

## Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction as Correlates of Employee Loyalty at Haibro

Mira Agustina<sup>1</sup>, Didi Sunardi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

### Article History

Received : 26 August 2026  
Revised : 28 August 2026  
Accepted : 21 September 2026  
Published : 22 September 2026

### Corresponding author\*:

Mira Agustina

### Contact:

[agustinmira48@gmail.com](mailto:agustinmira48@gmail.com)

### Cite This Article:

Agustina, M., & Sunardi, D. (2026). Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction as Correlates of Employee Loyalty at Haibro. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 5(05), 80–86.

### DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.56127/jukim.v5i05.3080>

**Abstract:** Haibro's internal records show loyalty rising from 74% in 2023 to 84% in 2025, below its 97% target; evidence from small regency-based e-commerce retailers is limited. **Objective:** This study examined employee engagement and job satisfaction in relation to loyalty among Haibro employees in Lebak Regency. **Method:** A quantitative survey used saturated sampling of 51 employees, observation, and a five-point Likert questionnaire collected from November 2025 to July 2026. Data were analyzed in IBM SPSS Statistics 30 using multiple regression, t tests, the F test, and  $R^2$ . Findings: Engagement ( $B = 0.230$ ,  $\beta = 0.257$ ,  $t = 2.343$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ) and job satisfaction ( $B = 0.694$ ,  $\beta = 0.613$ ,  $t = 5.590$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) were positively associated with loyalty; the model was significant,  $F(2, 48) = 40.765$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $R^2 = 0.629$ , and adjusted  $R^2 = 0.614$ . **Implications:** Management can assess engagement and satisfaction practices alongside other retention factors. Originality: This census examines both predictors in a small e-commerce fashion retailer in Lebak; its cross-sectional design does not establish causation.

**Keywords:** employee engagement; job satisfaction; employee loyalty; e-commerce retail; Haibro.

## INTRODUCTION

Employee loyalty supports workforce continuity because employee departures can disrupt staffing, coordination, and accumulated experience (Hom et al., 2017). Organizational commitment is also associated with withdrawal cognitions and turnover, which helps explain why employees' willingness to remain matters to organizations (Meyer et al., 2002). At Haibro, an e-commerce fashion retailer in Lebak Regency, internal records show average employee loyalty rising from 74% in 2023 to 79% in 2024 and 84% in 2025, still below the company's 97% target. The improvement therefore coexists with an unresolved gap against the stated target.

Employee engagement concerns employees' investment of themselves in work roles and the psychological conditions that support engagement and disengagement (Kahn, 1990). Work engagement is commonly described through vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2002), and has been studied in relation to job satisfaction, commitment, and intentions to quit (Saks, 2006). At the business-unit level, employee satisfaction and engagement are associated with outcomes including turnover (Harter et al., 2002), while perceived organizational support is related to job attitudes and reduced withdrawal (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Social exchange theory provides a framework for interpreting reciprocal workplace relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Indonesian studies have examined employee engagement and loyalty among government employees and manufacturing employees (Barus et al., 2025; Putri et al., 2020). Job-satisfaction and loyalty relationships have been studied in creative-industry and insurance contexts (Giovanni & Ie, 2022; Hamisah & Nawawi, 2023). Other studies have considered engagement and satisfaction together in small businesses and public

offices (Firmansyah et al., 2024; Palese et al., 2022), as well as job satisfaction and loyalty among retail employees (Alam et al., 2020).

These studies concern different employers and employee groups; they do not address Haibro's e-commerce retail workforce in Lebak Regency. Haibro's internal figures present a specific empirical question: whether employee engagement and job satisfaction are statistically associated with loyalty among the company's full workforce while loyalty remains below its internal target. Accordingly, this study aimed to examine the partial and simultaneous statistical associations of employee engagement and job satisfaction with employee loyalty among all 51 Haibro employees. Because the measures were collected in a cross-sectional survey at one company, the results are interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This quantitative descriptive study examined the relationships of employee engagement ( $X_1$ ) and job satisfaction ( $X_2$ ) with employee loyalty ( $Y$ ) at Haibro, an e-commerce retailer located in Citra Maja Raya, Maja District, Lebak Regency, Banten, Indonesia. The study was conducted from November 2025 to July 2026.

The population comprised all 51 Haibro employees. Saturated sampling was used, so all members of the population were included as respondents ( $n = 51$ ). The results describe the surveyed workforce at Haibro and are not a probability-based estimate for employees of other organizations.

Primary data were collected through observation and a questionnaire. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Secondary data were obtained from relevant literature and documentation.

Employee engagement ( $X_1$ ) was measured through vigor, dedication, and absorption. Job satisfaction ( $X_2$ ) covered compensation, the work environment, relationships with colleagues and supervisors, career-development opportunities, and job content. Employee loyalty ( $Y$ ) was assessed through compliance, responsibility, dedication, and integrity. Each construct was measured with 10 items, for 30 items in total.

The analysis included item-validity and reliability tests; residual-normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity checks; descriptive statistics; multiple linear regression; correlation; coefficient of determination; partial t tests; and the overall F test. Analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Statistics version 30. Statistical significance was evaluated at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The regression model was:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon$$

In this model,  $Y$  denotes employee loyalty;  $\alpha$  is the intercept;  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are regression coefficients;  $X_1$  is employee engagement;  $X_2$  is job satisfaction; and  $\varepsilon$  is the error term.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Respondent Characteristics

All 51 respondents were employees of Haibro. As shown in Table 1, 34 respondents (66.7%) were women, 42 (82.4%) were aged 21–24 years, and 30 (58.8%) had worked for less than one year. Twenty-seven respondents (52.9%) had completed senior high or vocational school, while 24 (47.1%) held a diploma or bachelor's degree.

**Table 1.** Respondent Characteristics

| Characteristic    | Category    | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| Gender            | Male        | 17        | 33.3           |
|                   | Female      | 34        | 66.7           |
| Age               | 18–20 years | 3         | 5.9            |
|                   | 21–24 years | 42        | 82.4           |
|                   | > 25 years  | 6         | 11.8           |
| Length of Service | < 1 year    | 30        | 58.8           |
|                   | 1–3 years   | 18        | 35.3           |

|                   |                               |    |      |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|----|------|
|                   | > 3 years                     | 3  | 5.9  |
| Highest Education | Senior High/Vocational School | 27 | 52.9 |
|                   | Diploma/Bachelor's Degree     | 24 | 47.1 |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

#### Instrument Validity and Reliability

Table 2 presents the item-validity results. All 30 item correlations exceeded the reported critical value of 0.2759. Employee engagement values ranged from 0.528 to 0.850, job-satisfaction values from 0.568 to 0.770, and employee-loyalty values from 0.670 to 0.912. All items exceeded the reported critical value.

**Table 2.** Item Validity Results

| Variable                              | Item  | Calculated r | Critical r | Decision |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|------------|----------|
| Employee Engagement (X <sub>1</sub> ) | X1.1  | 0.808        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.2  | 0.782        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.3  | 0.775        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.4  | 0.528        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.5  | 0.795        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.6  | 0.849        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.7  | 0.850        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.8  | 0.768        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.9  | 0.828        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X1.10 | 0.719        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
| Job Satisfaction (X <sub>2</sub> )    | X2.1  | 0.685        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.2  | 0.748        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.3  | 0.770        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.4  | 0.571        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.5  | 0.568        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.6  | 0.728        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.7  | 0.670        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.8  | 0.622        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.9  | 0.724        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | X2.10 | 0.658        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
| Employee Loyalty (Y)                  | Y.1   | 0.857        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.2   | 0.885        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.3   | 0.726        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.4   | 0.850        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.5   | 0.824        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.6   | 0.670        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.7   | 0.890        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.8   | 0.912        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.9   | 0.738        | 0.2759     | Valid    |
|                                       | Y.10  | 0.892        | 0.2759     | Valid    |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

The reliability results in Table 3 show Cronbach's alpha values of 0.922 for employee engagement, 0.868 for job satisfaction, and 0.946 for employee loyalty. Each value exceeded the stated 0.600 reliability threshold.

**Table 3.** Reliability Test Results

| Variable                              | Cronbach's Alpha | Threshold | Decision |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|
| Employee Engagement (X <sub>1</sub> ) | 0.922            | 0.600     | Reliable |
| Job Satisfaction (X <sub>2</sub> )    | 0.868            | 0.600     | Reliable |
| Employee Loyalty (Y)                  | 0.946            | 0.600     | Reliable |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

### Classical Assumption Checks

Table 4 reports a Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistic of 0.112 and an asymptotic two-tailed significance value of 0.149 for 51 residual observations. Because 0.149 exceeds 0.05, the test does not indicate a statistically significant departure from normality under the criterion used.

**Table 4.** Residual Normality Test

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test     |                |                         |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
|                                        |                | Unstandardized Residual |
| N                                      |                | 51                      |
| Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>       | Mean           | .0000000                |
|                                        | Std. Deviation | 3.85834762              |
| Most Extreme Differences               | Absolute       | .112                    |
|                                        | Positive       | .112                    |
|                                        | Negative       | -.098                   |
| Test Statistic                         |                | .112                    |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)                 |                | .149 <sup>c</sup>       |
| a. Test distribution is normal.        |                |                         |
| b. Calculated from data.               |                |                         |
| c. Lilliefors significance correction. |                |                         |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

As shown in Table 5, tolerance values for employee engagement and job satisfaction were both 0.643, and both VIF values were 1.556. These values meet the thresholds cited in the original analysis (tolerance above 0.10 and VIF below 10), so the reported diagnostics do not indicate problematic multicollinearity.

**Table 5.** Multicollinearity Test

| Variable                        | Tolerance | VIF   |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| Constant                        | —         | —     |
| <i>Employee Engagement (X1)</i> | 0.643     | 1.556 |
| <i>Job Satisfaction (X2)</i>    | 0.643     | 1.556 |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

The Glejser test results in Table 6 show significance values of 0.061 for employee engagement and 0.092 for job satisfaction. Both exceed 0.05; thus, the test does not indicate heteroskedasticity under the stated procedure and threshold.

**Table 6.** Heteroskedasticity Test (Glejser)

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup>       |                            |                                  |            |                                   |        |      |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------|------|
| Model                           |                            | Unstandardized Coefficients<br>B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients<br>Beta | t      | Sig. |
| 1                               | (Constant)                 | 14.736                           | 2.996      |                                   | 4.919  | .000 |
|                                 | <i>Employee Engagement</i> | -.136                            | .071       | -.292                             | -1.919 | .061 |
|                                 | <i>Job Satisfaction</i>    | -.144                            | .084       | -.261                             | -1.717 | .092 |
| a. Dependent Variable: absresid |                            |                                  |            |                                   |        |      |

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

### Multiple Linear Regression

Table 7 reports the estimated model:  $Y = 5.458 + 0.230X_1 + 0.694X_2 + \varepsilon$ . The intercept of 5.458 represents the predicted loyalty score when both predictors equal zero. Because a zero score for both predictors is outside the observed response scale, the intercept has limited practical interpretation.

Employee engagement had a positive unstandardized coefficient ( $B = 0.230$ ,  $SE = 0.098$ ) and standardized coefficient ( $\beta = 0.257$ ),  $t = 2.343$ ,  $p = 0.023$ . Job satisfaction also had a positive coefficient ( $B = 0.694$ ,  $SE = 0.124$ ;  $\beta = 0.613$ ),  $t = 5.590$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . These  $t$  statistics test each coefficient partially within the same multiple-regression model, controlling for the other predictor; they are not results from separate simple regressions. Job satisfaction has the larger standardized coefficient in this model, indicating a stronger standardized association in this sample, not a causal effect.

**Table 7.** Multiple Linear Regression Results

| Coefficients <sup>a</sup> |                             |            |                           |       |      |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| Model                     | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|                           | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1                         | (Constant)                  | 5.458      |                           | 1.307 | .197 |
|                           | Employee Engagement         | .230       | .098                      | .257  | .023 |
|                           | Job Satisfaction            | .694       | .124                      | .613  | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Loyalty

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

The overall F test in Table 8 was statistically significant,  $F(2, 48) = 40.765$ ,  $p < 0.001$ . The results indicate that employee engagement and job satisfaction were jointly associated with employee-loyalty scores in the analyzed workforce.

**Table 8.** Overall Regression F Test

| ANOVA <sup>a</sup> |            |                |    |             |        |                   |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model              |            | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
| 1                  | Regression | 1264.285       | 2  | 632.143     | 40.765 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|                    | Residual   | 744.342        | 48 | 15.507      |        |                   |
|                    | Total      | 2008.627       | 50 |             |        |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Loyalty

b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

Table 9 reports  $R = 0.793$ ,  $R^2 = 0.629$ , and adjusted  $R^2 = 0.614$ . The model accounts for 62.9% of observed variance in employee-loyalty scores in this sample (61.4% after adjustment); the remaining variation is outside the fitted model. These statistics describe model fit and do not establish causation.

**Table 9.** Model Summary and Coefficient of Determination

| Model Summary |                   |          |                   |                            |
|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model         | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1             | .793 <sup>a</sup> | .629     | .614              | 3.938                      |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction, Employee Engagement

Source: Authors' survey data processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 30 (2026).

## Discussion

Mean scores were 3.98 for employee engagement, 4.05 for job satisfaction, and 4.27 for employee loyalty, classified as good to very good. The regression results add that both predictors had positive partial associations with loyalty, with job satisfaction showing the larger standardized coefficient. Because the survey covered one company at one period, the findings are limited to this context and do not show that changes in engagement or satisfaction caused changes in loyalty.

## Employee Engagement and Employee Loyalty

Employee engagement was positively associated with employee loyalty after accounting for job satisfaction ( $B = 0.230$ ,  $\beta = 0.257$ ,  $t = 2.343$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ). This is directionally consistent with studies of employee engagement and loyalty in other organizational settings (Barus et al., 2025; Putri et al., 2020; Palese et al., 2022). The Haibro result extends that contextual discussion to an e-commerce fashion retailer in a regency setting. The cross-sectional questionnaire design does not establish a causal mechanism.

### Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty

Job satisfaction was positively associated with employee loyalty in the multiple-regression model ( $B = 0.694$ ,  $\beta = 0.613$ ,  $t = 5.590$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Its standardized coefficient was larger than that for employee engagement, though both are specific to this fitted sample. This direction is consistent with studies examining satisfaction and loyalty in creative-industry, insurance, and small-business contexts (Giovanni & Ie, 2022; Hamisah & Nawawi, 2023; Alam et al., 2020; Firmansyah et al., 2024). Differences in samples and predictor sets limit direct comparisons across studies.

### Joint Relationship and Practical Implications

The joint model was significant and accounted for 62.9% of observed variation in loyalty scores (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.614$ ). Haibro's internal records indicate that loyalty had not reached its 97% target by 2025, while relatively lower employee ratings were reported for compensation and promotion opportunities. Management may review those job-satisfaction dimensions alongside engagement practices such as employee participation, recognition, and communication. The survey did not test those specific actions, so they are considerations for evaluation rather than effects demonstrated by the model.

### CONCLUSION

Among the 51 Haibro employees included in this census, employee engagement ( $B = 0.230$ ,  $\beta = 0.257$ ,  $t = 2.343$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ) and job satisfaction ( $B = 0.694$ ,  $\beta = 0.613$ ,  $t = 5.590$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) were each positively associated with employee loyalty in the multiple-regression model. The predictors were jointly significant,  $F(2, 48) = 40.765$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; the model reported  $R^2 = 0.629$  and adjusted  $R^2 = 0.614$ . Job satisfaction had the larger standardized coefficient in this sample. These findings describe associations among questionnaire scores at one company and do not establish causal effects or generalize beyond this study context. Haibro's management may evaluate engagement and job-satisfaction initiatives, including compensation and career-development opportunities, while monitoring loyalty against the company target.

### REFERENCES

- Alam, P. N., Mita, R. J., Yana, Y., & Sanjaya, V. F. (2020). Pengaruh kompensasi, kepuasan kerja, dan beban kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada PT Indomarco Prismatama [The effect of compensation, job satisfaction, and workload on employee loyalty at PT Indomarco Prismatama]. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Saburai*, 6(2), 69–76. doi:10.24967/jmb.v6i2.1025
- Barus, Y. B., Normi, S., & Panjaitan, M. (2025). Pengaruh employee engagement, inklusivitas organisasi, dan kolaborasi terhadap loyalitas pegawai pada Badan Kepegawaian dan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia (BKPSDM) Kota Medan [The effect of employee engagement, organizational inclusivity, and collaboration on employee loyalty at the Medan City Personnel and Human Resources Development Agency]. *Journal Economics and Strategy*, 6(1), 173–182. <https://jurnal.utnd.ac.id/index.php/jes/article/view/1828>
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900. doi:10.1177/0149206305279602
- Firmansyah, R. A. D., Firdaus, V., & Indayani, L. (2024). Pengaruh budaya organisasi, employee engagement, dan kepuasan kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan pada UD. Bumbu Masak Machmudah (BMM) [The effect of organizational culture, employee engagement, and job satisfaction on employee loyalty at UD. Bumbu Masak Machmudah (BMM)]. *Jurnal Administrasi dan Manajemen*, 14(4), 544–555. doi:10.52643/jam.v14i4.5401
- Giovanni, V. F., & Ie, M. (2022). Pengaruh lingkungan kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap loyalitas karyawan di industri kreatif [The effect of work environment and job satisfaction on employee loyalty in the creative industry]. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 4(1), 232–242. doi:10.24912/jmk.v4i1.17196
- Hamisah, S., & Nawawi, M. T. (2023). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja, kompetensi, dan komitmen organisasional terhadap loyalitas pegawai di Taspen Life Jakarta [The effect of job satisfaction, competence, and organizational commitment on employee loyalty at Taspen Life Jakarta]. *Jurnal Manajerial dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(2), 474–483. doi:10.24912/jmk.v5i2.23418
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268–279. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268
- Hom, P. W., Lee, T. W., Shaw, J. D., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2017). One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 530–545. doi:10.1037/apl0000103

- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724. doi:10.5465/256287
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20–52. doi:10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842
- Palese, C. K., Saleh, M. Y., & Yunus, K. (2022). Pengaruh human capital dan employee engagement terhadap loyalitas pegawai dimediasi oleh kepuasan kerja pada Bagian Protokol dan Komunikasi Pimpinan Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Sinjai [The effect of human capital and employee engagement on employee loyalty, mediated by job satisfaction, in the Protocol and Leadership Communication Section of the Sinjai Regency Regional Secretariat]. *Indonesian Journal of Business and Management*, 4(2), 190–199. doi:10.35965/jbm.v4i2.1499
- Putri, A. A., Suwarsi, S., & Frendika, R. (2020). Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap loyalitas dan kinerja karyawan CV Core Rubber [The effect of employee engagement on employee loyalty and performance at CV Core Rubber]. *Prosiding Manajemen*, 6(2), 759–765. doi:10.29313/v6i2.22882
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619. doi: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. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326