

International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal
The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies
 --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies
Article Type:	Empirical articles
Corresponding Author:	Antonio L. Leal-Rodríguez, Ph.D. Universidad de Sevilla Seville, SPAIN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universidad de Sevilla
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Murad Ali, Ph.D.
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Murad Ali, Ph.D. Imran Ali, Ph.D. Gema Albort-Morant, Ph.D. Antonio L. Leal-Rodríguez, Ph.D.
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	Employees' wellbeing is nowadays at the core of organizational HRM strategies, as firms have turned to grasp the significance of human resources while attaining competitive advantages. However, some external factors like localization of labor can adversely influence expatriate employees' perception of wellbeing at the firm level. The current study examines the influence of job insecurity on employee's perceptions of wellbeing, and their involvement in knowledge sharing or knowledge hiding strategies. The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working at different organizations in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian government is currently implementing localization policies, and the organizations are increasingly replacing their expatriate employees with local employees in order to avoid governmental penalties. Therefore, it is important to examine how this job insecurity might be affecting expatriate employees' perceptions of wellbeing and knowledge management behaviors. The study uses Partial Least Squares (PLS) path-modeling technique to test the hypotheses proposed in this research. Some findings derived from this research are contrary to previous studies owing to the specific context examined in this research. The study found significant influence of job insecurity and employees' perceptions of work engagement, and knowledge sharing. There is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. Whereas, work engagement has a significant association with knowledge sharing and burnout. Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate employees.
Suggested Reviewers:	Antonio Ariza-Montes ariza@uloyola.es
Manuscript Classifications:	100.107: Social psychological theory; 400.415: Organizational Knowledge and Learning; 400.425: Human Capital; 400.426: Human resource management; 500.511: Structural Equation Modelling



Click here to access/download

Title Page

Title page.docx



The Influence of Job Insecurity on Expatriate Employees' Perceptions of Wellbeing and Knowledge Management Strategies

ABSTRACT

Employees' wellbeing is nowadays at the core of organizational HRM strategies, as firms have turned to grasp the significance of human resources while attaining competitive advantages. However, some external factors like localization of labor can adversely influence expatriate employees' perception of wellbeing at the firm level. The current study examines the influence of job insecurity on employee's perceptions of wellbeing, and their involvement in knowledge sharing or knowledge hiding strategies. The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working at different organizations in Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Arabian government is currently implementing localization policies, and the organizations are increasingly replacing their expatriate employees with local employees in order to avoid governmental penalties. Therefore, it is important to examine how this job insecurity might be affecting expatriate employees' perceptions of wellbeing and knowledge management behaviors. The study uses Partial Least Squares (PLS) path-modeling technique to test the hypotheses proposed in this research. Some findings derived from this research are contrary to previous studies owing to the specific context examined in this research. The study found significant influence of job insecurity and employees' perceptions of work engagement, and knowledge sharing. There is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. Whereas, work engagement has a significant association with knowledge sharing and burnout. Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate employees.

1
2
3
4 **Keywords:** Job insecurity, work engagement, burnout, employee wellbeing, knowledge
5
6 sharing, knowledge hiding.
7
8

9 **INTRODUCTION**

10
11 The last few decades have dramatically changed the way of doing business and
12
13 managing the workplace. The escalation in the use of computers and information and
14
15 communication technologies has driven organizations to become more innovative and
16
17 competent while adapting themselves to the currently dynamic business and work
18
19 environment (Leal-Rodríguez et al. 2018). In this vein, firms are increasingly developing
20
21 knowledge management (KM) systems to take advantage of the explicit and tacit
22
23 knowledge resources and boost their intellectual capital. In other words, organizational
24
25 design and managerial practice has significantly turned more knowledge-focused (Alavi
26
27 and Leidner 2001). Besides, organizations are now striving to improve their employees’s
28
29 levels of wellbeing to maintain an engaged, highly motivated and competitive workforce
30
31 and to be able to retain their more talented employees (Wright and Bonett 2007; Rothausen
32
33 et al. 2017). There is plenty of evidence available in the management literature that
34
35 emphasizes the significance of employees’ wellbeing to yield improved individual and
36
37 organizational outcomes and plenty of studies have examined the role of employee-related
38
39 factors while designing and implementing knowledge management strategies. However,
40
41 there is a scarcity of research studies aimed at examining the wellbeing perceptions of
42
43 employees and their intentions to share or hide knowledge in the times of job insecurity.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 As posited by Ferreira et al. (2017) further research should be directed towards the
54
55 topics of global Human Resources Management (HRM) and knowledge management in
56
57 international contexts, to ascertain the role played by human capital in competitively
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 relevant international business ventures. In this vein, this paper aims to shed light upon this
5
6 research line by attempting to provide answers to the following research questions: (1) How
7
8 do expatriate employees behave in terms of knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding
9
10 within contexts of job insecurity? and (2) how does these employees' perception of
11
12 wellbeing determine or influence their willingness to rely on knowledge sharing or
13
14 knowledge hiding behaviors?
15
16
17

18
19 Numerous studies have examined the relationship between job insecurity and
20
21 individual engagement (Lu et al. 2014) or work engagement (De Spiegelaere et al. 2014;
22
23 Wang et al. 2014; Moshoeu and Geldenhuys 2015). Other authors have also inquired the
24
25 link between job insecurity and negative outcomes as burnout effects (Schaufeli and
26
27 Greenglass 2001; Bosman et al. 2005; De Cuyper et al. 2012; Aybas et al. 2015; Bitmis
28
29 and Ergeneli 2015; Blom et al. 2018). However, there is sparse research available that
30
31 examines the effect of employees' wellbeing perceptions on their intentions to share or
32
33 hide knowledge within contexts of job insecurity. For this reason, the current study uses
34
35 employee engagement and burnout as positive and negative behaviors respectively to
36
37 approach the concept of perceived wellbeing. Subsequently, these variables are related to
38
39 the employees' knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding intentions. Thus, this paper
40
41 proposes an original theoretical model that examines expatriate employees' perceptions of
42
43 wellbeing, approached through their levels of engagement and burnout caused by job
44
45 insecurity. This model subsequently examines the role of both facets of wellbeing in
46
47 predicting the employees' knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding intentions.
48
49 Furthermore, this paper also examines the direct influence of job insecurity on expatriate
50
51 employee's knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 This study is carried out upon the particular context of expatriates. Concretely, it
5
6 relies on a sample of 265 expatriate employees working in Saudi Arabia. As posited by
7
8 Connelly (2010), the most common profile for an expatriate, namely the ‘traditional
9
10 expatriate’ is that person that works for a multinational corporation that comprises a rather
11
12 large international workforce, a corporate-level internationalization strategy and an
13
14 exhaustively detailed set of expatriation policies. Expatriates. There are plenty of studies
15
16 that assess HRM issues in the context of expatriates working in Saudi Arabia. However,
17
18 very scarce studies attempt to empirically assess knowledge sharing behavior among this
19
20 particular context (i.e., Ewers, 2013; Dulayami et al., 2015; Ali et al., 2018), and none of
21
22 them focuses on the ties between job insecurity, perceived wellbeing and knowledge
23
24 sharing/hiding behaviors.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 This manuscript is organized as follows: section 2 provides a conceptual framework
32
33 useful both for academics and practitioners that intend to explore the links existing between
34
35 job insecurity, the two wellbeing facets –work engagement and burnout and the two
36
37 intentions –knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding–. The third section describes the
38
39 methodology. The fourth section brings the empirical results of the study. And finally, the
40
41 fifth section discusses the main implications arising from the analysis as well as several
42
43 limitations and future lines of research.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 **2.1. Conceptual delimitation of the variables under assessment** 59 60 61 62 63 64 65

1
2
3
4 *2.1.1. Job Insecurity*
5
6

7 The conceptualization of job insecurity is a central question in the human resources
8 management literature. With this regard, Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) developed an
9 exhaustive review of this concept. According to these authors, job insecurity can be defined
10 as the employee’s fear of potential loss of continuity in a certain job that may range from
11 permanently losing the job itself to losing certain job characteristics that are positively
12 valued or considered important by the job-holder. Among the most critical sources of
13 threat, Greenhalgh (1983) emphasizes the importance of perceived organizational decline.
14 This author argues that employees are normally able to identify when their organization
15 has entered in a decline stage. Employees also know that such organizational decline
16 frequently bring adjustments that are likely to affect their continuity within their current
17 job positions. Fears alike may arise in response to the threat of a potential reorganization.
18 Coherently with this approach, in a recent study entitled “The hidden face of job
19 insecurity”, Gallie et al. (2017) posit that job insecurity not only comprises the employees’
20 fear of losing their job, but it should, on the contrary, encompass too the employees’ anxiety
21 about potential threats to their job status. Moreover, as Abildgaard et al. (2018) state, one
22 of the most critical consequences of organizational restructuring, and especially
23 downsizing processes, is uncertainty regarding the future features and content of the job
24 (qualitative job insecurity) as well as uncertainty about how longer will the employee
25 remain within the job position in question (quantitative job insecurity).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 *2.1.2. Employee’s Wellbeing*
55

56 The conceptualization of employee’s wellbeing is quite vague. Warr (1987, 1990)
57 did an extensive review of the concept of employee’s wellbeing and proposes employee’s
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 mental health as an indicator of ‘affective wellbeing’. Diener (1984) has also
5
6 conceptualized employee’s wellbeing as ‘subjective wellbeing’ described by employees’
7
8 overall experience in life, which is reported through individual’s self-described happiness.
9
10 At the organizational context, job satisfaction is considered to be the most common
11
12 predictor of employees’ perceptions of wellbeing and happiness (Wright 2005).
13
14 Employees’ perceptions and behaviors towards the organization they work for determine
15
16 their perceptions of wellbeing at work. Therefore, positive behaviors like job satisfaction,
17
18 loyalty and work engagement indicate positive perceptions of wellbeing, whereas negative
19
20 behaviors like burnout and turnover intentions represent negative perceptions of wellbeing.
21
22 The current study uses employees’ engagement as a positive behavior, and burnout as a
23
24 negative behavior towards perceptions of wellbeing. Employees’ engagement is
25
26 extensively used in research related to employees’ behavior. In this vein, Schaufeli et al.
27
28 (2006, p. 702), define engagement as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that
29
30 is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption”. The present study uses two
31
32 dimensions of employees’ engagement, including job engagement and organizational
33
34 engagement, as proposed by Saks (2006), and two dimensions of job burnout including,
35
36 emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, as proposed by Maslach and Jackson (1981).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 46 47 *2.1.3. Knowledge Sharing*

48 Knowledge sharing refers to the exchange of explicit and tacit knowledge among
49
50 employees (Nonaka 1994). Aizpurúa et al. (2011) describe knowledge sharing at the
51
52 workplace as the process through which the knowledge an employee possesses is turned
53
54 into a form that others can grasp, absorb, and exploit. Knowledge sharing is very important
55
56 for mobilizing the flow of knowledge assets within the organization (Wang et al. 2008) that
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 might lead to knowledge creation, knowledge application and and a potential increase in
5
6 innovation outcomes at individual, group and organizational levels (Pinho et al. 2012;
7
8 Wang et al. 2014). Knowledge sharing practices comprise the open sharing of knowledge
9
10 between all employees at different levels and departments, networked formally or
11
12 informally within the organizations (Want et al. 2008). Similarly, Lin (2007, p. 315) defines
13
14 knowledge sharing as “the exchange of employee knowledge, experiences, and skills
15
16 through the whole department or organization. KS comprises a set of shared understandings
17
18 related to providing employees access to relevant information and building and using
19
20 knowledge networks within organizations”. Nowadays, organizations rely on rigorous
21
22 knowledge management systems through the use of information and communication
23
24 technologies (ICTs) to promote knowledge sharing among employees.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 *2.1.4. Knowledge Hiding*

34
35
36 Knowledge hiding is relatively a new concept in the field of knowledge
37
38 management. Traditionally, majority of research focuses on knowledge sharing, some
39
40 readers might confuse between knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding by considering
41
42 knowledge hiding as an intention to not share the knowledge. Knowledge hiding is not
43
44 simply the lack of knowledge sharing, rather it is an intentional effort to conceal or
45
46 withhold knowledge required by some other (Connelly et al. 2012; Cerne et al. 2014;
47
48 Connelly and Zweig 2015; Bogilovic et al. 2017). Despite all the firms’ endeavors and
49
50 investments in KM systems and practices, knowledge hiding remains a prevalent behavior
51
52 among employees. With this regard, Pan et al. (2018) report that 76% of employees in the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 USA and 46% of Chinese employees tend to engage in knowledge hiding practices at their
5
6 workplace.
7

8
9 Knowledge hiding is practiced by employees in three forms; playing dumb,
10
11 rationalized hiding, and evasive hiding (Connelly et al. 2012). Playing dumb means when
12
13 somebody pretends that he or she does not know when someone requests any specific piece
14
15 of information or knowledge. Rationalized hiding occurs when the knowledge hider
16
17 explains the rationale being hiding the knowledge. Evasive hiding happens when someone
18
19 pretends knowledge seekers that he or she will share the information even when he or she
20
21 is intending to conceal it (Connelly et al. 2012).
22
23
24

25 26 **2.2. Links between Job Insecurity, Work Engagement and Burnout**

27

28
29 There is a considerable amount of research available in the academic literature that
30
31 examines the influences of job insecurity on employees' behavior (Cobb and Kasl 1977;
32
33 Ashford et al. 1989; Lawrence and Kacmar 2017). The psychological stress theory by
34
35 Lazarus and Folkman (1984), relates job insecurity to employee's subjective assessment of
36
37 job risk and the consequences of job loss (Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Hartley et al.
38
39 1991). The psychological stress theory, posited by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), relates
40
41 job insecurity to employee's subjective assessment of job risk and the consequences of job
42
43 loss (Roskies and Louis-Guerin 1990; Hartley et al. 1991). Job insecurity is often perceived
44
45 by employees as a threat that may exert severe adverse effects on their mental health and
46
47 subjective wellbeing (Cobb and Kasl 1977; Ashford et al. 1989; Hartley et al. 1991). Job
48
49 insecurity reduces employees' loyalty to the organization. Moreover, it increases negative
50
51 behaviors and decreases positive behaviors among employees (Hallier and Lyon 1996). Job
52
53 insecurity is related to employees' perception of losing their job and become unemployed
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (De Witte 1997, 1999). This author describes two dimensions of job insecurity: cognitive
5
6 and affective. The cognitive dimension of job insecurity is related to the perception of
7
8 potential job loss, whereas the affective dimension comprises the employee's fear of job
9
10 loss (De Witte 2000). In addition, Hallier and Lyon (1996) believe that job insecurity
11
12 contributes to reduce positive behaviors (i.e., job satisfaction) and to increase negative
13
14 behaviors (i.e., intentions to quit job) among employees. Moreover, De Witte (2005) posits
15
16 that job insecurity increases strain for the worker involved, and creates negative energy
17
18 among employees. Other studies point that job insecurity brings an escalation in
19
20 employees' turnover and health complaints, and a significant reduction of job satisfaction,
21
22 work engagement (Naswall et al. 2005). Several studies like the ones developed by De
23
24 Cuyper and De Witte (2005), De Cuyper et al. (2008) and Stander and Rothmann (2010)
25
26 found job insecurity to be negatively related to employees' engagement. On the basis of
27
28 the foregoing, this paper proposes the following hypothesis:
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 H1: Job insecurity is negatively related to expatriate employee's work engagement.
38
39
40

41 Burnout is defined by Maslach and Jackson (1981) as a syndrome characterized by
42
43 deep feelings of emotional exhaustion (feeling emotionally overwhelmed and exhausted
44
45 by work), depersonalization (an impassive and impersonal response towards others), and
46
47 reduced personal accomplishment (a feeling of reduced competence and achievement in
48
49 one's work). According to these authors, people firstly experience emotional exhaustion
50
51 due to over work-load, then their work relationships starts to be affected by that burnout
52
53 and a break-down phase towards other people begins. When they realize their
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 desensitization, they get the feeling as if they were not sufficient for their job and
5
6 subsequently they label themselves as unsuccessful.
7
8

9 With this regard, Burgard et al. (2012) explain that job insecurity provokes stress
10 and raises expatriate employee's levels of anxiety and depression. Hence, burnout is
11 considered a response to emotional or interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach and Jackson
12 1981, 1996; Mustafa et al. 2007), and also involves an erosion of engagement with one's
13
14 job (Maslach et al. 2001).
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Expatriates already experience considerable levels of stress and mental exhaustion
22 in their jobs as they often work longer hours and should accomplish challenging tasks
23 within the context of a foreign country, where they might feel hard to culturally fit and
24 establish roots. Localization policies can be a significant additional stressor that may
25 impact on their current and future work prospects and on their personal lives as well. Hence,
26 we hypothesize:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 H2: Job insecurity is positively related to expatriate employee's burnout.
37
38
39
40

41 **2.3. Links between Job Insecurity, Knowledge Sharing and Knowledge Hiding**

42 Knowledge sharing occupies a central role in employee-related knowledge
43 management research. Organizations that realize the significance of knowledge
44 management considers knowledge sharing as an important factor in evaluating employee's
45 performance. Therefore, in ideal conditions, employees tend to share their knowledge with
46 other colleagues in order to gain maximum benefits from the organization and learning
47 from their colleagues as well. However, in the situation of job insecurity, when employees
48 are dominated by negative perceptions and energy about organizations, employees tend to
49 not to share their knowledge. According to Nonaka (1994) and Bock et al. (2005), sharing
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 explicit and implicit knowledge shapes a voluntary behavior from employees, and when
5
6 employees are having negative energy they do not engage in such kind of voluntary
7
8 behavior. Moreover, since knowledge is perceived as power and competitive weapon of
9
10 employees when feel their job insecure, they try to secure their competitive advantage by
11
12 not sharing their knowledge with their co-workers. We can therefore, propose the
13
14 hypothesis below.
15
16
17

18
19 H3: Job insecurity is negatively related to expatriate employees' knowledge sharing
20
21 behavior.

22
23 Knowledge is a key source of power for employees (Foucault 1980;
24
25 Townley 1993), and employees make their own decision for sharing or hiding knowledge
26
27 on the basis of different organizational factors (Heizmann and Olsson 2015). When
28
29 employees perceive that their job is insecure, they might try to hide their knowledge from
30
31 other colleagues to maintain their expert power and secure their job (Hinkin and
32
33 Schriesheim 1989; Raven 2008). Since employees tend to feel worried and anxious due to
34
35 the influence of certain organizational factors that threat their job security, in an attempt to
36
37 compete with their colleagues and to secure their job, employees may hide their knowledge,
38
39 considering knowledge to be their competitive power. Serenko and Bontis (2016) also hold
40
41 that job insecurity increases expatriate employee's intentions to hide knowledge. Based on
42
43 the above arguments, the current study proposes the following hypothesis.
44
45
46
47

48
49 H4: Job insecurity is positively related to expatriate employees' knowledge hiding
50
51 behavior.

52 53 **2.4. Links between Work Engagement, Burnout and Knowledge Sharing Behavior**

54
55
56 Burnout is defined as a syndrome characterized by feelings of emotional exhaustion
57
58 (feeling emotionally overwhelmed and exhausted by work), depersonalization (an
59
60

1
2
3
4 impassive and impersonal response towards others), and reduced personal accomplishment
5
6 (a feeling of reduced competence and achievement in one's work). Burnout is a response
7
8 to emotional or interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach and Jackson 1981, 1996; Mustafa
9
10 et al. 2007), and also involves an erosion of engagement with one's job (Maslach et al.
11
12 2001). Since employee's work engagement is a positive behavior, it may have the power
13
14 to change the nature of burnout among employees. Coherently, previous studies also
15
16 suggest a negative association between employee's engagement and burnout. For instance,
17
18 Schaufeli et al. (2002) noted a negative association between employee's engagement and
19
20 burnout. Similarly, Schaufeli et al. (2008) also found a negative link between these
21
22 concepts. We therefore, propose the below hypothesis.

23
24
25
26
27
28 H5: Work engagement is negatively related to expatriate employee's perceptions of
29
30 burnout.
31
32

33
34
35
36 Employee's work engagement is a positive behavior that is depicted in their job-
37
38 related activities as well as organizational related activities. As suggested by Schaufeli and
39
40 Bakker (2003), engagement is "a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind", and
41
42 hence, the employees who feel engaged display high level of knowledge sharing like
43
44 positive behaviors. In this vein, several studies have linked employee's engagement with
45
46 high level of intentions to share knowledge. For instance, Cabrera et al. (2006) and Foss,
47
48 et al. (2009) found a positive association between employee's engagement and their
49
50 knowledge sharing behaviors. Thus, coherently with Schaufeli and Bakker (2003), the
51
52 employees who feel engaged with work may display higher levels of productivity and
53
54 knowledge sharing behaviors.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Therefore, knowledge sharing itself is a self-motivated process that may lead
5
6 employees to become more willing to share their expertise with their colleagues and
7
8 coworkers only when they are dedicated to their work and enthusiastic about their
9
10 organization (Fatima and Khan 2017). Such knowledge exchange develops the capability
11
12 of an organization to acquire competencies useful while building organizational
13
14 competitive advantages (Reid 2003). In this line, it is worth noting the importance of
15
16 implicating and motivating expatriate employees to share their knowledge with local
17
18 employees or other expatriates. Hence, the receivers of knowledge must have the ability to
19
20 apply this knowledge, generating with this a competitive advantage. We therefore, propose
21
22 the following hypothesis.
23
24
25
26
27

28 H6: Work engagement is positively related to employee's knowledge sharing behavior.
29
30
31
32

33 **2.5. The link between Employee Burnout and Knowledge Hiding**

34
35
36 The concept of knowledge hiding is not new, it is as old as the field of knowledge
37
38 management itself (Davenport 1997; Davenport and Prusak 1998). However, over the
39
40 decades, researchers mainly focused on knowledge sharing instead of knowledge hiding,
41
42 considering the overlapping nature of both constructs. Knowledge hiding is however, a
43
44 different construct, it is not just a lack knowledge sharing. As suggested by Bogilovic et al.
45
46 (2017), knowledge hiding implies an intentional effort to conceal or withhold knowledge
47
48 required by some other. Knowledge hiding is a negative behavior induced by some other
49
50 negative perceptions hold by the employee. In this way, employees can feel more secure
51
52 while intentionally hiding tacit and explicit knowledge (e.g. skills, expertise, know-how,
53
54 documents, videos, reports, among others) because their co-workers will not be able to
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 discover and exploit these feebleness and opportunities, as they could if all this information
5
6 were divulged (Černe et al. 2014).
7
8

9 Since burnout is a negative employee’s behavior, it motivates employees to hide
10
11 their knowledge from other employees in order to punish or affect organizational
12
13 effectiveness.
14

15
16 H7: Burnout is positively related to expatriate employee’s knowledge hiding
17
18 behavior.
19
20

21
22
23 Hence, the conceptual model of this study is presented below in Figure 1. The
24
25 independent variable is job insecurity, whereas the dependent variables are work
26
27 engagement, burnout, knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. The conceptual
28
29 model shows negative links between job insecurity and work engagement and knowledge
30
31 sharing, whereas positive association is presented between job insecurity, burnout and
32
33 knowledge hiding behavior. Work engagement is also having negative influence on
34
35 employee burnout perceptions.
36
37
38
39
40

41 -----
42 Insert Figure 1 about here
43 -----
44

45 46 47 **METHOD** 48

49 **3.1. Sample and data collection**

50 The data is collected from 265 expatriate employees working in different
51
52 organizations in Saudi Arabia through online survey questionnaire. Participation in the
53
54 survey questionnaire was voluntary and the respondents were assured regarding the
55
56 confidentiality and anonymity of the data. A total of 265 valid responses were received in
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 this research, which is quite sufficient as per criteria suggested by (Faul et al. 2007) through
5
6 statistical power analysis using the G* 3.1.9.2 software. Therefore, the sample size is quite
7
8 adequate for this kind of research. The data is collected from respondents belonging to
9
10 diverse socio-economic backgrounds in terms of gender, age, education, designation and
11
12 experience.
13
14

15 16 17 **3.2. Measures and Instruments**

18 The measurement instruments used in this study are borrowed from different
19
20 researches identified during literature review. All measures are rated on 5-point Likert
21
22 scales (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). The job insecurity instrument is taken from
23
24 De Witte (2000) containing 4 items, used by Vander Elst et al. (2014). Employee
25
26 engagement is measured through a scale developed by Saks (2006), comprising 6 items
27
28 each for job engagement and organizational engagement. Job burnout is measured using
29
30 Maslach and Jackson's (1981) scale followed by Choi et al. (2012). The study uses two
31
32 dimensions of job burnout: emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, comprising 4
33
34 items each. The instrument for knowledge sharing is taken from Huang (2009),
35
36 encompassing 4 items. The instrument to measure knowledge hiding is also taken from
37
38 previously published researches. The instrument is shaped by 3 items.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 47 **3.3. Data analysis**

48 Structural equation modeling (SEM) comprehends two types, i.e., covariance-based
49
50 SEM (CB-SEM) and variance-based SEM or partial least squares SEM (PLS-SEM; also
51
52 called PLS path-modeling). CB-SEM, which is one of the maximum-likelihood modeling
53
54 or factor-based techniques (e.g., LISREL, AMOS, EQS, Mplus, etc.), relies on the overall
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 fit of the proposed model by goodness-of-fit tests, and is suitable for confirmatory studies.
5
6
7 On the contrary, PLS-SEM is one of the multiple linear regression modeling techniques
8
9
10 (e.g., SmartPLS, WarpPLS, PLS-Graph, and ADANCO), that relies on the maximization
11
12
13 of the explained variance of the dependent variables, and is suitable for exploratory studies
14
15
16 (Astrachan et al. 2014).
17
18

19
20 This study employs partial least squares structure equation modeling (PLS-SEM),
21
22 a multivariate analysis technique (Henseler et al. 2015; Richter et al. 2015; Sarstedt et al.
23
24
25 2017) to estimate the measurement and structural model. PLS-SEM has its distinct features
26
27
28 compared to CB-SEM. For instance, PLS-SEM does not have minimal requirements of the
29
30
31 restrictive assumptions such as measurement scales, sample size, and distributional
32
33
34 assumptions imposed by CB-SEM (Astrachan et al. 2014).
35
36

37
38 The use of PLS-SEM in this study is appropriate because: (1) this study focuses on
39
40
41 prediction and explaining the variance in key target constructs (e.g., knowledge sharing
42
43
44 and knowledge hiding); (2) the research model shows a complex structure according to the
45
46
47 type of hypothetical relationships and level of multi-dimensionality (first- and second-
48
49
50 order constructs); (3) the relationship among the main constructs of the study is believed
51
52
53 to be in early stage of theory development and thus creates the opportunity where new
54
55
56 phenomena are to be explored; (4) using of latent variables scores in the subsequent
57
58
59 analysis of predictive relevance, particularly in the implementation of the two-stage
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 approach for modeling the multidimensionality of work engagement and burnout; and
5
6
7 finally, (5) this study benefits of the advantages of PLS-SEM in terms of less rigorous
8
9
10 requirement of restrictive assumption as it enables researchers to create and estimate such
11
12
13 models without imposing additional limiting constraints (Hair et al. 2017). This study
14
15
16 employs the SmartPLS 3 software (Ringle et al. 2015) for the PLS analysis.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **RESULTS**

23 **4.1. Measurement Model**

24
25
26
27 The evaluation of the measurement model focuses on the psychometric properties
28
29 of reliability, validity and dimensionality of each construct. These were assessed prior to
30
31 undertaking hypothesis testing via exploratory factor analysis (EFA), by assessing the
32
33 reliabilities, average variance extracted (AVE), square root of the average variance
34
35 extracted, and interconstruct correlations. This study operationalizes work engagement and
36
37 job burnout as second-order reflective composite constructs. This way, work engagement
38
39 is modeled as a composite reflective construct (Mode A), made up of two first-order
40
41 reflective dimensions: job engagement and organization engagement. As in Table 1, the
42
43 two first-order reflective dimensions reflect the higher-order composite construct.
44
45 Similarly, this study measures job burnout as a second-order reflective composite construct
46
47 consisting of two first-order reflective dimensions: depersonalization and emotional
48
49 exhaustion. All other constructs are modeled as first-order reflective constructs.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The assessment of the individual reliability of the items depends on examining the
57
58 standardized factor loadings. A popular rule of thumb is to accept items with loadings over
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 0.707 (Fornell and Larcker 1981). This study follows Kock's (2014) recommendation to
5 use one-tailed p values. Table 1 provides the standardized factor loadings for all first order
6
7 reflective constructs of each measurement item. The t -test of all the loadings is at the $p <$
8
9
10
11
12 .001 level. All the loadings are significant with few exceptional cases that are: J-In2 and
13
14 EE-OE3. These two items, which have loadings below 0.7 were found problematic and
15
16 removed from further analysis.
17

18
19 The reliability and convergent validity of the constructs is evaluated by analyzing
20
21 the Cronbach's alpha, Dijkstra-Henseler's rho (ρ_A), and composite reliability of the
22
23 indicator. A recommended value of 0.70 (in exploratory research, 0.60 to 0.70 is considered
24
25 acceptable) is considered as a threshold value for all these three approaches. The scores of
26
27 Cronbach's alpha, Dijkstra-Henseler's rho (ρ_A), and composite reliability are above the
28
29 minimum threshold, indicating adequate convergence or internal consistency (Table 1).
30
31 Table 2 and Table 3 show the means, standard deviation, correlation for all the first-order
32
33 and second-order level constructs respectively and the square root of the AVE on the
34
35 diagonals. Mean values depict that most constructs are generally above their respective
36
37 mid-point, while correlations among the independent constructs are relatively low. Thus,
38
39 multicollinearity was not a concern in this study as shown in Table 1 (Hair et al. 2017).
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 -----
47 Insert Table 1 about here
48 -----
49

50 The average variance extracted (AVE) provides an assessment of convergent
51
52 validity. Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommend an AVE value ≥ 0.50 . This means that
53
54 50% or more of the indicator variance should be accounted for. Consistent with this
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 suggestion, all the first-order as well as second-order level constructs have an AVE value
5
6 above this minimum as shown in Table 1.
7
8

9 This study assesses the discriminant validity using three approaches: (1) Fornell-
10 Larcker criterion; (2) cross loading; and, (3) the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations
11 (HTMT). The correlation matrix in Table 2 and Table 3 show that, for each pair of
12 constructs, the AVE square root of each construct is higher than the absolute value of their
13 correlation (Fornell and Larcker 1981). The results of the cross loading of all items loaded
14 higher on their respective constructs than on the other constructs and the cross-loading
15 differences are much higher than the suggested threshold of 0.10 (Gefen and Straub 2005).
16 Finally, in all cases the HTMT values are below the threshold of 0.85 or 0.90 (see the
17 diagonal values in Table 2 and Table 3). These results confirm that the discriminant validity
18 is present in this study.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 -----
34 Insert Table 2 about here
35 -----
36 Insert Table 3 about here
37 -----
38
39

40 41 **4.2. Structural Model** 42

43 This study follows the recommendations in Hair et al. (2017) to evaluate the
44 structural model. First, potential collinearity is assessed. The only result for assessing
45 collinearity issues is the variance inflation factor (VIF) value. Table 1 shows minimal
46 collinearity in the structural model as all the values of VIF are below the common cutoff
47 threshold of 5 to 10 (Hair et al. 2017).
48
49
50
51
52

53 Second, the structural model predictability is computed by means of variance
54 explained R^2 values for three dependent composite constructs as shown in Table 4.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62

1
2
3
4 Third, the sizes and significance of the path coefficients that represent the derived
5
6 hypotheses are examined. Following Hair et al. (2017), the significance levels of the path
7
8 coefficients are obtained using the bootstrapping procedure (with a number of 5000
9
10 bootstrap samples and 135 bootstrap cases). Table 4 provides the path coefficients, *t*-
11
12 statistics, significance level, *p*-values as well as the accompanying bootstrap confidence
13
14 intervals at 95 percent. An analysis of path coefficients and levels of significance shows
15
16 that all hypotheses are accepted except H4.
17
18
19
20

21 Fourth, the blindfolding procedure produces the Q^2 values, which applies a sample
22
23 re-use technique that omits part of the data matrix and uses the model estimates to predict
24
25 the omitted part. For PLS-SEM models, a Q^2 value larger than zero in the cross-validated
26
27 redundancy report indicates predictive relevance. Table 4 provides the Q^2 values of all
28
29 three dependent constructs. All Q^2 values are considerably above zero, thus providing
30
31 support for the model's predictive relevance in terms of out-of-sample prediction (Hair et
32
33 al. 2012).
34
35
36
37

38 Finally, this study also calculates the overall model fit through standardized root-
39
40 mean square residual (SRMR) as the root mean square discrepancy between the observed
41
42 correlation and the model implied correlations. This study follows Henseler et al. (2015)
43
44 and refers to the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) as an index for model
45
46 validation. Values below 0.08 are favorable in this instance (Hu and Bentler 1999). While
47
48 the model estimation with PLS-SEM in this study reveals a SRMR value of 0.07, which
49
50 confirms the overall fit of PLS-SEM path model (Henseler et al. 2015; Hair et al. 2017).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Insert Table 4 about here

5. Discussion and conclusion

The objective of this study is manifold. It examines the influence of job insecurity in shaping expatriate employee's perceptions of wellbeing –engagement and burnout– and how does such perception of wellbeing develop their knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. It also assesses the direct influence of job insecurity on expatriate employee's knowledge sharing and knowledge hiding behaviors. This study is conducted in the context of expatriate employees working in the currently uncertain labor market environment in Saudi Arabia, due to localization policies of the Saudi government.

Interestingly, some findings of this study do not match the findings of many previous theoretical studies owing to specific context of this study, which we believe is the strength of this research. The empirical results of this study reveal a positive association between job insecurity and knowledge sharing, which is contrary to our theoretical argument and the findings of many previous studies. However, there is no significant association found between job insecurity and knowledge hiding. This fact suggests that job insecurity exerts an external pressure on employees and in order to secure their job, expatriate employees tend to increase their knowledge sharing activities instead of hiding knowledge. This is in line with self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci 2001), therefore, when expatriate employees fear losing their job, they increase their engagement at work and share more knowledge. Similarly, Stander and Rothmann (2010) and Serenko and Bontis (2016) note that external pressures caused by job insecurity can change employees' behavior, leading them to tend to display more positive behaviors to secure their job.

1
2
3
4 Likewise, contrarily to what we expected, empirical results reveal a positive tie
5
6 between work engagement and burnout, whereas previous studies like the one developed
7
8 by Upadyaya et al. (2016) sustain that work engagement and burnout symptoms are
9
10 negatively associated over time. Besides, this study found a positive and significant
11
12 influence of job insecurity on employees' perceptions of wellbeing –approached by their
13
14 levels of work engagement, and burnout–. Hence two questions of utmost interest arise at
15
16 this point: (1) how can job insecurity be simultaneously leading to superior levels of work
17
18 engagement and burnout?, and (2) Can the employees' work engagement lead them to
19
20 higher levels of burnout? A possible explanation to both questions might be found in the
21
22 findings of Timms et al. (2012) in their article entitled 'Burnt-out but engaged: the co-
23
24 existence of psychological burnout and engagement'. These authors argue that for
25
26 individuals and groups that work under pressure it is plausible that certain aspects of
27
28 engagement (i.e. absorption and dedication) may coexist with burnout symptoms. Such
29
30 reasoning is coherent with what studies like the ones developed by Schaufeli and Bakkers
31
32 (2003) and Sonnentag (2005) uphold, mainly suggesting that work engagement and
33
34 burnout constitute opposite sides of wellbeing and that poor working conditions will lead
35
36 inevitably to burnout despite the employees still feel dedicated to their work (Timms et al.
37
38 2012). Furthermore, Schaufeli et al. (2008) found that the absorption dimension of work
39
40 engagement also loaded with workaholism. Perhaps workaholism might be also inducing
41
42 our sample respondents to remain burned but engaged, given that that workaholics tend to
43
44 find their job activity compulsively enjoyable, despite they work under pressure (McMillan
45
46 and O'Driscoll 2008). A possible clue to better understand this phenomenon is that those
47
48 employees that feel highly engaged to their work might experience higher levels of tension
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 and anxiety regarding the completion of their tasks, which could ultimately end in
5
6 experiencing burnout symptoms.
7

8
9 Moreover, coherently with what it was theorized, work engagement is shown to be
10 positively associated to knowledge sharing. Thus, those employees that feel deeply
11 engaged at the workplace may be more likely to rely on knowledge sharing behaviors.
12
13 Finally, burnout is significantly related to knowledge hiding behavior among expatriate
14 employees. This suggests that when employees feel psychologically exhausted and burned
15 at work, they may incur in knowledge hiding behaviors. Perhaps this might be in line with
16 employees' complaints about "being extremely busy to share their knowledge with others".
17
18 These findings are coherent with previous studies (i.e., Ford and Staples 2008; Ford et al.
19 2015) and provide empirical support for the ties between Work Engagement Theory and
20 the employees' attitude and commitment towards knowledge sharing. Concretely, they
21 reveal the relevant role of work engagement promotion and burnout prevention while
22 driving expatriate employees' knowledge sharing behaviors.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 This paper brings several important managerial and practical implications for
39 companies. Our study sheds light upon whether expatriate employees are willing or not to
40 share knowledge on the basis of their perceived workplace wellbeing. On the basis of our
41 empirical results, we would recommend managers to promote a set of human resources
42 management initiatives oriented at emphasizing expatriate employees' levels of
43 engagement, health perception and wellbeing at the workplace (i.e., proper job design, job
44 enrichment, avoiding lack of meaningfulness, providing adequate compensation policies,
45 etc.). This is in line with prior managerial literature that assumes employees' engagement
46 to be at the core of motivation and exerts a critical role in both individual and organizational
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 performance (Bakker and Bal 2010; Ford et al 2015). In sum, the more a company want
5
6 their expatriates to be willing to remain involved in knowledge sharing behaviors, the more
7
8 managers should focus on reducing burnout drivers, improving work-related psychological
9
10 conditions (i.e., diminishing job insecurity and uncertainty) and assuring that expatriates
11
12 are highly engaged to their work. This implies that those firms that ignore the benefits of
13
14 assuring proper working conditions and job engagement among their expatriate employees,
15
16 may find their knowledge-sharing initiatives to deteriorate.
17
18
19
20

21 This research has certain limitations that we aim to highlight. For instance, the data
22
23 was only collected from 265 expatriate employees working in Saudi Arabia. Therefore,
24
25 researchers should be carefully while generalizing these findings to other countries across
26
27 the globe. A large sample size could also increase the validity of the findings of this
28
29 research. In addition, a comparative analysis between the perceptions of local and
30
31 expatriate employees' perception of job insecurity, work engagement, burnout, knowledge
32
33 sharing and hiding behavior might provide interesting findings in future. Some other
34
35 constructs can also be used to explain why expatriate employees are willing to engage at
36
37 workplace and share knowledge despite of having a high level of job insecurity. Moreover,
38
39 future studies could examine the moderating role of cultural aspects (religion or customs)
40
41 or physical aspects (installations or attraction of the destination country) in the expatriate
42
43 employees' wellbeing. As well as, knowing if hiding knowledge could bring associated
44
45 problems when the expatriate employee returns to his country for illicit behavior. On the
46
47 other hand, future research may also study the role of family well-being in the expatriate
48
49 dissatisfaction.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58
59 **REFERENCES**
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Abildgaard, J. S., Nielsen, K., & Sverke, M. (2018). Can job insecurity be managed?
7 Evaluating an organizational-level intervention addressing the negative effects of
8 restructuring. *Work & Stress*, 32(2), 105-123.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1367735>
- 10 Aizpurúa, L. I., Saldaña, P. E. Z., & Saldaña, A. Z. (2011). Learning for sharing: an
11 empirical analysis of organizational learning and knowledge sharing. *International*
12 *Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(4), 509-518. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-
13 011-0206-z
- 14 Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management
15 systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136.
16 DOI: 10.2307/3250961
- 17 Ali, I., Ali, M., Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., & Albort-Morant, G. (2018). The role of knowledge
18 spillovers and cultural intelligence in enhancing expatriate employees' individual and
19 team creativity. *Journal of Business Research*.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.11.012>
- 21 Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Bobko, P. (1989). Content, cause, and consequences of job
22 insecurity: A theory-based measure and substantive test. *Academy of Management*
23 *journal*, 32(4), 803-829. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256569>
- 24 Astrachan, C. B., Patel V. K., & Wanzenried G. (2014). A Comparative Study of CB-SEM
25 and PLS-SEM for Theory development in Family Firm Research. *Journal of Family*
26 *Business Strategy*, 5, 116-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfbs.2013.12.002>
- 27 Aybas, M., Elmas, S., & DüNDAR, G. (2015). Job insecurity and burnout: The moderating
28 role of employability. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(9), 195-
29 203.
- 30 Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study
31 among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,
32 83(1), 189-206. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317909X402596>
- 33 Bitmiş, M. G., & Ergeneli, A. (2015). How psychological capital influences burnout: the
34 mediating role of job insecurity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 363-
35 368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.106>
- 36 Blom, V., Richter, A., Hallsten, L., & Svedberg, P. (2018). The associations between job
37 insecurity, depressive symptoms and burnout: The role of performance-based self-
38 esteem. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 39(1), 48-63.
39 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X15609118>
- 40 Bock, G.W., Zmud, R.W., Kim, Y.G., & Lee, J.N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation
41 in knowledge sharing: examining the rules of extrinsic motivators, social-
42 psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 87-111. DOI:
43 10.2307/25148669
- 44 Bogilovic, S., Cerne, M., & Skerlavaj, M. (2017). Hiding behind a mask? Cultural
45 intelligence, knowledge hiding, and individual and team creativity. *European Journal*
46 *of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(5), 710-723.
47 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1337747>
- 48 Bosman, J., Rothmann, S., & Buitendach, J. H. (2005). Job insecurity, burnout and work
49 engagement: the impact of positive and negative effectivity. *SA Journal of Industrial*
50 *Psychology*, 31(4), p-48. DOI:10.4102/sajip.v31i4.199
- 51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Cabrera, A., Collins, W. C., & Salgado, J. F. (2006). Determinants of individual
5 engagement in knowledge sharing. *International Journal of Human Resource*
6 *Management*, 17, 245–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500404614>
7
8 Cerne, M., Nerstad, C., Dysvik, A., & Skerlavaj, M. (2014). What goes around comes
9 around: Knowledge hiding, perceived motivational climate, and creativity. *Academy*
10 *of Management Journal*, 57, 172–192. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0122>
11
12 Choi, S., Cheong, K. J., & Feinberg, R. A. (2012). Moderating effects of supervisor support,
13 monetary rewards, and career paths on the relationship between job burnout and
14 turnover intentions in the context of call centers. *Managing Service Quality: An*
15 *International Journal*, 22(5), 492–516. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09604521211281396>
16
17 Cobb S., & Kasl S. V. (1977). *Termination: The Consequences of Job Loss*. Cincinnati: US
18 Department of Health Education and Welfare.
19
20 Connelly, B. L. (2010). Transnational entrepreneurs, worldchanging entrepreneurs, and
21 ambassadors: a typology of the new breed of expatriates. *International*
22 *Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6(1), 39–53. DOI: 10.1007/s11365-009-
23 0116-5
24
25 Connelly, C. E., & Zweig, D. (2015). How perpetrators and targets construe knowledge
26 hiding in organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*,
27 24, 479–489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2014.931325>
28
29 Connelly, C. E., Zweig, D., Webster, J., & Trougakos, J. P. (2012). Knowledge hiding in
30 organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 64–88.
31 <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.737>
32
33 Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). Working knowledge: How organizations manage
34 what they know. *Harvard Business Press*.
35
36 De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: mediator or moderator of the
37 relationship between type of contract and various outcomes. *South African Journal*
38 *of Industrial Psychology*, 31(4), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v31i4.211>
39
40 De Cuyper, N., Bernhard-Oettel, C., Berntson, E., De Witte, H., & Alarco, B. (2008).
41 Employability and employees' wellbeing: Mediation by job insecurity. *Applied*
42 *Psychology: An International Journal*, 57, 488–509. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-
43 0597.2008.00332.
44
45 De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., De Witte, H., Niesen, W., & Van Hootegem, G. (2014).
46 On the relation of job insecurity, job autonomy, innovative work behaviour and the
47 mediating effect of work engagement. *Creativity and Innovation*
48 *Management*, 23(3), 318–330. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12079>
49
50 De Witte, H. (1997). *Long term job insecurity as a stressor: Its impact on satisfaction and*
51 *commitment*. Paper presented at the 8th European Congress on Work and
52 Organizational Psychology, Verona, Italy.
53
54 De Witte, H. (1999). Job insecurity and psychological well-being: Review of the literature
55 and exploration of some unresolved issues. *European Journal of Work and*
56 *Organizational Psychology*, 8, 155–177. DOI: 10.1080/135943299398302
57
58 De Witte, H. (2000). Arbeidsethos en Jobonzekerheid: Meting en Gevolgen voor Welzijn,
59 Tevredenheid en Inzet op het Werk. 325–50 in R. Bouwen, K. De Witte, H. De Witte
60 and T. Taillieu (eds) *Van Groep naar Gemeenschap*. LiberAmicorum Prof. Dr. Leo
61 Lagrou. Leuven: arant.
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 De Witte, H. (2005). Job insecurity: Review of the international literature on definitions,
5 prevalence, antecedents and consequences. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*,
6 *31*(4), 1-6.
7
8 Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*, 542–575.
9 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
10
11 Dulayami, S. T. H., & Robinson, L. (2015). The individual and the collective: Factors
12 affecting knowledge sharing in Saudi Arabian companies. *Journal of*
13 *Documentation*, *71*(1), 198-209.
14
15 Ewers, M. C. (2013). From knowledge transfer to learning: The acquisition and
16 assimilation of human capital in the United Arab Emirates and the other Gulf States.
17 *Geoforum*, *46*, 124-137.
18
19 Fatima, A., & Khan, M. A. (2017). Do Hope Foster Innovative Work Behavior through
20 Employee Engagement and Knowledge Sharing Behavior? A Conservation of
21 Resources Approach Using MPLUS tool. *Business & Economic Review*, *9*(4), 181-
22 212. DOI: [dx.doi.org/10.22547/BER/9.4.9](https://doi.org/10.22547/BER/9.4.9)
23
24 Faul, F. Erdfelder, E. Lang, A., & Bucher, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical
25 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences.
26 *Behavioral Research Methods*, *39*(2), 179-191.
27
28 Ferreira, J. J., Ratten, V., & Dana, L. P. (2017). Knowledge spillover-based strategic
29 entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *13*(1),
30 161-167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-016-0415-6>
31
32 Ford, D., Myrden, S. E., & Jones, T. D. (2015). Understanding “disengagement from
33 knowledge sharing”: engagement theory versus adaptive cost theory. *Journal of*
34 *Knowledge Management*, *19*(3), 476-496. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2014-0469>
35
36 Ford, D., Myrden, S. E., & Jones, T. D. (2015). Understanding “disengagement from
37 knowledge sharing”: engagement theory versus adaptive cost theory. *Journal of*
38 *Knowledge Management*, *19*(3), 476-496. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2014-0469>
39
40 Ford, D. P., & Staples, D. S. (2008). What is knowledge sharing from the informer's
41 perspective?. *International Journal of Knowledge Management (IJKM)*, *4*(4), 1-20.
42
43 Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with
44 unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*,
45 39–50. DOI: [10.2307/3151312](https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312)
46
47 Foss, N. J., Minbaeva, D. B., Pedersen, T., & Reinholt, M. (2009). Encouraging knowledge
48 sharing among employees: How job design matters? *Human Resources Management*,
49 *48*(6), 871-893. DOI: [10.1002/hrm.20320](https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20320)
50
51 Foucault, M. (Ed.) (1980), *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*,
52 1972-1977, Pantheon Books, New York, NY.
53
54 Gallie, D., Felstead, A., Green, F., & Inanc, H. (2017). The hidden face of job insecurity.
55 *Work, employment and society*, *31*(1), 36-53.
56 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017015624399>
57
58 Gefen, D., & Straub, D. (2005). A Practical Guide to Factorial Validity Using PLS-Graph:
59 Tutorial and Annotated Example,” *Communications of the Association for*
60 *Information Systems*, *16*, 91–105. DOI: [10.17705/1CAIS.01605](https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.01605)
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Greenhalgh, L. (1983). Managing the job insecurity crisis. *Human Resource Management*,
5 22(4), 431-444. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930220409>
6
7 Greenhalgh, L., & Rosenblatt, Z. (1984). Job insecurity: Toward conceptual clarity.
8 *Academy of Management Review*, 9(3), 438-448. DOI: 10.2307/258284
9
10 Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least*
11 *Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks:
12 Sage.
13
14 Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2012). Partial least squares: the better approach
15 to structural equation modeling?.
16
17 Hallier J., & Lyon P. (1996). Job Insecurity and Employee Commitment: Managers'
18 Reactions to the Threat and Outcomes of Redundancy Selection. *British Journal of*
19 *Management*, 7(1), 107-123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.1996.tb00109.x>
20
21 Hartley, J., Jacobson, D., Klandermans, B., & van Vuuren, T. (1991). *Job Insecurity:*
22 *Coping with Jobs at Risk*. London: Sage.
23
24 Heizmann, H., & Olsson, M. R. (2015). Power matters: the importance of Foucault's
25 power/knowledge as a conceptual lens in KM research and practice. *Journal of*
26 *Knowledge Management*, 19(4), 756-769. [https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2014-](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-12-2014-0511)
27 0511
28
29 Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing
30 discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the*
31 *academy of marketing science*, 43(1), 115-135. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8)
32 0403-8
33
34 Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to
35 measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power. *Journal of applied*
36 *psychology*, 74(4), 561. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.561>
37
38 Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
39 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation*
40 *modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
42
43 Kock, N. (2015). One-tailed or two-tailed P values in PLS-SEM?. *International Journal of*
44 *e-Collaboration*, 11(2), 1-7. DOI: 10.4018/ijec.2015040101
45
46 Lawrence, E. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2017). Exploring the impact of job insecurity on
47 employees' unethical behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 27(1), 39-70.
48 <https://doi.org/10.1017/beq.2016.58>
49
50 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. New York: Springer.
51
52 Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., Ariza-Montes, A. J., Morales-Fernández, E., & Albort-Morant, G.
53 (2018). Green innovation, indeed a cornerstone in linking market requests and
54 business performance. Evidence from the Spanish automotive components industry.
55 *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 129, 185-193. DOI:
56 10.1016/j.techfore.2017.07.021
57
58 Lu, C. Q., Wang, H. J., Lu, J. J., Du, D. Y., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Does work engagement
59 increase person–job fit? The role of job crafting and job insecurity. *Journal of*
60 *Vocational Behavior*, 84(2), 142-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.12.004>
61
62 Maslach, C., & Jackson S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of*
63 *Occupational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205>
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- McMillan, L. H., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2008). The wellsprings of workaholism: A comparative analysis of the explanatory theories. The long work hours culture: Causes, consequences and choices, 85-111. DOI: 10.1016/B978-1-84855-038-4.00004-X
- Moshoeu, A. N., & Geldenhuys, D. J. (2015). Job insecurity, organisational commitment and work engagement among staff in an open distance learning institution. *Southern African Business Review*, 19(1), 22-43.
- Naswall, K., Sverke, M., & Hellgren, J. (2005). The moderating role of personality characteristics on the relationship between job insecurity and strain. *Work & Stress*, 19, 37-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500057850>
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- Pan, W., Zhang, Q., Teo, T. S., & Lim, V. K. (2018). The dark triad and knowledge hiding. *International Journal of Information Management*, 42, 36-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2018.05.008>
- Pinho, I., Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2012). Improving knowledge management processes: a hybrid positive approach. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(2), 215-242. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673271211218834>
- Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 1-22. DOI: 10.1111/j.1530-2415.2008.00159.x
- Reid, F., (2003). Creating a knowledge sharing culture among diverse business units. *Employment Relations Today*, 30(3), 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.10097>
- Richter, N. F., Cepeda, G., Roldan, J. L., & Ringle, C. M. (2015). European management research using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Journal of Management*, 33(1), 1-3. DOI: 10.1016/j.emj.2014.12.001
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J. M. (2015). SmartPLS 3. Boenningstedt: SmartPLS GmbH. <http://www.smartpls.com>.
- Roskies, E., & Louis-Guerin, C. (1990). Job Insecurity in Managers: Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(5), 345-359. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110503>
- Rothausen, T. J., Henderson, K. E., Arnold, J. K., & Malshe, A. (2017). Should I stay or should I go? Identity and well-being in sensemaking about retention and turnover. *Journal of Management*, 43(7), 2357-2385. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206315569312>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 141-166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Saks A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7) 600-619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2017). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling*. In C. Homburg, M. Klarmann, & A. Vomberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Market Research* (in press). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Preliminary Manual*, Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University, Utrecht.

- 1
2
3
4 Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work
5 engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and*
6 *Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701-716.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
8
- 9 Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-roma, V., & Bakker A. B. (2002). The
10 Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: A Two Sample Confirmatory Factor
11 Analytic Approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*,3(1),71-92.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
13
- 14 Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, Burnout, and
15 Work Engagement: Three of a Kind or Three Different Kinds of Employee Well-
16 being? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57(2), 173-203.
17 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00285.x>
18
- 19 Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Introduction to special issue on burnout and
20 health. *Psychology & Health*, 16(5), 501-510.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870440108405523>
22
- 23 Serenko. A., & Bontis. N. (2016). Understanding counterproductive knowledge behavior:
24 antecedents and consequences of intra-organizational knowledge hiding. *Journal of*
25 *Knowledge Management*, 20, 1199-1224. [https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2016-](https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2016-0203)
26 0203
- 27 Sonnentag, S. (2005). Burnout research: Adding an off-work and day-level perspective.
28 *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 271-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500386473>
29
- 30 Stander, M. W., & Rothmann, S. (2010). Psychological empowerment, job insecurity and
31 employee engagement. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(1),1-8. doi:
32 10.11611/yead.327329
- 33 Timms, C., Brough, P., & Graham, D. (2012). Burnt-out but engaged: the co-existence of
34 psychological burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*,
35 50(3), 327-345. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231211223338>
36
- 37 Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource
38 management. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 518-545. DOI: 10.2307/258907
- 39 Upadyaya, K., Vartiainen, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2016). From job demands and resources
40 to work engagement, burnout, life satisfaction, depressive symptoms, and
41 occupational health. *Burnout Research*, 3(4), 101-108.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2016.10.001>
43
- 44 Vander Elst, T., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2014). The Job Insecurity Scale: A
45 psychometric evaluation across five European countries. *European Journal of Work*
46 *and Organizational Psychology*, 23(3), 364-380.
47 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.745989>
48
- 49 Wang, C. L., Ahmed, P. K., & Rafiq, M. (2008). Knowledge management orientation:
50 construct development and empirical validation. *European Journal of Information*
51 *Systems*, 17(3), 219-235. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2008.12>
52
- 53 Wang, S., Noe, R. A., & Wang, Z. M. (2014). Motivating knowledge sharing in knowledge
54 management systems: A quasi-field experiment. *Journal of Management*, 40(4),
55 978-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311412192>
56
- 57 Warr, P. (1987). *Work, unemployment, and mental health*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x>

Wright, T. A. (2005). The role of “happiness” in organizational research: Past, present and future directions. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Research in occupational stress and well-being*, Vol. 4: 225-268. Amsterdam: JAI. DOI: 10.1016/S1479-3555(04)04006-5

Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as nonadditive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, 33(2), 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206306297582>

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TABLE 1

Measurement Model Results at First-order Level and Second-order Level.

Constructs	Code	Item wording	S.L	S.E	<i>t</i> -value ^{a, b}	α	ρ_A	C.R	AVE _c	VIF
<i>Step I: Results of the assessment of measurement model for first-order constructs</i>										
Job Insecurity										
	J-In1	Chances are I will soon lose my job.	0.86	0.04	23.77	0.86	0.89	0.91	0.78	1.37
	J-In2*	I am sure I can keep my job.								
	J-In3	I feel insecure about the future of my job.	0.88	0.02	45.65					
	J-In4	I think I might lose my job in the near future.	0.91	0.02	44.98					
Job engagement										
	EE-JE1	I really “throw” myself into my job.	0.79	0.05	16.83	0.70	0.72	0.82	0.53	1.64
	EE-JE2	Sometimes I am so into my job that I lose track of time.	0.73	0.06	12.72					
	EE-JE3	This job is all consuming; I am totally into it.	0.80	0.04	20.90					
	EE-JE4	My mind often wanders and I think of other things when doing my job.	0.59	0.11	5.42					
	EE-JE5	I am highly engaged in this job.	0.86	0.06	14.63					
Organization engagement										
	EE-OE1	Being a member of this organization is very captivating.	0.63	0.13	4.96	0.82	0.85	0.87	0.57	1.58
	EE-OE2	One of the most exciting things for me is getting involved with things happening in this organization.	0.70	0.12	5.85					

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	EE-OE3*	I am really not into the “goings-on” in this organization.								
	EE-OE4	Being a member of this organization make me come “alive.”	0.76	0.08	9.47					
	EE-OE-5	Being a member of this organization is exhilarating for me.	0.86	0.06	14.63					
	EE-OE-6	I am highly engaged in this organization.	0.82	0.06	13.00					
Emotional Exhaustion						0.81	0.83	0.88	0.64	2.44
	JB-EE1	I feel emotionally drained from customer service work.	0.78	0.05	14.42					
	JB-EE2	I feel used up by the end of the workday.	0.78	0.06	12.21					
	JB-EE3	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning.	0.80	0.03	26.16					
	JB-EE4	I feel burned out from customer service work.	0.84	0.04	22.26					
Depersonalization						0.83	0.85	0.88	0.66	2.48
	JB-Dep1	I have become more callous (heartless) toward customers.	0.86	0.02	45.72					
	JB-Dep2	I feel that I treat customers as if they were impersonal “objects”.	0.85	0.03	25.82					
	JB-Dep3	I worry about being callous (heartless) toward people.	0.70	0.07	9.96					
	JB-Dep4	I have become callous (heartless) toward people.	0.84	0.03	30.19					
Knowledge sharing						0.70	0.72	0.82	0.54	1.40
	KS1	I often share the reports and official documents from my work with the members of my team.	0.77	0.05	14.85					

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

	KS2	I always share my manuals, methodologies and models with the members of my team.	0.76	0.05	15.34					
	KS3	I often share my experience or know-how with the members of my team.	0.81	0.03	24.19					
	KS4	I always share my know-where and know-whom when prompted by the members of my team.	0.56	0.11	4.99					
Knowledge hiding						0.82	0.82	0.89	0.73	1.45
	KH1	Withhold helpful information or knowledge from my Saudi co-workers	0.85	0.02	35.22					
	KH2	Try to hide innovative achievements from my Saudi co-workers.	0.85	0.05	18.46					
	KH3	Do not transform personal knowledge and experience into organizational knowledge from my Saudi co-workers	0.87	0.02	46.29					
Step II: Results of the assessment of measurement model after generating second order constructs										
Constructs	Code	Item wording	C.W	S.E	t-value^{a, b}	α	ρ_A	C.R	AVE_c	VIF
Work engagement						0.70	0.82	0.81	0.69	1.04
		Job engagement	0.97	0.02	60.88					
		Organization engagement	0.65	0.13	5.12					
Job burnout						0.86	0.86	0.93	0.88	1.50
		Depersonalization	0.93	0.01	78.65					
		Emotional Exhaustion	0.94	0.01	120.59					
<i>Note:</i> * Problematic item and removed from final analysis. S.L = Standard loadings; S.E = Standard error; ^a Test-statistics are obtained by 5000 Bootstrap runs; ^b Absolute t-values > 1.65 are one-tailed significant at 5 percent; α = Cronbach's Alpha; ρ_A = Dijstra-Henseler's										

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

rho; C.R = Composite reliability; AVE = Average variance extracted; ^c Percentage of variance of item explained by the latent variable;
VIF = Variance inflation factor; C.W = Correlational weights.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TABLE 2
Mean, standard deviations, correlations and discriminant validity results at first-order level.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Job insecurity	3.00	0.83	<i>0.88</i>	0.40	0.30	0.62	0.62	0.40	0.65
2. Job engagement	3.35	0.64	0.30	<i>0.73</i>	0.64	0.38	0.53	0.42	0.47
3. Organization engagement	3.43	0.67	0.24	0.46	<i>0.76</i>	0.30	0.27	0.64	0.26
4. Depersonalization	2.90	0.95	0.54	0.29	0.26	<i>0.81</i>	0.90	0.38	0.79
5. Emotional exhaustion	3.15	0.86	0.53	0.40	0.21	0.75	<i>0.80</i>	0.53	0.12
6. Knowledge sharing	3.27	0.75	0.29	0.38	0.47	0.29	0.39	<i>0.73</i>	0.47
7. Knowledge hiding	2.92	0.98	0.56	0.36	0.22	0.38	0.29	0.35	<i>0.85</i>
Note: SD = Standard deviation; Diagonal and italicized elements are the square roots of the AVE (average variance extracted). Below the diagonal elements are the correlations between the constructs values Above the diagonal elements are the HTMT values.									

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TABLE 3
Mean, standard deviations, correlations and discriminant validity results at second-order level.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1. Job insecurity	3.00	0.83	<i>1.00</i>	0.40	0.62	0.29	0.56
2. Work engagement	3.39	0.65	0.20	<i>0.83</i>	0.50	0.54	0.42
3. Burnout	3.02	0.91	0.58	0.25	<i>0.94</i>	0.39	0.66
4. Knowledge sharing	3.27	0.75	0.29	0.49	0.37	<i>1.00</i>	0.35
5. Knowledge hiding	2.92	0.98	0.56	0.25	0.47	0.35	<i>1.00</i>
<p>Note: SD = Standard deviation; Diagonal and italicized elements are the square roots of the AVE (average variance extracted). Below the diagonal elements are the correlations between the constructs values Above the diagonal elements are the HTMT values.</p>							

TABLE 4
Structural model results

Structural path	Path coefficient	S.E	<i>t</i> -value (bootstrap)	95% Confidence interval	Conclusion
Job insecurity → Work engagement	0.25*	0.13	1.92	(0.04, 0.46) Sig.	H1; supported
Job insecurity → Burnout	0.55***	0.08	6.75	(0.42, 0.68) Sig.	H2; supported
Job insecurity → Knowledge sharing	0.10**	0.04	2.54	(0.03, 0.17) Sig.	H3; supported
Job insecurity → Knowledge hiding	0.03 ^{NSig.}	0.04	0.90	(-0.04, 0.10) NSig.	H4, not supported
Work engagement → Burnout	0.14*	0.09	1.66	(0.01, 0.29) Sig.	H5, supported
Work engagement → Knowledge sharing	0.48***	0.02	24.00	(0.45, 0.51) Sig.	H6, supported
Burnout → Knowledge hiding	0.46***	0.02	23.00	(0.43, 0.49) Sig.	H7, supported
SRMR composite model = 0.07					
R^2 Work engagement = 0.10; Q^2 Work engagement = 0.09					
R^2 Employee burnout = 0.35; Q^2 Employee burnout = 0.29					
R^2 Knowledge sharing = 0.48; Q^2 Knowledge sharing = 0.46					
R^2 Knowledge hiding = 0.44; Q^2 Knowledge hiding = 0.43					
Note: * t (0.05, 4999) = 1.65; ** t (0.01, 4999) = 2.33; *** t (0.001, 4999) = 3.09. Sig. denotes a significant direct effect at 0.05; Nsig. denotes a non-significant direct effect at 0.05 (based on t (4999), one-tailed test).					
R^2 = Determination coefficients; Q^2 = Predictive relevance of endogenous (omission distance=7).					
Threshold for R^2 value \geq 0.25 (weak); \geq 0.50 (moderate); \geq 0.75 (substantial).					
Threshold for Q^2 value $>$ 0 indicate predictive relevance.					

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

FIGURE 1
Conceptual Model

