

Employee Resilience Linking Job Insecurity and Perceived Organizational Support to Work Engagement

Sigit Roni Pamungkas^{1*}, Wachyu Hari Haji²

^{1,2}Universitas Trilogi, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: sigitrp86@gmail.com

Abstract

Rising layoffs can intensify uncertainty among employees who remain in organizations, yet the pathway from job insecurity to work engagement is not always direct. This study examines whether employee resilience transmits the effects of job insecurity and perceived organizational support to work engagement among private-sector employees in Jabodetabek. A quantitative explanatory, cross-sectional survey was conducted among full-time employees in manufacturing and service organizations with at least one year of organizational tenure. Of 428 responses collected, 407 met the screening and data-quality criteria. Data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling. Job insecurity reduced employee resilience (coefficient = -0.157) but did not have a significant direct effect on work engagement (coefficient = -0.052; $p = 0.119$). Perceived organizational support strongly increased employee resilience (coefficient = 0.594) and directly increased work engagement (coefficient = 0.301), while employee resilience increased work engagement (coefficient = 0.499). Employee resilience produced indirect-only mediation between job insecurity and work engagement and complementary mediation between perceived organizational support and work engagement. The model explained 41.3% of employee resilience and 55.0% of work engagement. The findings show that job insecurity undermines engagement mainly by weakening adaptive capacity, whereas organizational support sustains engagement both directly and by building resilience. Organizations undergoing change should combine transparent communication, visible support, and work-embedded resilience development.

Keywords: job insecurity, perceived organizational support, employee resilience, work engagement, private-sector employees

Introduction

Improved aggregate employment indicators do not necessarily mean that employees feel more secure at work. Indonesia illustrates this tension. Open unemployment declined from 8.42 million people in August 2022 to 7.46 million in August 2025, while administrative records of layoffs increased from 25,114 workers in 2022 to 88,519 in 2025 (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2022, 2025; Kementerian Ketenagakerjaan Republik Indonesia, 2022, 2025). These indicators capture different labor market processes, yet their divergent movement is relevant to employees who remain in organizations. News of restructuring, efficiency programs, unit closures, automation, and workforce reductions creates employment uncertainty before an individual receives a formal employment decision. For organizations, the managerial issue therefore extends beyond employees who leave and includes the capacity of remaining employees to sustain energy, attention, and commitment at work. This issue is particularly relevant to employees in manufacturing and service organizations in Jabodetabek because these work environments operate under continuing pressures for operational efficiency,

technological adaptation, organizational restructuring, and changing service requirements. Under such conditions, employment continuity becomes an important psychological concern for employees who remain within the organization.

Job insecurity captures this anticipatory condition. It refers to an employee's subjective assessment that the continuity of the current job is threatened and difficult to control (Shoss, 2017; Vander Elst et al., 2014). Meta-analytic evidence shows that job insecurity contains cognitive and affective components and is associated with unfavorable work attitudes and well-being outcomes (Jiang & Lavaysse, 2018). From a resource perspective, persistent uncertainty consumes attention, reduces planning confidence, and directs psychological resources toward managing employment-related threats. Within the Job Demands-Resources framework, job insecurity represents a hindrance demand because managing an uncontrollable threat requires sustained cognitive and emotional effort (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Conservation of Resources theory provides a complementary explanation. The threat of employment loss places valued resources at risk, including income, status, professional identity, social relationships, and future opportunities, thereby initiating a resource-loss process (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll et al., 2018).

One important organizational outcome is work engagement, a positive work-related state expressed through vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Bakker & Albrecht, 2018). Engaged employees invest energy in their tasks, experience meaning in their work, and maintain concentration despite operational pressures. However, empirical findings concerning job insecurity and engagement remain inconsistent. Karatepe et al. (2020) found that job insecurity reduced work engagement among hotel employees, whereas Zahda et al. (2024) reported a nonsignificant direct relationship in a different Indonesian employment setting. These contrasting findings show that the direct relationship alone does not fully explain how employment uncertainty is translated into employee engagement. A mechanism is therefore required to explain what happens to employees' adaptive resources between the experience of insecurity and their subsequent engagement at work.

Perceived organizational support represents a contrasting organizational condition. Organizational Support Theory proposes that employees develop a general belief regarding the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Support includes instrumental resources such as information, assistance, developmental opportunities, and work resources, as well as socioemotional resources such as recognition, fairness, and organizational concern. Meta-analytic and theoretical developments demonstrate that perceived organizational support is associated with stronger commitment, well-being, performance, and reciprocal contribution (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Eisenberger et al., 2020). Empirical studies also connect organizational support with work engagement through meaningfulness, thriving, and other positive psychological states (Imran et al., 2020; Canboy et al., 2023). Job insecurity and perceived organizational support therefore represent two theoretically distinct conditions. Job insecurity threatens valued employee resources, whereas organizational support provides resources that strengthen employees' capacity to function effectively at work.

Employee resilience provides the personal-resource mechanism connecting these conditions with work engagement. Resilience at work is not merely a stable personality trait. It represents a developable capacity to adapt, learn from difficulty, mobilize available resources, and remain effective when work conditions change (Näswall et al., 2019).

Organizational practices strengthen this capacity, whereas prolonged demands without adequate resources deplete employees' capacity to adapt effectively (Malik & Garg, 2020; Hanu & Khumalo, 2023). Evidence across occupational groups consistently associates resilience with higher work engagement (Wiroko & Sugiharti, 2022; Ibrahim & Hussein, 2024; Husnaa & Utomo, 2025). Perceived organizational support is also associated with stronger employee resilience because organizational resources provide the conditions required for employees to respond effectively to workplace adversity (Kharisma et al., 2025).

Integrating these arguments produces a dual-pathway resource model. Job Demands-Resources theory positions job insecurity as a hindrance demand, perceived organizational support as a job resource, employee resilience as a personal resource, and work engagement as a motivational outcome. Conservation of Resources theory explains the resource-loss pathway through which job insecurity reduces employees' adaptive capacity. Organizational Support Theory explains the resource-gain pathway through which organizational care and assistance strengthen employees' available resources. Recent Indonesian studies also identify work engagement as an important motivational state through which job resources are translated into performance and innovative behavior (Haji, 2024, 2025).

The studies reviewed above leave an important theoretical issue unresolved. Existing evidence primarily establishes direct relationships between job insecurity, organizational support, resilience, and engagement, or examines these variables through separate models. Such approaches do not explain whether the same personal resource operates between a negative job demand and a positive organizational resource. Testing employee resilience simultaneously in both pathways extends the resource logic of the JD-R framework by examining whether a personal resource responds differently to resource depletion and resource provision. It also connects COR theory and Organizational Support Theory within a single model by positioning resilience as the point at which threatened resources and organizationally provided resources are translated into motivational outcomes.

The present study addresses three related gaps. First, job insecurity and perceived organizational support are examined simultaneously rather than as isolated predictors, allowing a hindrance demand and an organizational resource to be evaluated within the same theoretical structure. Second, employee resilience is positioned as a mediator in both pathways, enabling direct comparison between a resource-loss process and a resource-building process. Third, the model is examined among full-time private-sector employees from manufacturing and service organizations across Jabodetabek, where restructuring, digitalization, efficiency pressures, and changing service demands form an important employment context. Accordingly, this study examines how job insecurity and perceived organizational support relate to employee resilience and work engagement, and whether employee resilience transmits these relationships.

Job Insecurity and Employee Resilience

Job insecurity represents a persistent threat to resources that employees consider valuable, including employment continuity, income, professional identity, status, and future opportunities (Shoss, 2017; Hobfoll et al., 2018). COR theory states that threats to valued resources generate resource-protection responses and reduce the resources available for coping with subsequent demands. Within the JD-R framework, job insecurity also represents a hindrance demand that consumes cognitive and emotional resources without directly contributing to goal attainment (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Employee resilience requires sufficient personal resources to adapt effectively to change, recover from difficulties, and maintain work functioning under pressure (Näswall et al., 2019). Prolonged workplace demands without adequate resources reduce this adaptive capacity (Malik & Garg, 2020; Hanu & Khumalo, 2023). Therefore, greater job insecurity is associated with lower employee resilience because employment uncertainty depletes resources required for effective adaptation.

H1: Job insecurity negatively affects employee resilience.

Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Resilience

Organizational Support Theory explains that employees interpret organizational concern, recognition, assistance, and resource provision as evidence that the organization values their contribution and well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). These resources strengthen employees' capacity to manage changing work demands and respond effectively to workplace challenges.

Resilience develops through access to resources that support adaptation and recovery rather than through individual capacity alone (Näswall et al., 2019). Kharisma et al. (2025) demonstrate a positive association between perceived organizational support and employee resilience. Organizational support therefore strengthens resilience by providing instrumental and socioemotional resources that employees can mobilize when dealing with workplace demands.

H2: Perceived organizational support positively affects employee resilience.

Job Insecurity and Work Engagement

Work engagement requires sustained energy, dedication, and concentration (Schaufeli et al., 2006). Job insecurity competes for these resources because employees must allocate cognitive and emotional effort to concerns regarding employment continuity. JD-R theory classifies such conditions as hindrance demands because they consume employee resources and interfere with motivational processes (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Karatepe et al. (2020) found that job insecurity reduced work engagement, although Zahda et al. (2024) reported a nonsignificant direct relationship in another employment setting. Despite this empirical variation, the resource logic establishes a negative directional relationship: greater employment uncertainty places demands on the same psychological resources required to sustain engagement.

H3: Job insecurity negatively affects work engagement.

Perceived Organizational Support and Work Engagement

Perceived organizational support provides employees with evidence that organizational contributions are recognized and that assistance is available when required. Organizational Support Theory predicts reciprocal employee responses to favorable organizational treatment (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Eisenberger et al., 2020). Employees respond to valued organizational support by investing greater effort and involvement in their work.

Previous research consistently connects organizational support with stronger engagement and positive psychological experiences at work (Kurtessis et al., 2017; Imran et al., 2020; Canboy et al., 2023). Organizational support therefore functions as a job resource

that strengthens employees' willingness and capacity to invest energy, dedication, and attention in their roles.

H4: Perceived organizational support positively affects work engagement.

Employee Resilience and Work Engagement

Resilient employees maintain effective functioning when confronted with changing work conditions because they adapt their responses, mobilize available resources, and recover from workplace difficulties (Näswall et al., 2019). These capabilities support the energy and persistence required for engagement.

Empirical findings across different occupational groups consistently demonstrate a positive relationship between resilience and work engagement (Wiroko & Sugiharti, 2022; Ibrahim & Hussein, 2024; Husnaa & Utomo, 2025). Resilience therefore represents a personal resource that sustains employees' capacity to remain energetic, dedicated, and absorbed in their work when organizational conditions change.

H5: Employee resilience positively affects work engagement.

Employee Resilience as a Mediator between Job Insecurity and Work Engagement

COR theory provides the basis for linking job insecurity, resilience, and work engagement as a sequential resource-loss process. Job insecurity threatens employment-related resources and reduces employees' adaptive capacity. Lower resilience subsequently limits the personal resources available to sustain vigor, dedication, and absorption at work.

This pathway extends the direct job insecurity and engagement relationship by identifying what is depleted before engagement declines. Job insecurity represents the resource threat, resilience represents the employee's adaptive resource, and engagement represents the motivational outcome. Accordingly, employee resilience transmits part of the negative relationship between job insecurity and work engagement.

H6: Employee resilience mediates the negative relationship between job insecurity and work engagement.

Employee Resilience as a Mediator between Perceived Organizational Support and Work Engagement

The relationship between perceived organizational support, resilience, and work engagement represents a resource-gain process. Organizational Support Theory explains the provision of organizational resources, while the JD-R framework explains how these resources contribute to personal resources and motivational outcomes. Perceived organizational support provides instrumental and socioemotional resources, and resilience reflects employees' capacity to mobilize these resources when responding to workplace demands.

Kharisma et al. (2025) link organizational support with resilience, while Wiroko and Sugiharti (2022), Ibrahim and Hussein (2024), and Husnaa and Utomo (2025) establish a positive relationship between resilience and work engagement. Together, these relationships establish a sequential process in which organizational support strengthens employees' adaptive resources, which in turn strengthen work engagement.

H7: Employee resilience mediates the positive relationship between perceived organizational support and work engagement.

Method

The study used a quantitative explanatory design with a cross-sectional survey. The unit of analysis was the individual employee. Data collection covered the Jabodetabek metropolitan area, including Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, South Tangerang, and Bekasi. The online survey was administered from 9 to 29 July 2026. Respondents were required to be at least 18 years old, employed by a private organization in the manufacturing or service sector, working full-time with an active employment relationship, located in Jabodetabek, and to have worked for the current organization for at least one year. Before proceeding to the screening questions, respondents received information about the study purpose, confidentiality of responses, voluntary participation, and consent; only respondents who agreed to participate continued the survey.

Purposive sampling was used because no complete sampling frame was available for private-sector workers meeting all eligibility criteria. The minimum sample was estimated using the Lemeshow formula for an unknown population, with a 95% confidence level, a proportion of 0.50, and a 5% margin of error, producing a minimum requirement of 385 observations (Lemeshow et al., 1990). The survey yielded 428 responses. Ten responses were excluded during eligibility screening because respondents selected employment sectors outside manufacturing and services. Eleven additional responses were excluded during data-quality screening because they showed completely invariant response patterns across all 20 measurement items, consisting of six all-five patterns and five all-one patterns. The final analytical sample comprised 407 respondents, exceeding the minimum sample requirement.

All constructs were measured using a five-point agreement scale. Job insecurity was represented by four items adapted from the Job Insecurity Scale, covering concern about losing the job, the possibility of having to leave, uncertainty regarding the future of the job, and difficulty ensuring that the current job could be retained (Vander Elst et al., 2014; Shoss, 2017). Perceived organizational support used five items reflecting appreciation of employee contributions, concern for well-being, consideration of employee goals and values, willingness to provide help when problems arise, and recognition of extra effort (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Employee resilience used five items reflecting adaptation to change, use of coworker support, learning from mistakes, managing work under difficult conditions, and searching for improved ways of working (Näswall et al., 2019). Work engagement used six items representing vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Data were analyzed using SmartPLS 4 with partial least squares structural equation modeling. The measurement model was evaluated using indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio. Indicator loadings above 0.70 and average variance extracted values above 0.50 were used to establish convergent validity, while heterotrait-monotrait values below 0.90 were used to assess discriminant validity. Internal consistency values between 0.70 and 0.95 were considered satisfactory. The structural model assessment included inner variance inflation factors, coefficients of determination, effect sizes, model fit, and predictive performance. Variance inflation factor values below 5 indicated the absence of critical collinearity (Hair et al., 2022).

Predictive performance was assessed using PLSpredict and cross-validated predictive ability testing. Construct-level Q²predict values greater than zero were interpreted as evidence that the model provided predictive relevance for the corresponding endogenous

construct. Prediction errors generated by the PLS model were compared with the indicator-average benchmark specified in the analysis. Predictive performance was considered stronger when the PLS model produced lower prediction loss than the benchmark for the relevant indicators.

Hypotheses were tested using bootstrapping at a 5% significance level. Path direction, coefficient magnitude, t-statistics, p-values, and 95% confidence intervals were considered jointly. A hypothesized relationship was considered statistically supported when the p-value was below 0.05 and the confidence interval did not include zero. Mediation was assessed using the specific indirect effects. A mediation effect was established only when the specific indirect effect was statistically significant. Indirect-only mediation was identified when the indirect effect was significant while the corresponding direct effect was nonsignificant. Complementary mediation was identified when both direct and indirect effects were significant and had the same direction (Hair et al., 2022).

Results and Discussion

The final sample reflected a diverse private-sector workforce, although several categories were more strongly represented. Men accounted for 60.69% of respondents, the largest age group was 26–35 years (41.28%), and 54.55% held a bachelor's degree. Jakarta was the most common work location (40.79%). Permanent employees represented 56.02% of the sample, 45.45% had one to three years of tenure, and 59.21% worked at staff level. Service-sector employees represented 59.21% of the sample and manufacturing employees 40.79%. Table 1 summarizes the largest category for each respondent characteristic.

Table 1. Largest Categories in the Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Largest category	n	%
Sex	Male	247	60.69
Age	26–35 years	168	41.28
Education	Bachelor's degree	222	54.55
Work location	DKI Jakarta	166	40.79
Employment status	Permanent	228	56.02
Tenure	1–3 years	185	45.45
Position	Staff/operational employee	241	59.21
Business sector	Services	241	59.21

Source: Primary data, 2026; processed by the author.

The response distributions showed that the highest combined agreement for perceived organizational support occurred on the item indicating that the organization valued employee contributions (66.34%), whereas recognition of extra effort was comparatively lower (58.48%). For employee resilience, actively searching for better ways to improve work recorded the highest combined agreement (71.49%), while managing work during difficult conditions was lower (59.95%). Within work engagement, dedication was the strongest dimension, with an average combined agreement of 69.05%, followed by vigor at 64.99% and absorption at 63.76%. These descriptive patterns were not used to decide the hypotheses, but they help identify practical areas in which employees perceived comparatively stronger and weaker experiences.

The measurement model met the required reliability and validity criteria. All 20 indicators had loadings above 0.70, ranging from 0.721 to 0.880. Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.812 to 0.874, rho_A from 0.832 to 0.882, and composite reliability from 0.875 to 0.908. Average variance extracted ranged from 0.597 to 0.665, indicating adequate convergent validity. Table 2 reports the construct-level measurement results.

Table 2. Measurement Model Assessment

Construct	Items	Loading range	Alph a	rho_ A	rho_ C	AVE
Job Insecurity	4	0.729–0.848	0.812	0.832	0.875	0.636
Perceived Organizational Support	5	0.725–0.880	0.873	0.882	0.908	0.665
Employee Resilience	5	0.721–0.813	0.830	0.835	0.881	0.597
Work Engagement	6	0.728–0.842	0.874	0.877	0.905	0.614

Source: SmartPLS 4 output, 2026; processed by the author.

The direct-effect tests produced four significant paths and one nonsignificant path. Job insecurity negatively predicted employee resilience, whereas perceived organizational support strongly and positively predicted employee resilience. Perceived organizational support and employee resilience also positively predicted work engagement. In contrast, the direct path from job insecurity to work engagement was negative but statistically nonsignificant. The complete direct-effect results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Direct Effects and Hypothesis Tests

H	Structural path	β	t	p	Decision
H1	Job Insecurity → Employee Resilience	-0.157	4.522	<0.001	Supported
H2	Perceived Organizational Support → Employee Resilience	0.594	18.341	<0.001	Supported
H3	Job Insecurity → Work Engagement	-0.052	1.561	0.119	Not supported
H4	Perceived Organizational Support → Work Engagement	0.301	6.527	<0.001	Supported
H5	Employee Resilience → Work Engagement	0.499	10.939	<0.001	Supported

Source: SmartPLS 4 output, 2026; processed by the author.

The negative association between job insecurity and employee resilience supports the view that employment uncertainty operates as a resource-depleting demand. The coefficient was modest (-0.157), but the relationship was statistically clear. Employees who devote attention to the possibility of losing their jobs may have fewer psychological resources available for learning, adapting, and solving work problems. This pattern is consistent with Conservation of Resources theory, which predicts that anticipated resource loss can trigger

defensive allocation of energy before the loss actually occurs (Hobfoll et al., 2018). It is also compatible with the broader job insecurity literature, where uncertainty is treated as a stressor because employees cannot easily determine when, whether, or how the threat will be resolved (Shoss, 2017; Jiang & Lavaysse, 2018). The finding therefore shifts attention from the employment event itself to the adaptive capacity of employees who remain in the organization.

Perceived organizational support was substantially more influential in explaining employee resilience. Its coefficient of 0.594 and effect size of 0.579 indicate that organizational support was the dominant predictor of resilience in the model. The result is theoretically meaningful because resilience at work is developable rather than purely dispositional. When employees perceive that the organization values their contributions, cares about their welfare, provides assistance, and recognizes effort, they gain both practical and socioemotional resources that can be used during change. Organizational Support Theory explains why these practices create a generalized expectation that the organization is willing to help when difficulties arise (Eisenberger et al., 2020). The result also agrees with evidence that organizational systems and supportive resources contribute to resilience development (Hanu & Khumalo, 2023; Kharisma et al., 2025).

The nonsignificant direct path from job insecurity to work engagement is one of the most informative findings. Its coefficient was -0.052 with $p = 0.119$, indicating that differences in insecurity did not directly correspond to sufficiently strong differences in engagement once organizational support and resilience were considered simultaneously. This differs from Karatepe et al. (2020), who found a negative direct relationship, but is closer to the nonsignificant pattern reported by Zahda et al. (2024). The result should not be interpreted as evidence that job insecurity is harmless. The total effect of job insecurity on work engagement was -0.131 and statistically significant ($p = 0.001$), showing that the negative consequence became visible when the indirect path through employee resilience was included. In this sample, uncertainty was therefore associated with engagement mainly through the weakening of adaptive capacity rather than through an immediate decline in vigor, dedication, or absorption.

Perceived organizational support directly increased work engagement with a coefficient of 0.301. The finding is consistent with Organizational Support Theory: employees who feel valued and cared for have a stronger basis for reciprocating through greater psychological investment in their work (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Kurtessis et al., 2017). It is also consistent with research showing that organizational support can enhance engagement through meaningfulness, thriving, and reduced stress (Imran et al., 2020; Canboy et al., 2023). Recent Indonesian studies reinforce the broader role of work engagement as a motivational state through which job resources are converted into desirable work outcomes, including innovation and performance (Haji, 2024, 2025). In the present model, however, organizational support did not rely solely on engagement-related reciprocity; it also operated by strengthening the personal resource of resilience.

Employee resilience had the strongest direct relationship with work engagement, with a coefficient of 0.499 and a medium effect size of 0.325. Employees who can adjust their work approach, learn from mistakes, mobilize coworker support, and remain effective under difficult conditions are better positioned to sustain energy and dedication. This result supports the Job Demands-Resources proposition that personal resources can protect motivation under demanding conditions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). It also aligns with evidence from

Indonesian and international employee samples showing positive relationships between resilience and work engagement (Wiroko & Sugiharti, 2022; Ibrahim & Hussein, 2024; Husnaa & Utomo, 2025). The descriptive result that absorption was weaker than dedication and vigor further suggests that adaptive capacity may be particularly relevant when employees must preserve concentration while managing uncertainty and changing work demands.

The mediation analysis clarifies how these relationships operate. Employee resilience significantly carried both the negative job insecurity pathway and the positive organizational support pathway, but the types of mediation were different. Table 4 presents the specific indirect effects.

Table 4. Specific Indirect Effects and Mediation Type

H	Indirect path	β	t	p	95% CI	Mediation
H6	JI $\rightarrow$ ER $\rightarrow$ WE	-0.079	4.053	<0.001	[-0.119; -0.044]	Indirect-only
H7	POS $\rightarrow$ ER $\rightarrow$ WE	0.296	9.451	<0.001	[0.236; 0.359]	Complementary

Source: SmartPLS 4 output, 2026; processed by the author. JI = Job Insecurity; POS = Perceived Organizational Support; ER = Employee Resilience; WE = Work Engagement.

For job insecurity, the indirect effect through employee resilience was -0.079 and its 95% confidence interval did not cross zero. Because the direct job insecurity-work engagement path was nonsignificant, the pattern was classified as indirect-only mediation. This finding offers a more precise explanation than a simple statement that insecurity reduces engagement. The employment threat first appears to erode the employee's capacity to adapt, learn, and remain effective; lower resilience then reduces work engagement. This sequential pattern is consistent with the resource-loss logic of Conservation of Resources theory. It also extends the Job Demands-Resources model by showing that a hindrance demand can influence a motivational outcome through deterioration in a personal resource, even when the direct demand-outcome path is weak.

For perceived organizational support, the indirect effect through employee resilience was 0.296, while the direct effect on work engagement was 0.301. Both effects were significant and pointed in the same direction, producing complementary mediation. The almost equal sizes of the direct and indirect paths are managerially important. Organizational support appears to maintain engagement in two ways: immediately, by creating a sense of recognition, care, and reciprocal obligation; and developmentally, by increasing employees' capacity to deal with setbacks and change. The total effect of perceived organizational support on work engagement reached 0.597, the largest overall effect on engagement in the model. This dual mechanism is compatible with studies in which organizational and psychological resources are translated into engagement through resilience (Malik & Garg, 2020; Kharisma et al., 2025).

The results suggest that organizational responses to restructuring should not focus only on motivational events or generalized messages encouraging employees to remain positive. The strongest leverage point in the model is perceived organizational support, and one of its benefits is the strengthening of resilience. Transparent change communication is particularly relevant because unclear information can amplify uncertainty even when the

organization has legitimate efficiency goals. Recognition also deserves attention because appreciation of extra effort was the relatively weakest support indicator in the descriptive results. Practical interventions can therefore combine timely change communication, supervisor conversations, visible recognition, access to development opportunities, peer support, and work-based resilience activities such as problem-solving practice and learning from setbacks.

The model also leaves meaningful unexplained variance: 58.7% of employee resilience and 45.0% of work engagement were associated with factors outside the tested relationships. Future studies can extend the model without losing theoretical focus. Change communication is a plausible organizational factor because message quality can shape employee responses to organizational change (Haumer et al., 2021). Psychological safety may help explain whether employees can ask questions, acknowledge errors, and seek assistance during uncertainty (Dirk et al., 2025). Perceived supervisor support is another relevant resource because direct supervisors often represent the organization in day-to-day interactions and can influence work engagement (Yose & Suyasa, 2023). Longitudinal designs would also help determine whether changes in insecurity precede changes in resilience and engagement, while multi-group analysis could test whether the structural relationships differ between manufacturing and services or between permanent and nonpermanent employees.

Conclusion

This study clarifies how job insecurity and perceived organizational support are associated with work engagement through employee resilience among private-sector employees in Jabodetabek. The findings reveal two distinct pathways. Job insecurity is negatively associated with employee resilience but has no significant direct relationship with work engagement. Its relationship with work engagement is transmitted entirely through employee resilience, indicating indirect-only mediation. In contrast, perceived organizational support is positively associated with both employee resilience and work engagement, while resilience also transmits part of its relationship with engagement. This pattern represents complementary mediation. Taken together, the results demonstrate that employee resilience occupies a central position in explaining how employees respond to both employment-related threats and supportive organizational conditions.

The study makes three specific theoretical contributions. First, it extends the Job Demands-Resources framework by demonstrating that a hindrance demand and an organizational resource operate through different configurations of the same personal resource. Job insecurity reaches work engagement through the erosion of resilience, whereas perceived organizational support is associated with engagement both directly and through strengthened resilience. Second, the findings refine Conservation of Resources theory by identifying resilience as a personal resource through which threatened employment resources are translated into lower work engagement. The nonsignificant direct relationship between job insecurity and engagement further shows that the consequences of employment uncertainty are not adequately represented by a direct demand-outcome relationship alone. Third, the study extends Organizational Support Theory by showing that perceived organizational support is associated not only with stronger engagement but also with the personal adaptive capacity that supports engagement. Organizational support therefore functions as both a motivational resource and a resource-building organizational condition within the tested model.

An additional empirical contribution lies in the asymmetric function of employee resilience across the two pathways. Resilience does not operate as a generic intervening variable with an identical role across predictors. In the job insecurity pathway, resilience constitutes the mechanism through which a resource threat is associated with lower engagement. In the perceived organizational support pathway, resilience constitutes an additional mechanism through which an organizational resource is associated with higher engagement alongside a significant direct relationship. This distinction advances the understanding of personal resources by demonstrating that their explanatory function depends on whether the preceding work condition represents resource threat or resource provision.

The managerial implication is equally specific. During restructuring, efficiency initiatives, digitalization, and work-process changes, organizations should address both the organizational source of resources and employees' capacity to use those resources effectively. Perceived organizational support should be translated into visible practices through clear change communication, accessible channels for employee concerns, recognition of employee contributions, supervisor responsiveness, and reliable assistance when work difficulties occur. Resilience development should be incorporated into everyday work through structured problem solving, adaptation to changing tasks, peer support, learning from errors, and supervisor follow-up. The findings also indicate that stand-alone motivational initiatives are insufficient when employment uncertainty weakens the personal resources required to sustain engagement. Maintaining engagement under uncertain conditions therefore requires organizational support practices that protect and strengthen employee resilience.

The study is subject to several limitations. Its cross-sectional design does not establish temporal ordering among the constructs, purposive sampling restricts statistical generalization beyond the sampled population, and reliance on self-reported measures introduces a common-source limitation. The combined analysis of manufacturing and service employees also does not capture sector-specific differences in employment uncertainty, organizational support, and adaptive demands. Future research should employ longitudinal or repeated-measure designs to examine changes in resilience and engagement over time, use probability-based sampling where an adequate sampling frame is available, integrate supervisor or organizational data with employee reports, and conduct multi-group analysis across sectors. Further models should incorporate change communication, psychological safety, and supervisor support to determine which organizational resources most effectively strengthen resilience under conditions of employment uncertainty.

References

- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2022). Agustus 2022: Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka (TPT) sebesar 5,86 persen dan rata-rata upah buruh sebesar Rp3,07 juta per bulan. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/pressrelease/2022/11/07/1916/>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka (TPT) sebesar 4,85 persen dan rata-rata upah buruh sebesar Rp3,33 juta. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/pressrelease/2025/11/05/2479/>
- Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: Current trends. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207>
- 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>

- Canboy, B., Tillou, C., Barzantny, C., Güçlü, B., & Benichoux, F. (2023). The impact of perceived organizational support on work meaningfulness, engagement, and perceived stress in France. *European Management Journal*, 41(1), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2021.12.004>
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
- Dirk, A. C., Zamralita, Z., & Fahlevi, R. (2025). The relationships between psychological safety and work engagement among Generation Z employees in the Jabodetabek area. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 5(7), 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i7.494>
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 7, 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>
- Haji, W. H. (2024). AI-enabled job characteristics, digital self-efficacy, and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of work engagement. *International Journal of Economics Social and Technology*, 3(4), 142–156. <https://doi.org/10.59086/ijest.v3i4.1582>
- Haji, W. H. (2025). Flexible work dan work-life balance pada kinerja pegawai hybrid. *Balance: Jurnal Akuntansi dan Manajemen*, 4(3), 3130–3146. <https://doi.org/10.59086/jam.v4i3.1589>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hanu, C., & Khumalo, N. (2023). Developing ambidexterity and resilience: The predictive role of high-performance work systems. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21, a2226. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2226>
- Haumer, F., Schlicker, L., Murschetz, P. C., & Kolo, C. (2021). Tailor the message and change will happen? An experimental study of message tailoring as an effective communication strategy for organizational change. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 14(4), 426–443. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-08-2020-0207>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J.-P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5, 103–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>
- Husnaa, L. M., & Utomo, U. H. N. (2025). Resilience and social support as predictors of work engagement in Indonesia industrial workers: A JD-R model perspective. *Psychological Research and Intervention*, 8(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.21831/pri.v8i1.88812>
- Ibrahim, B. A., & Hussein, S. M. (2024). Relationship between resilience at work, work engagement and job satisfaction among engineers: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 24, 1077. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18507-9>



- Imran, M. Y., Elahi, N. S., Abid, G., Ashfaq, F., & Ilyas, S. (2020). Impact of perceived organizational support on work engagement: Mediating mechanism of thriving and flourishing. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), 82. <https://doi.org/10.3390/JOITMC6030082>
- Jiang, L., & Lavaysse, L. M. (2018). Cognitive and affective job insecurity: A meta-analysis and a primary study. *Journal of Management*, 44(6), 2307–2342. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318773853>
- Karatepe, O. M., Rezapouraghdam, H., & Hassannia, R. (2020). Job insecurity, work engagement and their effects on hotel employees' non-green and nonattendance behaviors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 87, 102472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102472>
- Kementerian Ketenagakerjaan Republik Indonesia. (2022). Tenaga kerja ter-PHK Januari–Desember 2022. Satu Data Ketenagakerjaan. <https://satudata.kemnaker.go.id/data/kumpulan-data?search=phk>
- Kementerian Ketenagakerjaan Republik Indonesia. (2025). Tenaga kerja ter-PHK Januari–Desember 2025. Satu Data Ketenagakerjaan. <https://satudata.kemnaker.go.id/data/kumpulan-data?search=phk>
- Kharisma, E., Swasti, I. K., & Rosyanti, D. M. (2025). Peran resilience dalam mempengaruhi perceived organizational support terhadap work engagement. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Sistem Informasi*, 6(6), 3666–3675. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jemsi.v6i6.5360>
- Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854–1884. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554>
- Lemeshow, S., Hosmer, D. W., Klar, J., & Lwanga, S. K. (1990). Adequacy of sample size in health studies. World Health Organization.
- Malik, P., & Garg, P. (2020). Learning organization and work engagement: The mediating role of employee resilience. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(8), 1071–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1396549>
- Näswall, K., Malinen, S., Kuntz, J., & Hodliffe, M. (2019). Employee resilience: Development and validation of a measure. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 34(5), 353–367. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-02-2018-0102>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(4), 701–716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Shoss, M. K. (2017). Job insecurity: An integrative review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1911–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206317691574>
- Vander Elst, T., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2014). The Job Insecurity Scale: A psychometric evaluation across five European countries. *European Journal of Work*

- and Organizational Psychology, 23(3), 364–380.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2012.745989>
- Wiroko, E. P., & Sugiharti, D. S. S. (2022). Gratitude and work engagement: The mediating role of employee resilience. *INSPIRA: Indonesian Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(2), 38–50. <https://doi.org/10.32505/inspira.v3i2.4848>
- Yose, A. D., & Suyasa, P. T. Y. S. (2023). Peran perceived supervisor support terhadap work engagement (studi pada karyawan PT XYZ). *Phronesis: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, 12(2), 125–133. <https://doi.org/10.24912/phronesis.v12i2.25340>
- Zahda, F. M., Faliza, N., Zulkarnaen, T., Darmawati, Aiyub, & Qamarius, I. (2024). The role of work engagement mediation in the relationship between job insecurity, role ambiguity and employee performance at BPJS Health Langsa and Lhokseumawe branch offices. *International Journal of Social Science, Educational, Economics, Agriculture Research and Technology*, 3(10), 1744–1759.
<https://doi.org/10.54443/ijset.v3i10.564>