The International Journal of Social Sciences World
TIJOSSW is Available Online at:
https://www.growingscholar.org/journal/index.php/TIJOSSW
Vol. 7 No. 1, January- June 2025, Pages: 281~291
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15596866
ISSN 2690-5167
Growingscholar Publisher

the influence of employee engagement on turnover intention and burnout with supervisor support and coworker support as moderating variables

Radias Baskoroputro[1], Irene Rini Demi Pangestuti[2]

Article history:
Received: April 18, 2025; Accepted: June 02, 2025; Displayed Online: June 04, 2025; Published: June 30, 2025

Keywords

Employee Engagement;
Turnover Intention;
Burnout;
Supervisor Support;
Coworker Support;

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the effect of employee engagement on turnover intention and burnout, especially in government institutions in this case the Financial Services Authority, by also analyzing the effect of employee engagement on turnover intention and burnout which also maps the moderating role of supervisor support and coworker support. This study uses a quantitative approach with the aim of testing the causal relationship between variables based on the formulation of previously constructed hypotheses. The data used in this study consists of primary data obtained directly from respondents through filling out questionnaires compiled based on the construct of research variables, namely employee engagement, turnover intention, burnout, supervisor support, and coworker support. The results of the analysis show that employee engagement has a significant negative effect on burnout and turnover intention. The higher the employee engagement, the lower the level of emotional exhaustion and desire to leave the organization. Coworker support has also been shown to have a significant negative effect on both outcomes, emphasizing the importance of peer support in building psychological resilience and employee loyalty.

1. Introduction

Good human resource (HR) management is very important for the success and even survival of an organization, including for state institutions such as the Financial Services Authority (OJK). Good HR management will support work productivity and maintain organizational stability through employee retention and ensuring proper workload distribution. Conversely, the failure of an organization to manage HR can be a source of significant risk for the organization, including low work productivity, high employee turnover and a deterioration in the organization's reputation.

[1] *Universitas Diponegoro Semarang, Indonesia, Email : radias358@gmail.com*
[2] *Universitas Diponegoro Semarang, Indonesia*

Dessler (2017) stated that human resource management includes the process of acquiring, training, assessing, and developing employees, as well as maintaining their welfare and fairness. This activity is a key pillar in ensuring that the organization is able to achieve its goals optimally, because the success of the organization depends on the quality of its human resources. Employees not only carry out operational aspects but also bring innovation, creativity, and expertise that drive the progress of the organization. In addition, employees are contributors to the level of organizational productivity, and can support the creation of a positive work culture. Therefore, every organization, both in the private and public sectors, actively competes to get the best quality employees who contribute optimally and retain them so that they are willing to work for the organization.

To ensure that employees can make high contributions that support the performance and achievement of organizational targets, one of the important things is the realization of a high level of engagement. Engagement is seen as having a significant influence on reducing burnout and turnover intention as per the research results of Kurniawati and Raharja (2023). Research conducted by Molestane (2017) shows that employee engagement has a positive effect on organizational productivity. Likewise, previous research conducted by Nayak and Sarangi (2016) also found that in addition to its contribution to increasing productivity, employee engagement plays a role in increasing employee commitment.

Furthermore, organizations that can realize high employee engagement can reduce employee turnover or departure from the organization, either by quitting or moving to another place. The employee's intention to leave is indicated by the turnover intention value. Lestari and Margaretha (2021) define turnover intention as the desire to move or leave an organization to get a better job. This is important to note because turnover intention is characterized by a decrease in employee performance/productivity which is reflected in employee behavior including arriving late, often absent, and no enthusiasm/work spirit (Belete, 2018). High employee turnover has a direct impact on team performance and can disrupt the performance and profitability of the organization as well as the loss of time and costs for recruiting and training new employees (Childs et al, 2017).

Another thing to consider in human resource management in an organization is the level of burnout. Maslach et al. (2001) define burnout as "a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stress in the workplace, and is defined by three dimensions: exhaustion, cynicism, and incompetence". Similar to turnover intention, burnout also has a negative relationship with engagement. This is as stated by the research of Santhanam and Srinivas (2019) which found that disengaged employees (not feeling engaged) have a greater risk of experiencing burnout and are likely to leave the organization in the future.

Furthermore, Kuvaas and Dysik (2010) concluded that support from superiors (supervisor support) plays a crucial role in shaping employee attitudes, influencing employee commitment and also turnover intention. Support from superiors creates a work environment where employees feel valued and heard. Supportive superiors provide constructive feedback, encourage career development, and help employees face work challenges. This not only increases engagement but also reduces turnover intention and reduces burnout. Conversely, lack of support from superiors can weaken employee engagement, increase turnover intention, and trigger burnout. Likewise, support from coworkers (coworker support) also plays an important role in creating a positive work environment. Costa and Monteiro (2016) stated that "The lower the support of coworkers in the workplace, the lower the level of engagement which in turn will be reflected in lower performance at work." Supportive coworkers can help reduce stress, strengthen a sense of connectedness, and increase motivation. When employees feel supported by coworkers, they tend to be more engaged and have lower turnover intention and a lower risk

of burnout. However, if support from coworkers is low, the positive effects of employee engagement on reducing turnover intention and burnout may be reduced.

From a risk management perspective, there is a close relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention with risk management in an organization. High turnover rates and low employee engagement can pose major risks related to human resources. Losing experienced employees means losing valuable knowledge and expertise, which can disrupt operations and productivity. In addition, the process of recruiting and training new employees requires a lot of time and resources. The level of engagement is also related to operational risk because low engagement can result in inefficiency in the organization's operational activities and increased error rates in business processes. In addition, high turnover and low employee engagement can also affect the organization's reputation risk. Organizations that are known to the public to have low engagement rates can lead to negative perceptions and make it difficult for organizations to obtain quality human resources. High turnover rates can also be a financial risk for organizations, given the costs associated with very high turnover ranging from the cost of recruiting, hiring, and training new employees. In addition, low engagement can lead to decreased productivity which ultimately affects organizational performance.

Previous studies on the effect of employee engagement on turnover intention include research conducted by Islamy (2017) which found that variables such as vigor, dedication, and absorption have a significant effect on turnover intention. Research conducted by Rokhman (2022) shows that employee engagement has a significant effect on turnover intention with organizational commitment as a mediating variable. Conversely, research conducted by Wiranti et al. (2021) found that employee engagement has a significant effect on employee performance and organizational commitment, but does not have a significant effect on turnover intention directly. Research conducted by Solihin (2020) found that work engagement did not have a significant effect on turnover intention, while organizational commitment had a significant negative effect on turnover intention. Conversely, there is previous research that found that there was no significant effect between employee engagement and burnout. Previous studies on the relationship between employee engagement and burnout include research conducted by Christianty and Widhianingtanti (2016) which shows that there is a very significant negative relationship between employee engagement and burnout. On the other hand, research by Hikmatullah (2016) shows that there is no significant relationship between employee engagement and burnout in IT division employees in Jakarta. Previous studies on the relationship between supervisor support and turnover intention include research conducted by Fitri (2024) which shows that supervisor support has a negative and significant effect on turnover intention while research by Buulolo and Ratnasari (2020) shows that supervisor support has a negative effect on turnover intention.

Previous research on the relationship between coworker support and turnover intention includes that conducted by Maesaroh and Fadili (2024) which showed that there was a negative and significant influence between coworker support and turnover intention, while research conducted by Wijaya (2024) showed that coworker support did not have a direct effect on turnover intention.

Previous studies on the relationship between supervisor support and burnout include those conducted by Yulia et al. (2020) which showed that there was a significant negative relationship between supervisor support and burnout. Research conducted by Adawiyah et al. (2018) showed that there was a significant negative relationship between social support, including supervisor support, and burnout. Research conducted by Triastuti and Walyono. (2023) showed that the higher the social support, including from superiors, the lower the burnout that occurs in employees.

Previous studies on the relationship between coworker support and burnout include those conducted by Purnama et al. (2023) which showed that there is a significant negative relationship between coworker support and burnout in employees. Research conducted by Labiib (2013) and

Akbar and Soetjiningsih (2022) showed that there is a negative relationship between social support, especially from coworkers and superiors, and burnout levels.

Previous studies that have shown the role of supervisor support in moderating the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention include research conducted by Tennakoon and Herat (2021) which showed that supervisor support has a significant influence in moderating turnover intention, but this influence varies depending on the employee's tenure. Research conducted by Novrandy and Tanuwijaya (2022) shows that supervisor support can strengthen the relationship between work engagement and turnover intention. From

Previous studies have reviewed the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention and burnout, as well as the impact of supervisor support and coworker support on both variables. However, studies that comprehensively examine the role of supervisor and coworker support as moderating variables in the relationship are still limited, especially in the context of an independent state institution such as the OJK.

Based on this background, this study intends to examine the effect of employee engagement on turnover intention and burnout, and explore the role of supervisor support and coworker support as moderator variables in the context of the Financial Services Authority. With this approach, it is expected that the study can contribute to strengthening HR management while supporting the effectiveness of institutional risk management at the OJK.

2. Methods

This study uses a quantitative approach with the aim of testing the causal relationship between variables based on the formulation of previously constructed hypotheses. The data used in this study consists of primary data obtained directly from respondents by filling out a questionnaire compiled based on the construct of research variables, namely employee engagement, turnover intention, burnout, supervisor support, and coworker support. This data represents individual perceptions of the psychological and social conditions they experience in the work environment, and is collected to answer specific research problems. Primary data collection was carried out through a quantitative survey method using a closed questionnaire distributed online via the Google Forms platform. The questionnaire was designed using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree), and includes indicators of each variable based on instruments that have been validated from previous studies. The population in this study were all permanent OJK employees who work at the Head Office and KOJK throughout Indonesia. Based on the latest OJK Annual Report (2023), the number of permanent OJK employees is around 4,000 people. The population used includes all active employees of the Financial Services Authority (OJK) totaling around 4,000 people, both those working at the head office and regional OJK offices. The population is not further divided into sub-populations or stratification based on work units, work locations, age, gender, or length of service.

3. Results and Discussion

Classical Assumption Test Results

1) Residual Normality Test

The residual normality test is carried out to determine whether the error distribution (the difference between the actual value and the regression predicted value) follows a normal distribution.

Testing was carried out using Shapiro-Wilk, with the following criteria:

- p > 0.05 → Residuals are normally distributed
- p ≤ 0.05 → Residuals are not normally distributed

Normality Test Results

Model	Statistik Shapiro-Wilk	p-value	Interpretasi
Model 1 (Burnout)	0.971	0.025	❌ Tidak normal
Model 2 (Turnover Intention)	0.944	0.000	❌ Tidak normal

Both models produce residuals that are not normally distributed (p < 0.05). However, according to Ghozali (2018), linear regression can still be used even though the residuals are not completely normal, as long as the number of samples is sufficient (n > 30), there are no extreme outliers, and other assumptions are met (homoscedasticity, non-multicollinearity). Thus, because the sample of this study was 103 respondents, the regression model can still be used.

2) Multicollinearity Test

This test aims to ensure that there is no high correlation between independent variables. Multicollinearity is declared absent if the VIF value is <10 (Hair et al., 2010).

The VIF test results are as follows:

Variabel	VIF
EE_centered	2.075
SS_centered	2.395
CS_centered	2.034
EE_SS	2.914
EE_CS	2.938

The table above shows that all variables have VIF values below 10, even below 3, which means that there is no multicollinearity problem and the independent variables are free from high linear correlation with each other.

3) Heteroscedasticity Test (Glejser)

The Glejser test is used to detect whether the error variance is constant or not (homoscedasticity). The criteria used are:

- p-value > 0.05 → No heteroscedasticity (safe)
- p-value ≤ 0.05 → There is an indication of heteroscedasticity

The results of the Glesjer test are as follows:

Variabel	p-value Model 1 (Burnout)	p-value Model 2 (Turnover Intention)
EE_centered	0.3382	**0.0184** ❗
SS_centered	**0.0484** ❗	0.3687
CS_centered	0.9073	0.4461
EE_SS	0.0743	0.1088
EE_CS	0.9065	**0.0007** ❗

In Model 1 (Burnout), only SS_centered shows $p \leq 0.05$, indicating mild indication of heteroscedasticity. Meanwhile, in Model 2, there are 2 variables with $p \leq 0.05$ (EE_centered and EE_CS) indicating indication of heteroscedasticity. However, even though there are indications of heteroscedasticity in several variables, this does not invalidate the feasibility of the regression model. According to Gujarati (2009) and Ghozali (2018), violation of the homoscedasticity assumption only affects the efficiency of the model, not the accuracy of the coefficient estimates in general.

4) Autocorrelation Test (Durbin-Watson)

This test aims to determine whether there is autocorrelation (correlation between consecutive residuals) in the regression model. Autocorrelation can interfere with the accuracy of regression estimates.

Interpretation criteria (Gujarati, 2009):

- DW ≈ 2→ No autocorrelation
- DW < 1.5→ There is positive autocorrelation
- DW > 2.5→ There is negative autocorrelation

🔷 **Hasil:**

Model	Nilai Durbin-Watson	Interpretasi
Model 1 (Burnout)	2.047	✅ Tidak ada autokorelasi
Model 2 (Turnover Intention)	1.715	⚠️ Cenderung sedikit positif, namun masih dalam batas wajar

Model 1 shows no autocorrelation, while Model 2 shows a slight tendency towards positive autocorrelation, but is still within the tolerance limit for cross-sectional data (not time series). Although the Durbin-Watson value in Model 2 (1.715) shows a slight tendency towards positive autocorrelation, this does not interfere with the validity of the model because according to Ghozali (2018) and Gujarati & Porter (2009), autocorrelation tests are not required for cross-sectional data, as used in this study.

4. Discussion

This section discusses the results of the hypothesis testing of Model 1 and Model 2 that have been conducted in this study, while comparing them with the theoretical basis and previous

research. In general, this study uses the Job Demands–Resources Model (JD-R) framework as a basis for explaining how employee engagement, supervisor support, and coworker support play a role in influencing burnout and turnover intention.

Employee engagement in this study was proven to have a negative and significant effect on turnover intention (Model 2: $\beta = -0.841$; $p < 0.001$). This result is in line with the JD-R theory, where employee engagement can increase emotional attachment to the organization, thereby reducing the desire to leave. This finding also supports the studies of Schaufeli & Bakker (2004), Laurensius (2024), and Mobley (1977). However, research by Natalia & Rosiana (2017) and Wiranti et al. (2021) found different results, that the direct effect of employee engagement on turnover intention was not always significant. This difference may reflect variations in the context of the sector or organizational culture. Thus, hypothesis H1 is stated as supported and accepted.

Employee engagement was also shown to have a negative and significant effect on burnout (Model 1: $\beta = -0.730$; $p < 0.001$). This finding strengthens the theory that engagement and burnout are two opposite poles (Maslach & Leiter, 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2002). Studies by Xu (2019) and Weigl et al. (2016) also confirmed that high work engagement can act as a buffer against chronic work pressure. However, notes from Turan-Torun et al. (2025) show that in a digital environment with high expectations, engagement can actually trigger burnout, so contextualization remains important. With these results, hypothesis H2 is accepted and supported.

Supervisor support in this study did not show a significant effect on turnover intention (Model 2: $p = 0.256$). This is contrary to the findings of Putri (2025) and Siddiqi & Rahman (2025), who emphasized the importance of superior support in fostering organizational commitment. The findings of this study are more in line with the study of Győri and Perpek (2025), who found that in organizations with high workloads, supervisor support alone is not effective enough. Therefore, hypothesis H3 is rejected.

Supervisor support has no significant effect on burnout (Model 1: $p = 0.648$). This result is different from the study of Andersen & Pihl-Thingvad (2025) and Nguyen et al. (2025) who found a protective role of supervisors in reducing burnout. However, the results of this study are consistent with Flaharty (2025), who emphasized the importance of other factors such as job autonomy and individual coping in reducing burnout. Therefore, hypothesis H4 is also rejected.

Coworker support is proven to have a negative and significant effect on turnover intention (Model 2: $\beta = -0.443$; $p = 0.016$). This finding is consistent with the theory of Chiaburu & Harrison (2008) and research by Zhang et al. (2024), which states that coworker support strengthens employee loyalty. However, Andrews & Dawley (2025) warn that group solidarity can also have a negative side if it is not balanced with performance monitoring. With these results, hypothesis H5 is accepted and supported.

Coworker support also showed a significant negative effect on burnout (Model 1: $\beta = -0.280$; $p = 0.013$). This finding supports the results of Shakiba et al. (2025) and Nguyen et al. (2025) which confirmed the effectiveness of peer support in reducing psychological exhaustion. However, Kemter (2024) showed that in public bureaucracy, the effect of coworker support on burnout can be less effective than good work design. Therefore, hypothesis H6 is stated as accepted and supported.

In the moderation test, supervisor support does not moderate the relationship between employee engagement and turnover intention (Model 2: $p = 0.848$). This finding is in line with Shahbaz (2025) who emphasized the role of the reward system compared to supervisor support in strengthening the influence of engagement on turnover intention. Therefore, hypothesis H7 is rejected.

In the relationship between employee engagement and burnout, supervisor support actually shows a significant interaction effect in the opposite direction (Model 1: $\beta = +0.255$; $p = 0.036$). The higher the supervisor support, the negative effect of engagement on burnout actually weakens. This potentially reflects the phenomenon of "overmanagement" (Schaufeli & Taris,

2014; Bakker, 2005), where supervisors increase expectations for engaged employees, thereby increasing the psychological burden. Thus, hypothesis H8 is statistically significant, but the direction of the relationship is not supported. Coworker support was not proven to moderate the relationship between engagement and turnover intention (Model 2: p = 0.658), in line with Ahmad (2016) who found that embeddedness from coworkers is not necessarily sufficient to prevent turnover in bureaucracy. Therefore, hypothesis H9 is rejected.

In contrast, coworker support was shown to significantly moderate the relationship between engagement and burnout (Model 1: β = –0.330; p = 0.029). The higher the peer support, the stronger the effect of engagement in suppressing burnout. These results support the JD-R theory and the findings of Bourgoin et al. (2024) and Smith (2024). Thus, hypothesis H10 is stated to be supported.

In general, the results of this study strengthen the main role of employee engagement and coworker support in reducing burnout and turnover intention. However, the role of supervisor support as a moderator is not fully proven, and even has the potential to weaken the effect of engagement on burnout. These findings indicate the importance of strengthening the quality of supervisor support in a more empathetic and adaptive manner, in line with the context of modern organizations.

5. Conclusion

This study aims to examine the effect of employee engagement on turnover intention and burnout, as well as to examine the role of supervisor support and coworker support both as direct predictors and as moderating variables, using the Moderated Regression Analysis (MRA) approach in two separate models.

The results of the analysis show that employee engagement has a significant negative effect on burnout and turnover intention. The higher the employee engagement, the lower the level of emotional exhaustion and the desire to leave the organization. Coworker support is also proven to have a significant negative effect on both outcomes, emphasizing the importance of peer support in building psychological resilience and employee loyalty.

In contrast, supervisor support did not show a significant direct effect on either burnout or turnover intention. Although theoretically supervisor support plays an important social resource, in the context of this study its role is weaker than coworker support. In testing the moderation effect, coworker support was shown to moderate the relationship between employee engagement and burnout, where the higher the coworker support, the stronger the influence of engagement in reducing burnout. However, the moderation effect of coworker support was not proven to be significant in relation to turnover intention. Meanwhile, supervisor support showed interesting moderation results: supervisor support actually weakened the influence of engagement on burnout significantly (opposite moderation), and did not moderate the influence of engagement on turnover intention.

This finding strengthens the partial validity of the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory which places employee engagement and coworker support as important resources in reducing burnout and turnover intention. However, the role of supervisor support as a moderator does not always run according to theoretical expectations and shows the complexity of relations in the public bureaucratic environment.

Acknowledgements

We express our sincere gratitude to all individuals and organizations who contributed to the development and completion of this manuscript.

References

Adawiyah, R. et al. (2018), "The Relationship between Social Support and Burnout in Hospital Employees".

Ahmad, A. (2016). Moderating effect of coworker support on the relationship between HRM practices, organizational climate, leadership styles and organizational commitment.

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions. Sage Publications.

Andersen, L. B., & Pihl-Thingvad, S. (2025).How Superiors Support Employees to Manage Emotional Demands: A Qualitative Study

Á Győri, E Perpek (2025), "Who exits? Hungarian Social Workers Turnover".

Belete, A., (2018). "Turnover intention influencing factors of employees: an empirical work Review. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Organization Management.

Bourgoin Boucher, C., Ivers, H., & Biron, C. (2024). Mechanisms explaining the longitudinal effect of psychosocial safety climate on work engagement and emotional exhaustion.

Childs, B., Weidman, J., Farnsworth, C., & Christofferson, J. (2017). "Use of personality profile assessments in the US commercial construction industry. International Journal of Construction Education and Research".

Costa, V., & Monteiro, S. (2016). "Key knowledge Management Processes for Innovation: A Systematic Literature Review". Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems.

Dessler, G. (2017). Human Resource Management (15th ed.)

Flaharty, KL (2025).Perceived Supervisor Support and Its Role in the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Chronic Illness Symptoms.

Gujarati, D. N., & Porter, D. C. (2009). Basic Econometrics (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Ghozali, I. (2018). Multivariate Analysis Application with IBM SPSS 25 Program (9th Edition)

Hair, J.F., Hult, G.T.M., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Sage Publications.

Hair, JF, Black, WC, Babin, BJ, & Anderson, RE (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis (7th ed.). Pearson.

Hikmatullah, F. (2016), "The Relationship between Employee Engagement and Burnout in IT Division Employees".

Islamy, F. J (2017), "The Influence of Employee Engagement on Turnover Intention of Permanent Lecturers at the Indonesian Building College of Economics".

Jameel, A., & Ul Haq, M. A. (2024). Impact of Supervisory Support on Turnover Intention: Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy and Work Engagement in Higher Education Institutions. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations

Kurniawati, N. and Raharja, E. (2023), "The Influence of Employee Engagement on Organizational Performance: A Systematic Review".

Labiib, A. (2013), "Analysis of Social Relationships of Coworkers and Superiors with Burnout Levels in Mental Hospital Nurses".

Laurensius, O. (2024), "The Influence of Employee Engagement on Turnover Intentions of Employees in the Finance & Accounting Division of PT. Thamrin Brothers A. Rivai Palembang".

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal, and Coping. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Lestari, D. and Margaretha, M. (2021), "Work life balance, job engagement and turnover intention: Experience from Y generation employees".
Linton, R. (1936). The Study of Man. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction in MD Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.
Maesaroh, I. and Fadili, D. (2024), "The Influence of Coworker Support and Work Engagement on Turnover Intentions of Permanent Indomaret Employees in Jonggol District".
Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). "The Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do About It."
Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008), "Early predictors of job burnout and engagement"
Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior.
Molestane, M. (2017), "The Impact of Employee Engagement on Organizational Productivity: Case Study of the UVS".
Montani, F., Vandenberghe, C., & Grenier, J. (2025). Turning strain into gain: The role of managerial compassion in the relationship between work engagement and emotional exhaustion.
Mukti, U., and Andriyani (2018), "Analysis of the Influence of Work Stress, Work Support and Salary Satisfaction on Nurses' Turnover Intention".
Natalia and Rosiana (2017), "Analysis of the Influence of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance and Turnover Intention at Hotel D'Season Surabaya".
Nayak, B. and Sarangi, P. (2016), "Employee Engagement and Its Impact on Organizational Success - A Study in Manufacturing Company, India".
Newbold, P., Carlson, W.L., & Thorne, B. (2013). Statistics for Business and Economics (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
Nguyen, H.H., Tran, T.T., & Vo, T.P. (2025).Social Support and Burnout in Vietnamese Manufacturing Workers
Novrandy, R. and Tanuwijaya, J., (2022), "The Effect of Work-Family Conflict and Work Engagement on Task Performance and Turnover Intention with Supervisor Support Mediation".
Purnama, R. et al. (2023), "Burnout in Female Employees Reviewed from Work Family Conflict and Coworker Support".
Princess (2025), " The Influence of Supervisor Support on Turnover Intention Mediated by Work Engagement on Employees of GlobalXtreme Company"
Rokhman, F. (2022), "The Effect of Employee Engagement on Turnover Intention with Organizational Commitment as a Mediating Variable at CV Karya Perdana, Sumbermulyo Village, Jombang Regency".
Schaufeli, W. and Bakker, A. (2004), "Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multi-sample study".
Siddiqi, K. and Rahman, Md. (2025). "Supervisor Support among Bangladeshi Nurses".
Smith, N. A. (2024). Service employees' occupation-based metaperceptions and coworker support: A self-verification perspective
Solihin et al., (2020), "The Influence of Work Engagement and Organizational Commitment on Employee Turnover Intention Levels at PT Telkom Akses Balikpapan".
Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of Intergroup Relations,
Tennakoon and Herat (2021), "Perceived Supervisor Support and Employee Turnover Intention: The Moderating Effect of Employee Tenure."

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review.

Turan-Torun, F., Vandenberghe, C., & Grenier, J. (2025).Burnout and heavy work investment in digital leadership: A paradox of engagement?

Triastuti, N. et al. (2023), "Social Support with Burnout in Employees".

Van Dick, R., Baethge, A., & Junker, N. (2024). Remote work and employee well-being: Boundary conditions for supervisor support.

Weigl (2016), "The associations of supervisor support and work overload with burnout and depression: A cross-sectional study in two nursing settings".

Wijaya, G. (2024), "The Influence of Coworker Support and Work Environment on Turnover Intention through Work Motivation in Gen Y and Gen Z Workers in Malang City".

Wiranti, et al. (2021), "Analysis of Employee Engagement on Employee Performance and Turnover Intention through Organizational Commitment as an Intervening Variable on Private Bank Employees".

Xu, S. (2018). Crisis communication within a community: Bonding, coping, and making sense together. Public Relations Review

Yulia, A. et al. (2020), "Burnout in Nurses at Dr. Muhamamad Zein Painan Regional Hospital: Strategic Leadership as a Moderator".

Y. Zhang, W. Xu, et al.(2024), "Child Protection and Practice".9. https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0001055