

Organizational Commitment as a Personal Resource in Forming of Work Engagement

Megawati Batubara¹, Fasya Hadiyan Aprilingga², Alya Bunga Fadlillah³

^{1,2,3}Department of Industry and Organizational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology,
Padjadjaran University, Indonesia

Email: ¹megawati.batubara@unpad.ac.id, ²fasya16001@mail.unpad.ac.id,
³alya16006@mail.unpad.ac.id

Info Article

Article History:

Submission 25/04/2022

Revision 10/05/2022

Accepted 27/05/2022

Keywords:

Organizational commitment;

Personal resource;

Work engagement

ABSTRACT

JD-R framework model states that work engagement can be predicted from the combination of job characteristics in the form of job resources and individual characteristics in the form of personal resources with job demands. Personal resource has been shown to help individuals manage the demands of work, accept failure better and have a resilient way to work. With this condition, it is very important to find the variables that can act as a personal resource. The purpose of this study is to measure the contribution given by organizational commitment as a personal resource to work engagement. This research is non-experimental quantitative research using correlation method, with the purposive sampling of 60 respondents. The measuring instruments used are questionnaires that have been adapted and developed from Meyer & Allen (2012) and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) from Schaufeli & Bakker (2017). The results showed that organizational commitment given significant contribution (moderate) in shape the work engagement. In detail, there is a strong and significant relationship between normative commitment to vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Copyright (c) Psikostudia : Jurnal Psikologi

Correspondence:

Megawati Batubara

Departemen Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi, Fakultas Psikologi, Padjadjaran University

Email: megawati.batubara@unpad.ac.id



BACKGROUND

Referring to JD-R Framework Models, work engagement is the result of job resources and personal resources, these two sources become individual forces in the face of job-demand demand. By having high job resources and personal resources, the work engagement of employees in the workplace will be high (Schaufeli, 2017; Vander Elst et al., 2016). Job resources are physical, psychological, social and organizational characteristics that allow individuals to face the demands of work and stimulate personal and professional development (Schaufeli, 2017; Vander Elst et al., 2016). Job resource refers to the physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that can reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs. Job resources play a role in individual external motivation because they are sourced from the work environment which then fosters a willingness to strive and optimize work tasks (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In other words, job resources are resources provided by the organization to its employees, such as salaries, benefits, work facilities, support of colleagues and superiors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

On the other hand, there are personal resources that are resources of individuals. Following the revised version of the JD-R Framework Models, personal resources are defined as aspects of the self that affect resilience, the ability of individuals to control (self-control) and have an impact / influence on the success of individuals in the environment (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) . Another definition of personal resource is the positive characteristic of the individual to his capacity / ability to work to reduce the negative potential of job demands. Personal resources include aspects of optimism, resilience, self-esteem or self-efficacy (De Simone et al., 2018; García-Sierra et al., 2016; Schaufeli, 2017). Other research shows that psychological capital and work life balance

can also act as personal resources to contribute to the formation of work engagement (Aqmar et al., 2022; Wijaya & Dewayani Suharto, 2021).

In personal resources, the belief that the individual has the ability and competence to perform work behaviors with a certain degree of success will motivate him to act, even in situations where work obstacles and difficulties often arise (Orgambídez et al., 2019). Personal Resource can also help individuals to manage job demands, be able to accept failure better, and have a more resilient way to be able to understand and handle the demands of daily work (Orgambídez et al., 2019). With these conditions, it becomes important to know what variables personal resources can be.

Several studies on variables that become personal resources have been conducted, including psychological capital and optimism, which show a predictive effect on work engagement (Grover et al., 2018; Van Wingerden et al., 2017). If reviewed further, variables that can act as personal resources are variables that can provide a positive experience for employees. For this reason, in this study researchers focused on organizational commitment variables. Several studies have shown that higher levels of personal resources have been associated with high scores in organizational commitment (Peng et al., 2013) and a lower intention to leave the organization (De Simone et al., 2018; Peng et al., 2013; Shahpouri et al., 2016).

Organizational commitment is defined as the level of involvement of a worker in a particular organization (Meyer et al., 2012). Organizational commitment has 3 components, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment is defined as the feeling of an individual who feels emotionally closer to an organization and has engagement with the organization

and its goals (Meyer et al., 2012). Employees with high levels of affective commitment will continue to work in the same company or organization, not because they feel compelled to do so, but because they want to do so (Meyer et al., 2012). Continuance commitment describes the need for employees to keep working for the organization, because there will be losses they face if they leave so they assume that staying within the company is the only option. Employees who have a high continuance commitment, will stay in the organization because they need it and will do their best for their work only when they get rewards that match their expectations (Meyer et al., 2012). The last, normative commitment is what is shown by workers who survive in an organization because they believe that it is morally correct regardless of how much increased status or satisfaction the company has given over the years (Meyer et al., 2012).

Work engagement is defined as a positive, satisfying, and work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2013). The vigor dimension refers to high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, a willingness to invest effort in one's work, and perseverance even in the face of adversity. Dedication deals with feelings of meaning, passion, inspiration, and pride in work, as well as high engagement with work. Absorption arises when a person is fully concentrated on his work, so worker spends their time focusing on the work tasks (Schaufeli, 2013).

When the employees involved feel that the work they are doing is important (meaningful), they will perform their tasks more effectively as well as experience positive feelings and emotions at work (happiness, pleasure, well-being). As a result, workers will tend to develop and maintain affective commitments with

organizations and realize higher organizational commitments (Beukes & Botha, 2013; García-Sierra et al., 2016; Santos et al., 2016) and lower to leave the company (De Simone et al., 2018; Shahpouri et al., 2016).

From the study, which was reviewed only on the contribution of variables in general and did not look at the component/dimension relationship. For this reason, this study will test both organizational commitment and work engagement in general, as well as in detail on the organizational commitment components, namely affective, continuance, normative and work engagement dimensions, namely vigor, dedication, and absorption. By looking at the relationship between each component and dimension, it is expected to get a more comprehensive and detailed picture of the relationship between the two variables, so that the organization can determine which components or dimensions need intervention to support organizational performance.

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study there are 2 variables, namely organizational commitment, and work engagement. Organizational commitment is defined as the level of involvement of a worker in a particular organization (Meyer et al., 2012). Organizational commitment has 3 components, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Work engagement is defined as a positive, satisfying, and work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2013).

The subject of this study was an employee at start-up company X, with a minimum working period at 6 months. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, where researchers gather

employees with specific characteristics to participate in the study (R. Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2019). With the sampling technique obtained by research respondents as many as 60 employees.

There are 2 research instruments used in this research, namely organizational commitment, and work engagement. In measuring organizational commitment, researchers used questionnaires adapted and modified from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Meyer and Allen (2012). This questionnaire measures employees' perceptions of commitment to the organization. This questionnaire consists of 37 items based on 3 organizational commitment components, namely Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment. The scale used in this measurement is the ordinal scale because the questionnaire used uses the Likert scale with a score of 1-6 to show different levels. There are 2 (two) categories of item scores, namely positive and negative. For the highest scale positive items are a score of 6 (very suitable) to a score of 1 (very unsuitable) and the opposite for negative item. The overall reliability of the item is (R) 0.907. Reliability values for affective commitment (R) components are 0.868, normative commitment (R) is 0.789, and continuance commitment (R) is 0.734.

Work engagement variables were measured using questionnaires adapted and modified from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) consisting of 42 items (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). This measuring instrument is a Likert scale and has 5 answer options with a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always). The reliability of the work engagement measuring instrument shows that the overall reliability item is (R) 0.927, the vigor dimension reliability value (R) is 0.849, the dedication dimension (R) is

0.866, and the absorption dimension (R) is 0.646.

This research is a non-experimental quantitative study using correlational methods. This non-experimental correlational quantitative study attempts to determine the relationship between the organizational commitment component and the work engagement dimension that researchers have no control over the variable because the variable cannot be manipulated (R. Burke Johnson & Christensen, 2019).

This study used correlational analysis to prove the hypothesis. The results obtained are a correlation between the total score of each organizational commitment component, including affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment, and the total score of each dimension of work engagement, including vigor, dedication, and absorption, with the initial normality test of each component. organizational commitment and work engagement dimension using Kolmogorov-Smirnov. If the organizational commitment component and the work engagement dimension are both normally distributed, then parametric tests are used, Pearson Correlation. However, if the organizational commitment component or work engagement dimension is not distributed normally then a non-parametric test is used, Rank Spearman. The correlation strength criteria used in this study correspond to Dancey and Reidy's criteria (2020).

RESEARCH RESULTS

The results of the study began from exposure to demographic data, with categories of gender, age, last education, marital status and working period.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Characteristic	N	%
Gender		
Man	41	68%
Woman	19	32%
Age		
18 - 14 years old	29	48%
25 - 37 years old	31	52%
Education Level		
SLTP & SLTA	14	23%
D3 & Bachelor	46	77%
Marriage Status		
Unmarried	46	77%
Marry	14	23%
Working Time		
< 1 year	11	0.3%
1 - 2 years	38	64%
3 - 4 years	6	10%
≥ 5 years	5	8%

Respondents in this study numbered 60 people, consisting of 41 respondents (68%) men and 19 respondents (32%) women. Based on age, respondents were divided into two age groups, namely 29 respondents (48%) aged 18-24 years and 31 respondents (52%) aged 25-37 years. When viewed from the last level of education, the most respondents came from higher education levels including D3 and S1 as many as 46 respondents (77%) then from the secondary education level, namely SLTP and

SLTA graduates as many as 14 respondents (23%). Furthermore, based on marital status there were 46 unmarried respondents (77%) and 14 married respondents (23%). The working period of respondents in these companies varies with the length of work ranging from 4 months to 7 years. 11 respondents (18%) worked for 1 - 2 years, 38 respondents (64%) worked for 3 - 4 years, 6 respondents worked for 3 - 4 years (10%), and who have worked for more than 5 years as many as 5 respondents (8%).

Table 2 Organizational Commitment contribution to Work Engagement

		Skor OC	Skor WE
Spearman's rho	Skor OC	Correlation Coefficient	.487**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	60
	Skor WE	Correlation Coefficient	.487**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	60

Based on correlational analysis, this study shows that there is a significant (moderate) relationship between organizational commitment variables and work engagement variables. In table 2 it is

explained that the contribution value between these two variables is 0.487 with a Sig value. (2-tailed) between variables is $0.000 < 0.05$.

Table 3 Contribution of *Organizational Commitment* Components to *Work Engagement* Dimensions

	Vigor		Dedication		Absorption	
	r	p-value	r	p-value	r	p-value
Affective	0.341	0.008	0.523	0.000	0.239	0.066
Continuance	0.200	0.125	0.169	0.197	0.109	0.406
Normative	0.529	0.000	0.597	0.000	0.333	0.009

In Table 3 is outlined in detail the contributions of each component and dimension. The results showed that there is a significant (moderate) relationship between affective commitment and vigor ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$; $r = 0.341$) and has a significant (strong) relationship with dedication ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$; $r = 0.523$). This shows that employees who survive in the company with a foundation of affective commitment show the spirit of work, persistent, unyielding, able to answer the challenges and demands of work, and willing to give dedication to their work and company. However, affective commitment has a weak and insignificant relationship with absorption ($p\text{-value} > 0.05$; $r = 0.239$), which means the basis of affective commitment has no impact on full concentration on work.

Other results showed that there was a weak and insignificant relationship between continuance commitment and vigor, dedication, and absorption ($p\text{-value} > 0.05$; $r = 0.200$; $r = 0.169$; and $r = 0.109$). This shows that employees who survive in the company with a continuance commitment foundation or consider profit and loss if leaving the company, then the employee does not show strong efforts, less persistent, unenthusiastic, unambiguous, and cannot concentrate fully in work.

The next component, normative commitment, shows a strong and significant relationship in vigor and dedication ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$; $r = 0.529$; $r = 0.597$) as well as a moderate and significant relationship at absorption ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$; $r = 0.333$). That is, employees with a normative commitment foundation or who feel obliged to stay in the

company, show a persistent work attitude, passionate, dedicated and can concentrate on their work.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study showed that *organizational commitment* contributed significantly and moderately (0.487) to the formation of *work engagement*. This is supported by previous research. Employees with a *high organizational commitment* tend to be more enthusiastic in working (*engaged*) (Simons & Buitendach, 2013). Employees' commitment to an organization is very important because it affects their involvement in the organization and contributes to their retention (Jabri & Issam Ghazzawi, 2019). Committed employees also have a greater sense of job satisfaction, which may be a predictor of engagement. Committed employees have goals that can help them to advance the goals and objectives of the organization or company they work for (Jabri & Issam Ghazzawi, 2019).

According to Beukes & Botha (2013), *organizational commitment* is positively correlated with *work engagement*, employees who have engagement have better social functions and commitments (Beukes & Botha, 2013). *Organizational commitment* and *work engagement* have complementary relationships (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Research conducted by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova explains that *work engagement* can not only reduce work stress but can also bring success to the organization and increase commitment to the organization because employees tend to engage in their work and engage their

emotions and feelings in the company (Saks & Gruman, 2014) . Based on previous research and this research, organizational commitment has a strong significant relationship to work engagement that appears consistently.

In more detail, this study found a significant (strong) relationship in the organizational commitment component, namely affective and normative commitment to the dedication dimension. This is supported by research that found a significant positive relationship between affective commitment and work engagement (Geldenhuis et al., 2014). Research conducted by Simons & Buitendach (2013) shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between affective commitment and work engagement ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.62$) and between normative commitment with work engagement ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.34$), although the dimensions of work engagement are not described in detail. (Simons & Buitendach, 2013). Other studies have shown a positive and significant relationship between organizational commitment and work engagement dimensions which include vigor, dedication, and absorption ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.61, 0.64, \text{ and } 0.52$). In the study, the organizational commitment component was not outlined in detail. However, the three studies above show a significant and strong relationship in the organizational commitment component and the dimension of work engagement and support the findings in this study.

Detailed research conducted by Saks (2019) and Sonnentag (2012) showed that there is a positive relationship between affective commitment and vigor, dedication, and absorption ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.64, 0.65 \text{ and } 0.54$). There is a positive relationship between continuance commitment, with dedication and absorption ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.69 \text{ and } 0.41$). While at the vigor the relationship

is significant but weak ($p < 0.05, r = 0.27$). There is a positive and significant relationship between normative commitment and vigor, dedication, and absorption ($p < 0.01$; $r = 0.62, 0.57 \text{ and } 0.52$) (Saks, 2019; Sonnentag et al., 2012). From this study, it can be concluded that the three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative) have a significant and strong relationship in all three dimensions of work engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption), except continuance commitment to vigor. with low correlation.

Referring to previous research, affective commitment is a component of organizational commitment that consistently has a significant (strong) relationship to work engagement and its dimensions. Affective commitment has also been the most consistent and strongest predictor of positive organizational outcomes, such as work effort, performance (Singh & Gupta, 2015). Affective commitment is closely related to work engagement (Christian et al., 2014). Although in this study, there is an affective commitment that has a weak relationship, namely in the absorption dimension.

Meanwhile, the other two organizational commitment components, namely continuance and normative, still show different results. What is new and interesting to discover in this study is that continuance commitment has a weak relationship to all three dimensions of work engagement. Normative commitment has a strong and medium correlation value (none of which are low) in all three dimensions of work engagement.

Normative commitment is an individual's belief in his or her sense of responsibility to the organization. Individual remained in the organization because he felt it was an obligation to remain loyal to the organization (ought to). This is supported by

research conducted by Freeney & Fellenz (2013) that work engagement considers emotional aspects and rational aspects related to work and the entire work experience (Freeney & Fellenz, 2013). Normative commitment is not only a personal commitment, but an expectation felt by employees, where employees will remain loyal to the company that compensates for the services provided (Singh & Gupta, 2015). The strength of normative commitment is determined by the rules an individual receives and the mutual relationship between the organization and its employees (Abreu et al., 2013). From the results of this study, the normative commitment component contributes significantly and strongly to the three dimensions of work engagement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research conducted, it can be concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between organizational commitment to work engagement and a contribution value of 0.487. In detail, the affective commitment component has a significant and strong relationship in the dedication dimension. The results of this study are in line with some previous studies.

The new finding of this study is that of the three components of organizational commitment, normative commitment is the foundation of commitment that has a significant and strong relationship in all three dimensions of work engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption). In contrast, continuance commitment has a weak relationship with all three dimensions of work engagement. While in previous studies, the three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative) have a significant and strong relationship in work engagement (vigor, dedication, and absorption).

REFERENCES

- Abreu, M. C. S., Cunha, M. C., & Rebouças, S. M. P. (2013). Effects of personal characteristics on organizational commitment: Evidence from Brazil's oil and gas industry. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(20), 3831–3852. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.781527>
- Aqmar, A., Aprillie, R., Lubis, H., Dwi, D., & Rahmah, N. (2022). *Modal Psikologis dan Lingkungan Kerja Non Fisik terhadap Keterikatan Kerja Karyawan Generasi Milenial*. 11(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Beukes, I., & Botha, E. (2013). Organisational commitment, work engagement and meaning of work of nursing staff in hospitals. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2 SPL), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1144>
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2014). Erratum to Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance [Personnel Psychology, 64, 89-136] DOI:10.1111/J.1744-6570.2010.01203.X. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(1), 309–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12070>
- Dancey, C. P., & Reidy, J. (2020). Statistics without maths for psychology [electronic resource]. In *Pearson Education Limited*.
- De Simone, S., Planta, A., & Cicotto, G. (2018). The role of job satisfaction, work engagement, self-efficacy and agentic capacities on nurses' turnover intention and patient satisfaction. *Applied Nursing Research*, 39(October

- 2017), 130–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2017.11.004>
- Freeney, Y., & Fellenz, M. R. (2013). Work engagement, job design and the role of the social context at work: Exploring antecedents from a relational perspective. *Human Relations*, 66(11), 1427–1445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726713478245>
- García-Sierra, R., Fernández-Castro, J., & Martínez-Zaragoza, F. (2016). Work engagement in nursing: An integrative review of the literature. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(2), E101–E111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12312>
- Geldenhuis, M., Łaba, K., & Venter, C. M. (2014). Meaningful work, work engagement and organisational commitment. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v40i1.1098>
- Grover, S. L., Teo, S. T. T., Pick, D., Roche, M., & Newton, C. J. (2018). Psychological capital as a personal resource in the JD-R model. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 968–984. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-08-2016-0213>
- Jabri, B. Al, & Issam Ghazzawi. (2019). Organizational commitment : A review of the conceptual and empirical literature and a research agenda. *International Leadership Journal*, 11(March), 78–119.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Jackson, T. A., McInnis, K. J., Maltin, E. R., & Sheppard, L. (2012). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels across cultures: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(2), 225–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.005>
- Orgambidez, A., Borrego, Y., & Vázquez-Aguado, O. (2019). Self-efficacy and organizational commitment among Spanish nurses: the role of work engagement. *International Nursing Review*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12526>
- Peng, J., Jiang, X., Zhang, J., Xiao, R., Song, Y., Feng, X., Zhang, Y., & Miao, D. (2013). The impact of psychological capital on job burnout of chinese nurses: The mediator role of organizational commitment. *PLoS ONE*, 8(12), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0084193>
- R. Burke Johnson, & Christensen, L. (2019). Educational Research Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Approaches Seventh Edition. In *Thousand Oaks, Calif. : SAGE*, [2019].
- Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, 6(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034>
- Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2014). What Do We Really Know About Employee Engagement? *Computational Complexity*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq>
- Santos, A., Chambel, M. J., & Castanheira, F. (2016). Relational job characteristics and nurses' affective organizational commitment: The mediating role of work engagement. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 72(2), 294–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12834>
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2013). What is engagement? *Employee Engagement in Theory and Practice*, 15–35. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203076965>
- Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout.

- Organizational Dynamics*, 46(2), 120–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008>
- Shahpouri, S., Namdari, K., & Abedi, A. (2016). Mediating role of work engagement in the relationship between job resources and personal resources with turnover intention among female nurses. *Applied Nursing Research*, 30, 216–221.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnr.2015.10.008>
- Simons, J. C., & Buitendach, J. H. (2013). Psychological capital, work engagement and organisational commitment amongst call centre employees in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2 SPL), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1071>
- Singh, A., & Gupta, B. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Benchmarking*, 22(6), 1192–1211.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2014-0007>
- Sonnentag, S., Mojza, E. J., Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Reciprocal Relations Between Recovery and Work Engagement: The Moderating Role of Job Stressors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(4), 842–853.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028292>
- Van Wingerden, J., Derks, D., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). The Impact of Personal Resources and Job Crafting Interventions on Work Engagement and Performance. *Human Resource Management*, 56(1), 51–67.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21758>
- Vander Elst, T., Cavents, C., Daneels, K., Johannik, K., Baillien, E., Van denBroeck, A., & Godderis, L. (2016). Job demands–resources predicting burnout and work engagement among Belgian home health care nurses: A cross-sectional study. *Nursing Outlook*, 64(6), 542–556.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2016.06.004>
- Wijaya, P., & Dewayani Soeharto, T. N. E. (2021). Kontribusi Work Life Balance Terhadap Work Engagement Karyawan. *Psikostudia: Jurnal Psikologi*, 10(3), 266.
<https://doi.org/10.30872/psikostudia.v10i3.5627>