Eduvest – Journal of Universal Studies
Volume 5 Number 8, August, 2025
p- ISSN 2775-3735- e-ISSN 2775-3727

Resilience and Social Support as Predictors of Work Engagement in Employees at PT. X

Agatha T Veronica Tampombebu, Sutarto Wijono, Heru Astikasari Setya Murti
Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana Salatiga, Indonesia
Email: agathatampombebu@gmail.com, sutarto.wijono@uksw.edu, heru.astikasari@uksw.edu

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the role of resilience and social support as predictors of work engagement among employees of PT. X, a labor outsourcing company in North Morowali, Central Sulawesi. Work engagement refers to employees' positive attachment to their work, encompassing vigor, dedication, and absorption. Resilience is defined as the ability to adapt and persevere in the face of challenges, while social support includes emotional, informational, and material assistance from the surrounding environment. This research employed a quantitative approach with a multiple linear regression design. The sample consisted of all 100 employees of PT. X, selected using a saturated sampling technique. Data were collected using the Resilience Scale (Wagnild & Young), the Social Support Scale (Cohen et al.), and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Schaufeli & Bakker). The results indicate that resilience and social support simultaneously have a significant effect on work engagement ($R^2 = 0.425$; $p < 0.05$), with effective contributions of 22.32% and 20.19%, respectively. Partially, both variables were also significant predictors of work engagement. These findings highlight that the combination of internal strength (resilience) and external resources (social support) enhances employees' engagement at work. The study provides insights for management to develop programs that strengthen resilience and social support to optimize employee performance.

KEYWORDS *Resilience, Social support, Work engagement, Employees, Organizational psychology.*

INTRODUCTION

In the modern era like today, companies are one of the places for the application of advanced technology (Wereda, 2022). Companies compete to keep up with technological developments in order to maintain their existence. PT. X is one company that provides personnel and services to employees with the qualifications needed by company Y, which is engaged in production machinery, so employees try to adapt to the novelty of technology to support successful performance. To realize this, the company must also have employees with good adaptability who easily adjust to the times. Puspita et al. (2020) explained that human performance with machines can increase human resources and train individuals to think critically and analytically. Employees working at PT. X by taking a collaborative project with other companies must have good *durability* to compete and achieve the company's targets. Employees at PT. X face great challenges with the phenomenon of very heavy work demands and great

responsibilities, so employees are needed who have a sense of attachment to their work. A sense of attachment to work is called *work engagement*. Employees who have good *work engagement* will greatly benefit the company. Khairunnisa et al. (2022) explained that workers who have *work engagement* will feel able to deal with pressure and make positive breakthroughs; these workers are also more focused on completing their work and able to face challenges and adapt to change.

On September 24, 2024, the author conducted interviews with 15 employees related to *work engagement* at PT. X. The findings showed that out of 15 employees, seven said that if faced with obstacles at work, they would try to solve them as much as possible. Meanwhile, five said they were always enthusiastic about their work and gave their best results so that the company's cooperation partners also felt happy, even though they sometimes experienced obstacles in their work. In addition, three people said they have difficulty focusing and concentrating when working. Based on interviews and questionnaire analysis, it was found that employees of PT. X with a fairly low category of *work engagement* make up 20%, while 80% of employees have a high category of *work engagement*. This shows that some employees at PT. X have not fully reached a high level of *work engagement* nor understood how important *work engagement* is for individuals and companies, so it is necessary to improve this so that all employees have high *work engagement*.

A study conducted by Ramadhan and Budiono (2023) at a university found problems related to employees with low *work engagement*, evidenced by suboptimal performance that affected company productivity. However, research by Dewi and Rozana (2024) found that employees in a hospital with high *work engagement* positively affected organizational productivity. In Indonesia, according to Gallup (2016), only 8% of employees are engaged with their work. Ghaniyyaturrahmah (2023) explained that Indonesia is one of 94 countries where employees are largely "not engaged" (77%), while only 7% are "engaged," so it is very important to examine *work engagement* among employees in companies operating in Indonesia. This is interesting to re-examine because it is suspected that problems related to *work engagement* remain, especially among employees at PT. X.

Therefore, the author considers research on *work engagement* in organizations or companies important. This is supported by findings from Madyaratri and Izzati (2021), who explained that employees with high *work engagement* impact success in productivity, loyalty, attendance, and profitability. Smith and Markwick (in Natalia & Wijono, 2023) also said companies are obliged to nurture employees to increase *work engagement*. Based on this explanation, not only must employees develop personal *work engagement*, but companies also need to pay attention to their employees to increase attachment to their work. Maufarrikh

et al. (2020) said employees who have *work engagement* enjoy their work more and have more energy and enthusiasm.

Several positive and negative impacts related to *work engagement* were found. Bakker and Leiter (in Setyawati & Wijono, 2023) explain the positive impact includes higher productivity, willingness to work, openness, and adaptability. However, negative impacts such as work-life imbalance may occur when employees are too engaged, potentially ignoring family and rest time (Bakker et al., 2011). Kerdpitak and Jermsittipartsert (2020) explained that lack of work-life balance decreases company performance and increases turnover, causing burnout or fatigue. Schaufeli et al. (2008) showed that highly engaged employees can experience long-term work fatigue if not balanced with other positive activities.

Factors affecting *work engagement* according to Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) include personal resources like positive self-evaluation linked to resilience, and job resources such as social support that trigger motivation. Steven and Prihatsanti (2017) found resilience to be a factor in forming *work engagement*. Social support is also a factor, as evidenced by Puspita (2012). Thus, internal variables include *resilience*, and external variables include *social support*.

The above description shows *resilience* and *social support* are important to re-examine due to their relationship and influence on *work engagement*. Anisa and Khairiyah (2023) explained that *resilience* increases *work engagement*. Individuals with good *resilience* do not give up easily, adapt to stress, and improve situations (Prasetyo & Farhanindya, 2021). Good *resilience* leads to better coping and positive impact on *work engagement* (Wang et al., 2017). Besides *resilience*, *social support* is essential for a healthy work environment and enthusiasm despite demands (Iswanto & Agustina, 2016). Ramos and Almeida (2017) stated *social support* and *work engagement* are keys to professionalism. Saniya and Dewi (2022) found good *social support* increases *work engagement*, supported by Wijaya and Syarifuddin (2024), who linked high social support with high *work engagement*. Workplace *social support* can increase employees' attachment to work.

Nugraha (2020) found *resilience* and *social support* have a simultaneous effect on *work engagement*, combining internal and external resources to create strong adaptive capacity. Nurjanah and Lutfianawati (2024) similarly found simultaneous effects. Khairunnisa et al. (2022) observed *resilience* positively influences *work engagement*, helping employees survive pressures and adapt. Puspo (2021) found *resilience* predicts *work engagement* (β=0.484). Heng and Chu (2023) confirmed *resilience* as a significant predictor. For *social support*, Çankır et al. (2015) found it predicts *work engagement* (β=0.89) among Turkish university lecturers. Hakanen et al. (2021) found *social support* predicts *work engagement* over three years among Finnish employees. Wijaya et al. (2024) found positive

influence of *social support* on *work engagement*, as employees feeling supported are more engaged.

The current research on *resilience* and *social support* as predictors of *work engagement* differs from previous studies. Viveka and Sahrah (2024) studied BKDPSDM employees, while Nugraha (2020) studied hospital nurses. This research focuses on PT. X employees with different organizational cultures and individual characteristics. Unlike previous studies using accidental or purposive sampling, this study uses saturated sampling. Research on *resilience* and *social support* as predictors of *work engagement* is still rare, especially with whole-company subjects. This study uses the theories of *resilience* by Wagnild and Young (1993), *social support* by Cohen et al. (2009), and *work engagement* by Schaufeli and Bakker (2004). By contrast, Viveka and Sahrah (2024) used other theories for *resilience* and *social support*. This study employs psychological scales based on previous research, aiming to contribute new references on this topic for PT. X employees.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative research method with a multiple linear regression design to examine the influence of two independent variables—resilience (X1) and social support (X2)—on the dependent variable, work engagement (Y). Resilience was defined as an individual's ability to adapt and overcome challenges and measured using the Resilience Scale by Wagnild and Young (1993). Social support referred to assistance from the social environment and was assessed through Cohen et al.'s (2009) Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL). Work engagement reflected an employee's positive involvement in their work and was measured using Schaufeli and Bakker's (2004) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. The study population consisted of 100 employees from PT. X, with the entire population sampled using saturation sampling to ensure full representation.

Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires, scored from 1 to 4 based on favorable and unfavorable statements. The resilience scale comprised 14 items across two dimensions—personal competence and acceptance of self and life—while the social support scale included 20 items covering appraisal, tangible, self-esteem, and belonging support. The work engagement scale measured 17 items across vigor, dedication, and absorption dimensions. These instruments were adapted from established theories and previous studies to ensure validity and reliability. The numerical data were analyzed statistically to determine the relationships between variables.

Before hypothesis testing, classical assumption tests validated the regression model. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test assessed normality, with significance values

> 0.05 indicating normal distribution. Linearity testing in SPSS 22 confirmed linear relationships between independent and dependent variables (significance > 0.05). Multicollinearity was examined using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance values; VIF < 10 and Tolerance > 0.10 indicated no multicollinearity issues. Heteroscedasticity was tested with Spearman's rho to check for residual variance inequality across observations, confirming model reliability.

The findings aimed to provide insights into how resilience and social support collectively influence work engagement among employees. By applying rigorous statistical methods and validated instruments, the research contributed to organizational psychology literature, particularly in understanding employee well-being and productivity. The results offered practical implications for organizations seeking to enhance employee engagement through targeted support systems and resilience-building initiatives. The methodology ensured robust conclusions, reinforcing the study's validity and applicability in real-world workplace settings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Assumption Test

Normality Test

The normality test used in this study is the Kolmogorov Smirnov normality test with the help of the SPSS for windows program computer with the following conditions:

1. If the significance of < 0.05 means that the data to be tested has a significant difference from the standard normal data, it means that the data is not normal.
2. If the significance > 0.05, it means that there is no significant difference between the data to be tested and the standard normal data, which means that the data is normal.

The table below shows a significance value of 0.17 > 0.05. This means that the data being tested is distributed normally.

Table 1. Normality Test

TEST Parameters		***Values***
N		**100**
Normal Parameters	(Mean)	0.0000000
	Hours of deviation	0.09587335
	Absolute	0.076
	Positive	0.076
	Negative	-0.67
Test Statistic		0.076
Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed)		**170c**

Linearity Test

The test was carried out with the help of the SPSS version 22 program using *linearity* with a significance level of >0.05. The results of the linear test of the resilience variable have a significance value of 0.418>0.05 so that it can be said to be linear.

Table 2. Linearity Test of resilience as a predictor of *work engagement*

Source			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Resiliensi, *work engagement*	Between Groups	(Combined)	1820.999	14	130.071	4.702	.000
		Linearity	1445.448	1	1445.448	52.256	.000
		Deviation from linearity	375.550	13	28.888	1.044	.418
Within Groups			2351.191	85	27.661		
Total			4172.190	99			

Table 3. Test of Linearity *of Social Support* as a Predictor of *Work Engagement*

Source			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social support, work engagement	Between Groups	(Combined)	2233.175	20	111.659	4.549	.000
		Linearity	1418.635	1	1418.635	57.799	.000
		Deviation from linearity	814.540	19	42.871	1.747	.045
Within Groups		1939.015	79	24.544			
Total		4172.190	99				

Table 3 above shows the results if social support has a significance value of 0.45>0.05 which means that it is linear.

Multicollinearity Test

The technique to determine multicollinearity is to look at the values of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance. With the following conditions:

1. If the VIF value is > 10 or tolerance < 0.10, then it can be stated that there are symptoms of multicollinearity.
2. If the VIF value is < 10 or tolerance > 0.10, then it can be stated that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity

Table 4. Multicollinearity Test

Model		Collinearity Statistic	
		Tolerance	**VIF**
1	Resilience	.632	1.583
	Social support	.632	1.583

Based on table 4, it is known that if the tolerance value of the two variables is 0.63>0.10, then the VIF value of the two social support variables is 1.58<10, this means that both variables can be stated to have no symptoms of multicollinearity.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The test results in table 4.10 below based on spearman's rho show that both variables X1 and X2 have a significance value of >0.05, namely X1 has a sig value of 0.532 >0.05 and X2 has a sig value of 0.443>0.05 which means that there are no symptoms of Heteroscedasticity.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test

Model			X1	X2	*Unstandardized Residual*
Spearman's rho	**X1**	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.618**	-.063
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.532
		N	100	100	100
	X2	Correlation Coefficient	.618**	1.000	.078
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.443
		N	100	100	100

Hypothesis test

The hypothesis test in this study was carried out to determine the multiple linear regression test. Here are the results of multiple linear analysis.

Table 6. the results of multiple linear analysis

Model Summary

Model	R	R2	Adjusted R2	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.652	.425	.413	4.972

a. Predictors: (constant), Resilience, Social support

b. Dependent variable: Work engagement

Based on the multiple analysis test table, the value of the correlation coefficient, resilience, and social support simultaneously affected work engagement with a correlation coefficient value of R2 = 0.425; p<0.05. So it is interpreted that there is a contribution or influence of independent variables with dependent variables of 42.5%.

F Test (Simultaneous)

The F test was conducted to test whether independent variables, namely, resilience and social support, simultaneously affect dependent work engagement variables.

Table 7. Multiple regression test of F value significance

Model	Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1782.408	2	891.204	36.173	.000b
Residual	2389.782	97	24.637		
Total	4172.190	99			

a. Dependent variable: Work engagement
b. Predictors: (Constant), resiliensi, social support

In table 7, it is shown that the value of F is calculated > F of the table (36.173 > 3.070) with a significance of 0.000, p < 0.01. Therefore, it is concluded that resilience and social support are predictors of work engagement.

T Test

Based on the results of the T test, X1 has a significance value of 0.00<0.05 which means that resilience has a significant influence on work engagement, then social support has a significance value of 0.00<0.05 which can be concluded that there is a significant influence between the X2 variable on the Y variable.

Table 8. T test results

Coefficients						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**		
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
1	(Constant)	5.072	5.475		.926	.357
	Resilience	.642	.163	.379	3.941	.000
	Social support	.359	.098	.350	3.647	.000

a. *Dependent variabel: Work engagement*

Table 8 shows the coexistence value of multiple linear regression equations. The value of the equation used is the one in column **β** (coefficient). The following is the linear regression equation using the analysis below:

And = a + **b1 X1 + b2 X2**

And = 5.072 + 0.379 X1 + 0.350 X2

The coefficients contained in the equation above can be explained as follows:

- The α value of 5,072 is a constant or state when the *work engagement variable* has not been influenced by other variables, namely the

resilience (X1) and *social support* (X2) variables. If the independent variable does not exist, then *the work engagement* variable does not change.

- **β1** (regression coefficient value X1) of 0.379 indicates that the resilience variable has an effect on *work engagement*, which means that every 1 unit increase in the resilience variable will affect *work engagement* by 0.379 assuming that other variables are not studied in this study.
- **β2** (regression coefficient value X2) of 0.350 indicates that the *social support* variable has an effect on *work engagement,* which means that every 1 increase in the *social support* variable will affect *work engagement* by 0.350 assuming that other variables are not studied in this study.

D) Effective Donation

Table 9. Effective Contributions

Variable	**Coefficient of determination (Beta)**	**Correlation coefficient**	**Effective donation**
Resilience	0.379	0.589	22.32%
Social support	0.350	0.577	20.19%
Total			42.5%

Table 9 shows the effective contribution. The equation used is the one in the column **B** (coefficient). Here's an equation for finding effective donations:
$SE(X)\% = Beta_x$ x Correlation Coefficient x 100% or $SE(X)\% = Beta_x \times r_{xy} \times 100\%$.

Based on the results of the calculation, it is shown that the value of the effective contribution of resilience in *work engagement* of 22.32% and effective contribution value *social support* at *work engagement* by 20.19%.

Discussion

The hypothesis that Resilience and Social Support are simultaneously predictors of work engagement in employees of PT. X is stated in receipt. The calculation results are shown through R2 0.425; $p<0.05$. It can be said that Resilience and Social Support are simultaneously predictors of work engagement in employees of PT. X. The results of this study may be caused by first, most employees consider that when resilience is owned by them as a guideline in work coupled with the existence of social support can make them have more work engagement, where resilience can help them survive even in difficult work situations so that they can still maintain work engagement at work, coupled with social support obtained by the closest people and environment Around such as friends, colleagues, and bosses who can ultimately increase the work engagement of the employees themselves. This statement is supported by findings by Nurjanah and

Lutfianawati (2024) and also found that resilience and social support together have a significant positive influence on work engagement. Then it is also supported by research. Second, some employees think that when they have resilience and social support in carrying out tasks, they can achieve work engagement in the company. Where this is also inseparable from the individual's self-confidence in himself through resilience and receiving positive support at work through social support which will later increase work engagement at work. This opinion is supported by Viveka and Sahrah (2024) who also explained in their research that resilience and social support simultaneously have a significant effect on work engagement. This is in line with Nugraha (2020) finding that resilience and social support simultaneously affect work engagement, where resilience and social support tend to have a high influence on work engagement.

In addition, the results of the study partially showed that resilience had an effect on work engagement shown from $\beta = 0.379$; $p<0.05$ In other words, partial resilience as a predictor of work engagemet. This may be due to some employees who think that when they have resilience, they will have work engagement at work. This statement is supported by the findings of Nurjanah, et al. (2024) found that resilience has a significant influence on work engagement. The research conducted by Puspo (2021) found results where resilience has an influence on work engagement with a value of (β=0.484) which means that resilience can be a predictor of work engagement. The results of the partial test on social support had an effect on work engagement, which was shown by the results of $\beta = 0.350$; $p<0.05$ In other words, social support is partially as a predictor of work engagement. This may be caused by some employees who think that when they get social support, work engagement will arise in them. This is supported by the results of the findings made by Wijaya, et al. (2024) also in their research, which found results if social support has an influence on work engagement. In line with research conducted by Nugraha (2020), it also found results if social support has an influence on work engagement.

Furthermore, the effective contribution of resilience to work engagement was 22.32%, ($\beta = 0.379$) and the effective contribution of social support to work engagement was 20.19% ($\beta = 0.350$) So that when combined, the total effective contribution of resilience and social support simultaneously to work engagement is shown by the value of R Square (R2) of 0.425 which means that the influence of the variables of resilience and social support on the variables of work engagement together is 42.5% and 57.5% of the rest are likely to be influenced by other variables that have not been researched by researchers such as leadership and the type of bribery or other variables that have the possibility of being predictors of work engagement.

CONCLUSION

The study found that both resilience and social support significantly predicted work engagement among employees at PT. X, jointly accounting for 42.5% of the variance in engagement levels. As internal and external resources respectively,

resilience and social support together foster employees' positive connection to their work, marked by vigor, dedication, and absorption. These results support previous research and emphasize the importance of cultivating these factors through targeted organizational programs to enhance employee well-being and productivity. For future research, it is suggested to explore additional variables such as leadership styles, organizational culture, or work-life balance to gain a broader understanding of influences on work engagement. Employing longitudinal or mixed-method designs could also deepen insights into causal and contextual dynamics, while studies across various industries and cultural contexts would improve the generalizability and applicability of findings for tailored workplace interventions.

REFERENCES

Anisa, S., Dewinda, H. R., & Khairiyah, U. (2023). The Relastionship Between Resilience and Work Engagement in Dukcapil Employees in The City of Padang Panjang. Psycho Holistic, 5(1), 24-30.

Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Key questions regarding work engagement. European journal of work and organizational psychology, 20(1), 4-28.

Bakker, A. B., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Work engagement: Further reflections on the state of play. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 20(1), 74-88.

Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309-328.

Dewi, N. S., & Rozana, A. (2024). Pengaruh Work Life Balance terhadap Work Engagement pada Perawat Lansia. Jurnal Riset Psikologi, 51-56.

Çankır, B., Koçak, Ö. E., & Altunel, M. C. (2015). The effect of job resources on work engagement: A study on academicians in Turkey. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice. https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2015.2.2349

Ghaniyyaturrahmah, N., & Djamhoer, T. D. (2023). Pengaruh Perceived Organizational Support terhadap Work Engagement pada Perawat RSUD Majalengka. Jurnal Riset Psikologi, 93-100.

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Turunen, J. (2021). The relative importance of various job resources for work engagement: A concurrent and follow-up dominance analysis. BRQ Business Research Quarterly, 234094442110124. https://doi.org/10.1177/23409444211012419

Heng, Q., & Chu, L. (2023). Self-efficacy, reflection, and resilience as predictors of work engagement among English teachers. Frontiers in Psychology, 14, 1160681.

Iswanto, F., & Agustina, I. (2016). Peran dukungan sosial di tempat kerja terhadap keterikatan kerja karyawan. MEDIAPSI, 2(2), 38-45.

Kerdpitak, C., & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2020). The effects of workplace stress, work-life balance on turnover intention: An empirical evidence from pharmaceutical industry in Thailand. Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy, 11(2), 586–594. https://doi.org/10.5530/srp.2020.2.86

Khairunnisa, A., Pranandari, K., & Avavidya, A. (2022). Resiliensi dan work engagement pada agen asuransi. Arjwa: Jurnal Psikologi, 1(3), 129-138.

Madyaratri, M. M., & Izzati, U. A. (2021). Perbedaan work engagement ditinjau dari masa kerja pada karyawan bagian produksi. Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi, 8(3), 24–35.

Natalia, D., & Wijono, S. (2023). Job Demands terhadap Work Engagement pada Karyawan di PT X. Jurnal Cakrawala Ilmiah, 3(4), 969-978.

Nugraha, A. R. (2020). Pengaruh Resiliensi Dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Work Engagement Pada Perawat Di Rsud Sayang Kabupaten Cianjur (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia).

Nurjanah, D. A., Putri, A. M., & Lutfianawati, D. (2024). Pengaruh Resiliensi dan Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Work Engagement Pada Guru Sekolah Luar Biasa Bandar Lampung. Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research, 4(4), 12368-12383.

Prasetyo, Y., & Farhanindya, H. H. (2021). Resiliensi dengan work engagement pada karyawan lapangan. CERMIN: Jurnal Penelitian, 5(2), 350-361.

Puspita, M.D. (2012). Hubungan antara dukungan sosial dan makna kerja sebagai panggilan (calling) dengan keterikatan kerja. Calyptra: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Universitas Surabaya, 1(1), 1-17.

Puspo Wiroko, E. (2021). The role of servant leadership and resilience in predicting work engagement. Journal of Resilient Economies, 1(1), 32-40.

Ramadhan, N. D., & Budiono, B. (2023). Pengaruh Self Efficacy dan Work Engagement terhadap Employee Performance melalui Job Satisfaction pada Karyawan PT. X. Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 783-796.

Ramos, A. O., Almeida, H. D. (2017). Work engagement, social support, and job satisfaction in Portuguese nursing staff: a winning combination. Applied Nursing Research, 36, hlm. 37-41.

Saniya, A. M., & Dewi, E. K. (2022). Hubungan antara Dukungan Sosial dan Work Engagement pada Guru Sekolah Luar Biasa di Kota Cilegon dan Serang. Jurnal EMPATI, 11(2), 91-96.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of organizational behavior, 25(3), 293-315.

Schaufeli, W. B., Taris, T. W., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). It takes two to tango: Workaholism is working excessively and working compulsively. The long work hours culture. Causes, consequences and choices, 203-226.

Setyawati, N. T., & Wijono, S. (2022). Modal psychology with work engagement in one of the largest retail companies in indonesia. Journal of Social Research, 1(12), 734-750.

Smith, Gemma Robertson & Carl Marwick. 2009. Employee Engagement: a review of current thinking. UK: Institute for Employment Study.

Steven, J., & Prihatsanti, U. (2017). Hubungan antara resiliensi dengan work engagement pada karyawan bank panin cabang menara imperium kuningan jakarta. Jurnal Empati, 7(3), 160-169.

Viveka, D. G. A. P., & Sahrah, A. (2024). Resiliensi dan dukungan sosial atasan dengan work engagement pada pegawai badan kepegawaian daerah dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia (bkdpsdm) kabupaten bangli. Dinamika Psikologis: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologis, 1(1), 48-61.

Wagnild, G.M. & Youang, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the resilience scale. Journla of Nursing measurement, 1, (2), 165-178.

Wereda, W. (2022). The Role of Modern Technologies in Functioning of Contemporary Innovative Enterprises on the Example of Poland. *European Research Studies Journal*, *XXV*(Issue 3), 418–429. https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/3039

Wijaya, I. P. R., Hamzah, M. N., & Syarifuddin, S. (2024). Pengaruh Kepemimpinan Transformasional, Dukungan Sosial Terhadap Work Engagement melalui Kinerja pada Ditlantas Polda Sulawesi Selatan. Jurnal Sains Manajemen Nitro, 3(1), 34-44.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. Journal of personality assessment, 52(1), 30-41.