

From Perceived Organizational Support to Perceived Organizational Resilience: The Mediating Roles of Employee Engagement and Readiness for Change

Dwi Astuti^{1*}, Erina Rulianti², Daspar Daspar³, Sri Mulyati⁴

Universitas Pelita Bangsa, Indonesia

Email: dwi.astuti@pelitabangsa.ac.id

Abstract

Manufacturing companies operating in volatile and uncertain environments require the capacity to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and recover from disruption. This study examines the association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience, with employee engagement and readiness for change positioned as parallel mediators. Data were collected from 100 permanent employees of manufacturing companies who had at least one year of tenure and direct experience with organizational change or restructuring. Respondents were selected through purposive sampling, and the data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS. The measurement model demonstrated adequate reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. Perceived organizational support was positively associated with employee engagement ($\beta = 0.541, p < 0.001$) and readiness for change ($\beta = 0.617, p < 0.001$), while its direct association with perceived organizational resilience was not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.108, p = 0.421$). Employee engagement ($\beta = 0.383, p < 0.001$) and readiness for change ($\beta = 0.333, p = 0.003$) were positively associated with perceived organizational resilience. Both specific indirect paths were significant, establishing an indirect-only mediation pattern. The findings identify two distinct employee-level mechanisms linking perceived organizational support with perceived organizational resilience: engagement in current work roles and readiness to adapt to organizational change. The study contributes to human resource management research by integrating these mechanisms within a single manufacturing-sector model.

Keywords: perceived organizational support, employee engagement, readiness for change, perceived organizational resilience, manufacturing

Introduction

Manufacturing companies operate in an increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous business environment, shaped by global supply chain disruptions, rapid technological change, and shifting market demand. Under these conditions, the capacity of an organization to anticipate potential disruptions, absorb their impact, and recover and adapt afterward, commonly referred to as organizational resilience, has become an important strategic capability rather than an optional attribute (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Ducheck, 2020). In this study, resilience is assessed from the employee perspective as perceived organizational resilience. This framing aligns the resilience measure with the individual-level data source while retaining the organizational capability domain represented by the construct. Because manufacturing operations depend heavily on coordinated human effort,

employee perceptions of organizational support, engagement, and readiness for change are directly relevant to the assessment of organizational resilience.

Perceived organizational support (POS) refers to employees' general belief that the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Social exchange theory posits reciprocal responses to favorable organizational treatment, including stronger psychological engagement and greater acceptance of organizational change (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employee engagement is defined as the degree to which employees are cognitively, emotionally, and physically invested in their work role (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002), while readiness for change captures employees' beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the need for change and the organization's capacity to implement it successfully (Holt et al., 2007; Armenakis et al., 1993). The present study positions these constructs as distinct employee-level mechanisms linking perceived organizational support with perceived organizational resilience. Engagement represents investment in the current work role, whereas readiness for change represents preparedness for organizational transition. Perceived organizational resilience is therefore operationalized as employees' assessment of the organization's capacity to anticipate, absorb, adapt to, and recover from disruption rather than as an aggregated firm-level measure.

Evidence from the manufacturing sector supports the relevance of these constructs. Tahir (2023), drawing on the perspectives of 429 managers in Indonesian manufacturing enterprises, found that employee engagement is a key determinant of successful organizational change. Gigliotti et al. (2019) showed that perceived organizational support is linked to individual readiness for change, partly through its effect on employees' trust in the organization. In a manufacturing context in Nigeria, Eketu et al. (2020) found that organizational-level factors, such as organizational structure, significantly shape employees' resilience capacity, underscoring the relevance of organizational conditions in building resilience within manufacturing firms.

Despite this evidence, prior studies commonly examine perceived organizational support in relation to employee engagement or readiness for change as separate pathways, while resilience is frequently examined at a different level of analysis. The theoretical issue is therefore not limited to the absence of a combined model. It concerns how an employee-level perception of organizational support is transmitted into an employee assessment of organizational resilience through two conceptually distinct psychological processes. Employee engagement captures cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in ongoing work roles, whereas readiness for change captures preparedness to accept and enact organizational adaptation. A parallel mediation model separates these mechanisms and estimates their independent indirect contributions within the same structural framework, addressing the level-of-analysis and mechanism-identification issues simultaneously in the manufacturing context.

Based on this background, the present study examines the association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience in manufacturing companies, with employee engagement and readiness for change positioned as parallel mediating variables. The study contributes to the human resource management literature by testing two distinct psychological transmission mechanisms within a single structural model and by maintaining consistency between the employee-level unit of observation and the perception-based measurement of organizational resilience. The model also provides an

evidence-based basis for identifying employee-focused areas relevant to resilience-oriented management practice.

Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement

Perceived organizational support reflects employees' belief that the organization recognizes their contribution and genuinely cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Employee engagement refers to the extent to which employees invest themselves cognitively, emotionally, and physically in their work role (Kahn, 1990; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Social exchange theory links favorable organizational treatment with reciprocal psychological investment in the work role (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Saks (2006) similarly found that perceived organizational and supervisor support are significant antecedents of employee engagement. This theoretical and empirical basis leads to the following hypothesis:

H1: Perceived organizational support is positively associated with employee engagement.

Perceived Organizational Support and Readiness for Change

Readiness for change describes employees' beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which a change is needed and the organization's capacity to implement it successfully (Holt et al., 2007; Armenakis et al., 1993). Organizational support provides a resource context through which employees evaluate the communication, consideration, and organizational capacity associated with a change process. Gigliotti et al. (2019) found that perceived organizational support is associated with individual change readiness. This theoretical and empirical basis leads to the following hypothesis:

H2: Perceived organizational support is positively associated with readiness for change.

Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Organizational Resilience

Organizational resilience refers to an organization's capacity to anticipate potential threats, absorb the impact of disruption, and adapt and recover in ways that sustain its core functions (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011; Ducheck, 2020). In the present study, this capability is measured as perceived organizational resilience through employee assessments. Perceived organizational support represents an organizational condition that communicates value, care, and resource availability to employees. Such support is theoretically linked with cooperative and adaptive employee responses that are relevant to resilience, while employee engagement and readiness for change represent more proximal psychological pathways through which the association can also be transmitted (Eketu et al., 2020). The direct path is therefore tested as a positive structural association alongside the two indirect paths:

H3: Perceived organizational support is positively associated with perceived organizational resilience.

Employee Engagement and Perceived Organizational Resilience

Employee engagement reflects cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in the work role and is associated with initiative, adaptability, and discretionary effort (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006). These work-role characteristics are directly relevant to employees' assessment of the organization's capacity to maintain coordinated responses during disruption. The proposed model therefore links stronger employee engagement with higher perceived organizational resilience. This reasoning leads to the following hypothesis:

H4: Employee engagement is positively associated with perceived organizational resilience.

Readiness for Change and Perceived Organizational Resilience

Readiness for change captures employees' preparedness to support and participate in organizational adaptation rather than resist it (Holt et al., 2007; Vakola, 2014). Organizational resilience includes adaptation of structures, processes, and strategies in response to disruption. Readiness for change therefore represents a directly relevant psychological condition for employees' assessment of the organization's adaptive capacity. This reasoning leads to the following hypothesis:

H5: Readiness for change is positively associated with perceived organizational resilience.

The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement and Readiness for Change

The proposed mediation model contains two parallel and conceptually distinct mechanisms. The employee engagement pathway represents the translation of perceived organizational support into cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in current work roles, which is then associated with perceived organizational resilience. The readiness-for-change pathway represents the translation of organizational support into preparedness for organizational transition, which is then associated with perceived organizational resilience. Engagement therefore captures present-role investment, whereas readiness for change captures adaptive preparedness. Estimating both pathways simultaneously identifies the independent indirect contribution of each mechanism while controlling for the other. This reasoning leads to the following hypotheses:

H6: Employee engagement mediates the association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience.

H7: Readiness for change mediates the association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience.

Method

This study employs a quantitative cross-sectional associative design to examine structural associations among perceived organizational support, employee engagement, readiness for change, and perceived organizational resilience in manufacturing companies. Data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), which is appropriate for models involving multiple latent constructs, mediation relationships, and moderate sample sizes (Hair et al., 2019). The analysis was performed using SmartPLS (Ringle et al., 2015). The population consists of employees working in manufacturing companies. A total of 100 respondents were selected through purposive sampling using three eligibility criteria: permanent employment status, at least one year of tenure in the current manufacturing company, and direct experience with organizational change or restructuring initiatives. The most complex endogenous construct in the structural model receives three incoming paths, so the final sample contains 33.3 observations per predictor at that point in the model.

Data were collected through a structured, self-administered questionnaire. The instrument measured four latent constructs using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Perceived Organizational Support (POS) was measured with five indicators adapted from Eisenberger et al. (1986), reflecting employees' belief that the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being.

Employee Engagement (EE) was measured with five indicators adapted from Kahn (1990) and Schaufeli et al. (2002), reflecting employees' cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in their work. Readiness for Change (RC) was measured with five indicators adapted from Holt et al. (2007), capturing employees' beliefs and attitudes regarding the appropriateness and manageability of organizational change. Perceived Organizational Resilience (POR) was measured with five indicators adapted from Lengnick-Hall et al. (2011) and Duchek (2020), reflecting employee assessments of the organization's capacity to anticipate, absorb, and recover from disruption. No new measurement scale was developed; the analysis used the adapted indicators from the cited sources. Consistent with the two-stage approach commonly applied in PLS-SEM (Hair et al., 2019), the measurement model (outer model) was evaluated based on indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE) for internal consistency and convergent validity, followed by the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT) for discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Henseler et al., 2015). The structural model (inner model) was assessed using the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), collinearity statistics (VIF), path coefficients, and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Hypotheses were tested using a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples to obtain t-statistics and p-values for the direct and indirect paths.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the measurement model and the structural model, followed by hypothesis testing and a discussion of each finding in relation to the theoretical framework and prior research presented above.

Measurement Model (Outer Model)

The measurement model was evaluated to establish the reliability and validity of the four constructs before the structural associations were tested. Perceived organizational resilience was treated as a perception-based construct measured at the employee level, consistent with the unit of observation. Table 1 presents the range of indicator loadings together with the reliability and convergent validity statistics for each construct.

Table 1. Construct Reliability and Validity

Construct	Indicators	Loading Range	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Perceived Organizational Support (POS)	5	0.758–0.814	0.849	0.892	0.624
Employee Engagement (EE)	5	0.799–0.852	0.888	0.918	0.691
Readiness for Change (RC)	5	0.714–0.866	0.860	0.900	0.644
Perceived Organizational Resilience (POR)	5	0.716–0.851	0.855	0.897	0.635

Source: SmartPLS output, processed data (2026).

All indicator loadings exceeded the recommended minimum threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019), and each construct achieved a Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability above 0.84, well beyond the conventional cut-off of 0.70. The average variance extracted for all constructs exceeded 0.50, ranging from 0.624 to 0.691, indicating that each construct explained more than half of the variance in its respective indicators. These results confirm that the measurement model achieved adequate internal consistency reliability and convergent validity. Discriminant validity was examined using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity (Fornell–Larcker Criterion)

	POS	EE	RC	POR
POS	0.790			
EE	0.541	0.832		
RC	0.617	0.727	0.802	
POR	0.520	0.683	0.677	0.797

Source: SmartPLS output, processed data (2026).

As shown in Table 2, the square root of the AVE for each construct exceeded its correlation with every other construct, satisfying the Fornell-Larcker criterion for discriminant validity. The reported HTMT values ranged from 0.602 to 0.829 and remained below the conservative threshold of 0.90 (Henseler et al., 2015), providing additional evidence of discriminant validity among the four constructs. In addition, all inner and outer variance inflation factor (VIF) values ranged from 1.54 to 2.64, below the threshold of 5, indicating that collinearity did not pose a concern in either the measurement or the structural model.

Structural Model (Inner Model)

The structural model was assessed using the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), collinearity statistics, path coefficients, and SRMR, followed by hypothesis testing for the direct and indirect paths. Table 3 presents the R^2 values for the endogenous constructs.

Table 3. Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Endogenous Variable	R^2	R^2 Adjusted	Category
Employee Engagement (EE)	0.293	0.285	Moderate
Readiness for Change (RC)	0.380	0.374	Moderate
Perceived Organizational Resilience (POR)	0.543	0.529	Moderate

Source: SmartPLS output, processed data (2026).

Table 3 shows that perceived organizational support explained 29.3 percent of the variance in employee engagement and 38.0 percent of the variance in readiness for change.

The full model, comprising perceived organizational support, employee engagement, and readiness for change, explained 54.3 percent of the variance in perceived organizational resilience, which can be classified as a moderate level of explanatory power (Hair et al., 2019). In terms of effect size, perceived organizational support exerted a large effect on readiness for change ($f^2 = 0.613$) and employee engagement ($f^2 = 0.414$), whereas its direct effect on perceived organizational resilience was negligible ($f^2 = 0.015$). Employee engagement exerted a medium effect on perceived organizational resilience ($f^2 = 0.147$), and readiness for change exerted a small effect ($f^2 = 0.097$).

The direct structural paths among constructs were tested using a bootstrapping procedure with 5,000 resamples. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Direct Paths and Hypothesis Testing

Hyp.	Path	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics	P Values	Decision
H1	POS → EE	0.541	6.078	0.000	Supported
H2	POS → RC	0.617	8.332	0.000	Supported
H3	POS → POR	0.108	0.805	0.421	Not Supported
H4	EE → POR	0.383	3.498	0.000	Supported
H5	RC → POR	0.333	2.933	0.003	Supported

Source: SmartPLS bootstrapping output (5,000 resamples), processed data (2026).

The indirect associations of perceived organizational support with perceived organizational resilience through employee engagement and readiness for change were tested using bootstrapping, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Indirect Paths and Mediation Testing

Hyp.	Path	Original Sample (O)	T Statistics	P Values	Decision
H6	POS → EE → POR	0.207	2.983	0.003	Supported (Indirect-only Mediation)
H7	POS → RC → POR	0.205	2.815	0.005	Supported (Indirect-only Mediation)

Source: SmartPLS bootstrapping output (5,000 resamples), processed data (2026).

The direct path from perceived organizational support to perceived organizational resilience was not statistically significant (H3, $p = 0.421$), while both specific indirect paths were statistically significant (H6 and H7). The resulting pattern is therefore reported as indirect-only mediation rather than full mediation. The specific indirect coefficient through employee engagement was 0.207 ($t = 2.983$, $p = 0.003$), and the specific indirect coefficient through readiness for change was 0.205 ($t = 2.815$, $p = 0.005$). The total indirect effect was

0.412 ($t = 4.514$, $p < 0.001$). The total effect coefficient, obtained by combining the direct coefficient of 0.108 and the total indirect coefficient of 0.412, was 0.520. The t -value of 4.514 and its p -value reported in Table 5 refer to the total indirect effect, not to the total effect.

The estimated model produced a Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) of 0.125. This value exceeds the conventional 0.08 threshold and is also above the 0.10 reference value discussed for composite-based PLS models (Henseler et al., 2014). The model therefore does not meet these commonly used global fit benchmarks. The structural coefficients and mediation results are interpreted alongside this model-fit limitation rather than as evidence of satisfactory overall model fit.

Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Engagement

The results support H1, with perceived organizational support showing a strong, significant, and positive association with employee engagement ($\beta = 0.541$, $t = 6.078$, $p < 0.001$), consistent with the large effect size reported earlier ($f^2 = 0.414$). Employees reporting stronger organizational support also reported higher cognitive, emotional, and physical investment in their work. This result is consistent with Saks (2006), who found that perceived organizational and supervisor support are significant antecedents of employee engagement, and it reinforces the social exchange interpretation of reciprocal psychological investment in the work role.

Perceived Organizational Support and Readiness for Change

H2 was supported, with perceived organizational support showing a significant positive association with readiness for change ($\beta = 0.617$, $t = 8.332$, $p < 0.001$), the strongest structural path observed in this study. Respondents reporting stronger organizational support also reported higher readiness for change. This finding is consistent with Gigliotti et al. (2019), who found that perceived organizational support is closely associated with individual readiness for change. Within the present manufacturing sample, the result identifies organizational support as the strongest modeled correlate of change readiness.

Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Organizational Resilience

H3 was not supported: the direct association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience was positive but statistically insignificant ($\beta = 0.108$, $t = 0.805$, $p = 0.421$), with a negligible effect size ($f^2 = 0.015$). The direct path therefore provides no statistical evidence of an independent association after employee engagement and readiness for change are included in the model. This finding is broadly consistent with Eketu et al. (2020), who emphasized the role of employee-level psychological states and behaviors in connecting organizational conditions with resilience-related outcomes. The significant indirect paths reported in Table 5 locate the association within the two mediating mechanisms rather than in the direct path.

Employee Engagement and Perceived Organizational Resilience

H4 was supported, with employee engagement showing a significant positive association with perceived organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.383$, $t = 3.498$, $p < 0.001$). Higher employee engagement was associated with higher employee assessments of the organization's capacity to respond to disruption, consistent with the medium effect size

reported earlier ($f^2 = 0.147$). This finding corroborates Tahir (2023), who found that employee engagement is a key determinant of organizational change readiness among Indonesian manufacturing enterprises, and it is consistent with the role of engagement in initiative and adaptability (Kahn, 1990; Saks, 2006).

Readiness for Change and Perceived Organizational Resilience

H5 was supported, with readiness for change showing a significant positive association with perceived organizational resilience ($\beta = 0.333$, $t = 2.933$, $p = 0.003$). Respondents with higher readiness for change also reported higher perceived organizational resilience. This finding is consistent with Vakola (2014) and Holt et al. (2007), who emphasized individual readiness for change as an important condition for organizational adaptation. In the present model, change readiness represents a distinct adaptive-preparedness pathway associated with employees' assessment of organizational resilience.

The Mediating Role of Employee Engagement and Readiness for Change

The mediation results support H6 and H7 and establish an indirect-only mediation pattern through employee engagement and readiness for change. The direct path (H3) was not significant, whereas both specific indirect paths were significant. The indirect coefficient through employee engagement was 0.207 and the indirect coefficient through readiness for change was 0.205, indicating nearly equal contributions from the two mechanisms in this sample. Employee engagement represents present-role psychological investment, while readiness for change represents preparedness for organizational transition. Their simultaneous significance demonstrates that the association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience is transmitted through two distinct employee-level pathways. This mechanism is consistent with the broader human resource management literature, which frames organizational support as an upstream organizational condition operating through proximal psychological states (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2011). The finding also complements Eketu et al. (2020), who linked organizational conditions with employee resilience-related responses in manufacturing settings.

Conclusion

This study examined the structural association between perceived organizational support and perceived organizational resilience in manufacturing companies, with employee engagement and readiness for change positioned as parallel mediating variables, using a sample of 100 employees. The measurement model demonstrated adequate reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity across all constructs. Perceived organizational support was positively associated with employee engagement and readiness for change, while its direct association with perceived organizational resilience was not statistically significant. Employee engagement and readiness for change were each positively associated with perceived organizational resilience, and both specific indirect paths were significant. The empirical pattern is therefore characterized as indirect-only mediation rather than full mediation.

The principal theoretical contribution is the identification of two distinct employee-level mechanisms linking perceived organizational support with perceived organizational resilience. Employee engagement represents psychological investment in current work roles,

whereas readiness for change represents preparedness for organizational adaptation. Their simultaneous significance demonstrates that the association between organizational support and resilience perceptions is transmitted through both mechanisms within the same structural model. The perception-based framing of organizational resilience also aligns the construct with the employee-level unit of observation used in the analysis.

From a practical perspective, the supported structural paths identify employee engagement and readiness for change as relevant focal areas alongside perceived organizational support. Manufacturing companies can align support practices with participative work design, recognition, and open communication to address engagement, while transparent change communication, training, and visible management support address readiness for change. These recommendations are linked directly to the statistically supported paths in the model and are not interpreted as causal effects because the evidence is cross-sectional.

This study is subject to several limitations. The purposive sample of 100 respondents restricts the scope of generalization beyond the observed manufacturing employees. The cross-sectional design does not support causal inference over time. In addition, the SRMR value of 0.125 exceeds commonly used global fit benchmarks and therefore represents a substantive model-fit limitation. Future research can test the model with larger and more diverse manufacturing samples, longitudinal designs, alternative model specifications, and theoretically relevant constructs such as organizational trust, leadership style, or psychological capital. Predictive assessment and additional diagnostic statistics can also be reported when the corresponding SmartPLS outputs are available.

References

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations*, 46(6), 681–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- 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>
- Eketu, A., Ogbu Edeh, F., Alamina, U. P., Yeo, S. F., Kumari, P., & Eder, J. E. (2020). Effects of organizational structure on employee resilience. *Journal of Business School*, 3(2), 75–85.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
- Gigliotti, R., Vardaman, J., Marshall, D., & Gonzalez, K. (2019). The role of perceived organizational support in individual change readiness. *Journal of Change Management*, 19(2), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2018.1459784>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T. K., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Diamantopoulos, A., Straub, D. W., Ketchen, D. J., Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., & Calantone, R. J. (2014). Common beliefs

- and reality about PLS: Comments on Rönkkö and Evermann (2013). *Organizational Research Methods*, 17(2), 182–209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114526928>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295>
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256287>
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
- 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>
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2015). SmartPLS 3. SmartPLS GmbH. <https://www.smartpls.com>
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610690169>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71–92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Tahir, R. (2023). The employee engagement on the organizational change: Study on manufacturing industry in Indonesia [Data set]. Mendeley Data. <https://doi.org/10.17632/78rpvt7k4n.1>
- Vakola, M. (2014). What's in there for me? Individual readiness to change and the perceived impact of organizational change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 35(3), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2012-0064>