizational Commitment* variables consisting of three dimensions, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment and

normative commitment can be seen in table 2. Because the organizaional commitment variable is a variable with second order, validity and reliability testing is carried out on these three dimensions. Information from the table shows:

- Validity testing for the affectie commitment dimension which consists of 4 indicators results in the conclusion that only three indicators are valid and reliable as can be seen from the outer loading value > 0.5 , the AVE value of $0.511 > 0.5$ and the composite reliability value of $0.757 > 0.7$. The three indicators in question are OC11, OC12 and OC14, one indicator, OC13, must be removed because it produces an AVE < 0.5 .
- Validity testing for the continuance commitment dimension with three measurement indicators shows that all indicators are proven valid because they produce an outer loading value > 0.5 . The three indicators are also interconnected in forming the continuance commitment dimension as can be seen from the AVE value of $0.568 > 0.5$. The three indicators are also reliable as shown by the composite reliability value of $0.797 > 0.7$,
- Validity testing for the *Normative Commitment* dimension shows that of the 4 indicators, only 3 indicators are valid because they produce an outer loading value > 0.5 while one indicator, OC31, must be removed because it has an outer loading < 0.5 . The results of discriminant validity testing resulted in an AVE value of $0.640 > 0.5$, which means that it is proven that the indicators are interconnected in forming the dimensions of the normative commiennat. Reliability testing results in a Cronbach alpha value of 0.841, which means it is proven that the three indicators that make up the normative commiment dimension are consistent (reliable).

Table 8. Validity and Reliability Testing of Organizational Commiment Variables

Variables	Item	Outer Loading	AVE	Composite Reliability
Dimensions Affective Commitment	OC11	0.685	0.440	
	OC12	0.758		
	OC13	0.559		
	OC14	0.636		
Improvements				
	OC11	0.757	0.511	0.757
	OC12	0.762		
	OC14	0.616		
Dimensions Continuance Commitment	OC21	0.737	0.568	0,797
	OC22	0.823		
	OC23	0.694		
Dimensions Normative Commitment	OC31	0.473		
	OC32	0.698		
	OC33	0.726		
	OC34	0.881		
Improvements				
	OC32	0.722	0.640	0.841
	OC33	0.779		
	OC34	0.890		

Source: data processed

The results of testing the validity and reliability of the *Employee Engagement* variable

The results of processing validity testing for *employee engagement* variables consisting of 9 indicators resulted in the conclusion that only five indicators were proven valid and reliable, namely indicators EE1, EE2, EE4, EE5 and EE7 which produced fouter loading > 0.5 . Produces an AVE of $0.522 > 0.5$ and produces a composite reliability of $0.844 > 0.7$. A total of 4 indicators must be eliminated because they do not meet the provisions of outer loading, AVE and composite reliability, namely indicators EE3, EE6, EE8 and EE9. For more details can be seen in table 2.

Table 9. Validity and Reliability Testing of *Employee Engagement* Variables

Variables	Item	Outer Loading	AVE	Composite Reliability
Employee Engagement	EE1	0.590	0.416	
	EE2	0.728		
	EE3	0.487		
	EE4	0.611		
	EE5	0.741		
	EE6	0.580		
	EE7	0.636		
	EE8	0.663		
	EE9	0.550		
Improvement 1				
Employee Engagement	EE1	0.597	0.416	
	EE2	0.728		
	EE4	0.661		
	EE5	0.758		
	EE6	0.539		
	EE7	0.648		
	EE8	0.652		
	EE9	0.550		
Improvement 2				
Employee Engagement	EE1	0.614	0.441	
	EE2	0.728		
	EE4	0.704		
	EE5	0.749		
	EE7	0.683		
	EE8	0.630		
	EE9	0.509		
Employee Engagement	EE1	0.626	0.484	
	EE2	0.742		
	EE4	0.733		
	EE5	0.734		
	EE7	0.712		
	EE8	0.614		
Employee Engagement	EE1	0.635	0.522	0,844
	EE2	0.730		
	EE4	0.767		
	EE5	0.719		
	EE7	0.753		

Source: data processed

Discussion of Research Results

Hypothesis 1: Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on Employee Engagement

Hypothesis 1 was carried out with the aim of testing *Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on Employee engagement*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.443, which means that increasing Flexibility and Trust will increase Employee engagement and conversely low Flexibility and Trust will decrease Employee engagement.

Hypothesis 2: Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on Organizational Commitment

Hypothesis 2 is carried out with the aim of testing *Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on organizational commitment*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.514, which means that increasing *Flexibility and Trust* will increase *organizational commitment* and conversely low *Flexibility and Trust* will reduce *organizational commitment*.

Hypothesis 3: Transparency does not have a positive effect on Employee Engagement

Hypothesis 3 was carried out with the aim of testing *transparency has a positive effect on Employee engagement*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.046 which means that increased *transparency* will increase *Employee engagement* and conversely low *transparency* will decrease *Employee engagement*.

Hypothesis 4: Transparency has a positive effect on Organizational Commitment

Hypothesis 4 is carried out with the aim of testing *transparency has a positive effect on Organizational Commitment*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.192, which means that increased *transparency* will increase *Organizational Commitment* and conversely low *transparency* will reduce *Organizational Commitment*.

Hypothesis 5: Organizational Commitment has a positive effect on Employee Engagement

Hypothesis 5 was carried out with the aim of testing *Organizational Commitment has a positive effect on Employee engagement*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.305, which means that increased *Organizational Commitment* will increase *Employee engagement* and conversely low *Organizational Commitment* will decrease *Employee engagement*.

Hypothesis 6: Flexibility and Trust have a positive effect on Employee engagement through the mediating role of Organizational Commitment.

Hypothesis 6 was carried out with the aim of testing *organizational commitment mediating the positive effect of Flexibility and Trust on Employee engagement*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.099, which means that increasing *Flexibility and Trust* will increase *Employee engagement mediated by organizational commitment and vice versa*.

Hypothesis 7: Transparency does not have a positive effect on Employee engagement through the mediating role of Organizational Commitment

Hypothesis 7 was carried out with the aim of testing *organizational commitment mediating the positive effect of transparency on Employee engagement*. The processing results are shown with an estimated coefficient value of 0.058 which means that increasing *transparency* will increase *Employee engagement mediated by organizational commitment and vice versa*.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the data analysis conducted in the previous chapter, the following are the conclusions of this study:

1. *Flexibility and Trust* have a positive influence on *Employee Engagement*. This shows that employees have work flexibility and trust in each other, the higher the level of engagement between employees.

2. *Flexibility and Trust* have a positive influence on *Organizational Commitment*. This shows that employees have work flexibility and trust for work-life balance towards each other, the higher the level of employee commitment to their organization.
3. *Transparency* has no positive effect on *Employee engagement*. This shows that there is no openness of salary transparency from superiors to employees, which creates variability or speculation of different responses to employee engagement.
4. *Transparency* has a positive effect on *Organizational Commitment*. This shows that the existence of high transparency in an organization will increase high commitment in the company's organization.
5. *Organizational Commitment* has a positive effect on *Employee engagement*. This shows that the higher an employee is committed to the company organization and feels responsible for the company, it will increase the attachment between employees because they feel connected to each other.
6. *Flexibility and Trust* have a positive effect on *Employee engagement* through the mediating role of *Organizational Commitment*. High flexibility and trust through the mediating role of organizational commitment will increase employee engagement.
7. *Transparency* does not have a positive effect on *Employee engagement* through the mediating role of *Organizational Commitment*. There are limitations to salary transparency between employees and superiors, through the mediating role of organizational commitment, so that employee engagement does not have a good effect due to the complexity of each employee.

REFERENCES

- Bouranta, N., & Psomas, E. (2024). Educational innovation practices in primary and secondary schools during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(2), 355-373.
- Dwianto, A. S., Darka, D., & Widayatmoko, W. (2023). The role of job flexibility and organizational support in employee commitment: An investigation with job satisfaction intervention. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal (MSEJ)*, 4(6), 10016-10023.
- Einwiller, S., Ruppel, C., & Stranzl, J. (2021). Achieving employee support during the COVID-19 pandemic—the role of relational and informational crisis communication in Austrian organizations. *Journal of Communication Management*, 25(3), 233-255.
- Gashi, A., Kutlllovci, E., & Zhushi, G. (2022). E-work evaluation through work–life balance, job effectiveness, organizational trust and flexibility: Evidence from Kosovo during COVID-19. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44(2), 371-385.
- Gautam, K. P., Sharma, P., Dhakal, K. N., & Sharma, A. (2022). Job flexibility as a predictor of organizational commitment. *Journal of Educational and Management Studies*, 12(1), 25-38.
- Jindain, C., & Gilitwala, B. (2024). The factors impacting the intermediating variable of employee engagement toward employee performance in a hybrid working model. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 18(2), 167-179.
- Mele, C., & Russo-Spena, T. (2024). Agencement of onlife and phygital: smart tech-enabled value co-creation practices. *Journal of Service Management*.
- Otoo, F. N. K. (2019). Human resource development (HRD) practices and banking industry effectiveness: The mediating role of employee competencies. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 43(3/4), 250-271.
- Otoo, F. N. K. (2024). Does employee engagement mediate the nexus of job resource and employee turnover intentions?. *IIMT Journal of Management*.
- Pavlova, O. (2019). The impact of flexible working arrangements on competitive advantages of organization. In *14th prof. Vladas Gronskas international scientific conference*, 5th

December, 2019: reviewed selected papers. (pp. 55-61). Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

- Rachmaningrum, S. D., & Handini, D. P. (2023). Analysis of The Effect of Organizational Trust on Employee Commitment Mediated by Employee Engagement. *Journal of Management Research and Studies*, 2(1), 50-61.
- Raza, M., Khokhar, M. F., Zubair, M., & Rubab, M. (2023). Impact of Transparent Communication in HR Governance: Fostering Employee Trust and Engagement. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 12(3), 558-566.
- Stofberg, R., Bussin, M., & Mabaso, C. M. (2022). Pay transparency, job turnover intentions and the mediating role of perceived organizational support and organizational justice. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 44(7), 162-182.
- Stranzl, J., Ruppel, C., & Einwiller, S. (2024). Staying emotionally connected while being physically apart—exploring what teleworkers need to stay committed and how internal communication can contribute. *Journal of Communication Management*, 28(2), 272-293.