



The Effect of Employee Engagement (Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption) on Job Satisfaction at PT Pelindo 1

Eny Ariyanto¹, Moch Hamied Wijaya², Anindya Nurani Mutiara Sari³

^{1,2} Lecturer at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta

³ Lecturer at Universitas Mitra Bangsa, Jakarta

ABSTRACT: This study examines the effect of employee engagement variables—vigor, dedication, and absorption—on job satisfaction. The research subjects consisted of all employees of PT Pelindo 1 in 2020. A total of 225 employees were selected as the sample using a simple random sampling method. Primary data were collected through a questionnaire instrument. To test the research hypotheses, data were analyzed using a multiple linear regression model. The results indicate that employee engagement and vigor have a significant but weak positive effect on job satisfaction. In contrast, dedication and absorption show a positive but statistically insignificant effect. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 14%, suggesting that vigor, dedication, and absorption are weak predictors of job satisfaction.

KEYWORDS: Employee Engagement, Vigor, Dedication, Absorption, Job Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

In recent studies, employee engagement and job satisfaction have become the main focus of human resource management studies. Schaufeli et al. (2002) defines employee engagement as a positive mental state associated with work, characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is defined as the degree to which a person feels satisfied or dissatisfied with their job. This definition includes an overall evaluation of how the individual feels about various aspects of the job (Greenberg & Baron, 2008). Employee engagement is recognized as one of the key factors that drive employee productivity and commitment to the organization (Kahn, 1990). On the other hand, job satisfaction is often considered a key indicator of employee well-being, which directly affects retention rates and organizational performance (Locke, 1976). Previous studies have shown that job satisfaction plays an important role in increasing productivity, decreasing employee turnover rates, and creating a positive work environment (Judge et al., 2001).

Although many studies show that employee engagement has a significant influence on job satisfaction (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Saks, 2006), there are still some gaps in this research that need to be highlighted. Among them are some research results that show a relationship that is not always linear between employee engagement and job satisfaction (Xanthopoulou et.al 2009; Christian et.al 2011). Similarly, the gap arises due to limitations in the context of the type of industry and location of the study.

On a number of themes, research on the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction has been conducted in western countries as well as in specific industry contexts, such as the banking, healthcare, technology and education sectors. However, research in the cultural context of some Asian countries, particularly in high-pressure sectors such as manufacturing or healthcare, is limited. This proves the need for cross-cultural studies in various sectors to understand the dynamics of the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction in company employees.

Previous studies often measured employee engagement in general terms without distinguishing the influence of specific dimensions, such as cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Saks, 2006). This makes it difficult to understand how each dimension of employee engagement contributes to job satisfaction.

To understand and enrich the empirical gap analysis as mentioned above, this research will be conducted with a population of employees at PT. Pelabuhan Indonesia 1 (PT. Pelindo 1). PT Pelindo 1 is a company in the form of a state-owned enterprise (BUMN) domiciled in Indonesia and operates in the field of seaport services. Company employees are positioned as research respondents. As research subjects, employees will independently measure the intensity of employee engagement and job satisfaction that occur in each of them. Furthermore, based on the gap analysis, this study aims to examine the causal relationship between the dimensions of employee engagement and job satisfaction variables at PT Pelindo 1, which has a different cultural and industrial context



LITERATURE REVIEW AND HIPOTHESIS

Employee Engagement. Human resource researchers provide different narratives regarding the concept and definition of employee engagement variables. However, with interesting and effective phrases, and departing from their respective scientific perspectives, there are still similarities in the substance of the content of the concept of employee engagement. Gallup (2013) defines employee engagement as the level of positive emotions that employees have towards their work. Engaged employees not only work well but also have a high sense of responsibility towards the company. Harter et. al. (2002) identified employee engagement as the level of involvement and enthusiasm that employees have towards their work. Furthermore, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) define employee engagement as a positive, energized, and committed state related to work. They divide engagement into three components: passion, dedication, and absorption. Kahn (1990) defines employee engagement as a condition when individuals express themselves fully during work

In essence, the employee engagement variable is a psychological concept that describes how much employees are emotionally, mentally, and physically connected to their work. They focus on three main dimensions, namely: engagement, commitment, and job satisfaction. They associate engagement with better outcomes for the organization, such as higher productivity and lower absenteeism.

Employee engagement has three main dimensions (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004):

- a) **Vigor:** The level of energy and endurance during work. Vigor refers to high energy levels and strong mental resilience during work. Employees who have vigor tend to be enthusiastic, not easily tired, and have the motivation to keep trying despite challenges.
- b) **Dedication:** Deep emotional involvement with work, accompanied by feelings of pride and motivation. Dedication refers to deep emotional involvement, where employees feel enthusiastic, proud, and inspired by their work. Dedicated employees feel their work is meaningful, important and in line with their personal values.
- c) **Absorption:** The level of total involvement, where the employee finds it difficult to disengage from work. Absorption refers to a state of complete focus and total involvement in the work, such that the employee feels time passes quickly and it is difficult to disengage from the task. This dimension reflects the feeling of being fully engaged in the work and enjoying the process.

Job Satisfaction. The job satisfaction variable can generally be defined as a positive or negative attitude or feeling about one's job resulting from an evaluation of the characteristics of his job. Robbins & Judge (2017) define job satisfaction as a positive or negative feeling that an individual has towards their job. If individuals feel that their jobs match their expectations, then they tend to feel satisfied. According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction is a positive or pleasant emotional state resulting from a person's assessment of their job or work experience. This variable is often measured through several key dimensions that reflect important aspects of the work experience.

Job satisfaction variables are often measured through several main dimensions that reflect important aspects of the work experience. The dimensions of job satisfaction are (Robbins & Judge, 2017):

- a) **Work Itself.** Refers to the extent to which employees are satisfied with the content, responsibilities, and challenges of the work they do. Employees feel satisfied when work provides meaning, variety, and opportunities to use their skills.
- b) **Pay and Benefits.** Refers to employee perceptions of the fairness, appropriateness, and attractiveness of pay and other benefits (bonuses, allowances). Employees are satisfied when the compensation received is perceived as fair compared to their contribution or industry standards.
- c) **Coworkers.** Describes the quality of social and professional relationships between employees in the work environment. Employees who have good relationships with coworkers tend to feel more satisfied and comfortable at work.
- d) **Supervision.** Refers to employees' perceptions of the quality, fairness, and support provided by immediate supervisors. Effective supervision involves clear communication, rewards for performance, and support in dealing with work difficulties.
- e) **Opportunities for Advancement.** Involves perceptions of opportunities for promotion, training, and skills development. Employees are satisfied if there is a clear career path and opportunities to improve their competencies.
- f) **Work Environment.** Refers to the physical conditions of the workplace, such as cleanliness, comfort, safety, and available facilities. A supportive work environment can improve employee well-being and reduce stress.

Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction. The empirical research results of Bakker & Demerouti (2007) show a positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. Employees who are emotionally and cognitively engaged in their work tend to feel satisfied because they have a clear understanding of their contribution to organizational goals (Saks, 2006).



Similarly, the research findings of Christian et al. (2011) proved that employees' high involvement in their work shows a higher sense of pride, enthusiasm, and emotional attachment, all of which contribute to job satisfaction. Schaufeli and Bakker's (2004) research found employee engagement significantly increases job satisfaction because engaged employees feel valued, have clear goals, and enjoy their work. However, there are also several factors that moderate the relationship between the two variables. Some of these moderating variables include leadership style, organizational support, and work culture, which can strengthen the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction (Christian et al., 2011).

Hypothesis 1: *Employee engagement has a positive effect on job satisfaction*

Vigor, Dedication, Absorption and Job Satisfaction. From several research findings, it has been proven that employee engagement has a positive correlation and influence on job satisfaction. Similarly, the dimensions of vigor, dedication, absorption have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction. A few studies have proven that the three dimensions of employee engagement collectively have a positive influence on job satisfaction (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; May et al., 2004; Saks, 2006; Rich et al., 2010; Gupta & Sharma, 2016). Partially, some research findings also show strong evidence that the dimensions of employee engagement have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, namely: vigor (Salanova et al., 2005; Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Shuck et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2012; Ariani, 2013), dedication (Koyuncu et al., 2006; Hakanen et al., 2006; Albrecht, 2010; Mone et al., 2011), absorption (Salanova et al., 2005; Wefald & Downey, 2009; Halbesleben, 2010; Tims et al., 2013). With the strengthening of the findings of the results of studies and research, it can be concluded that these empirical facts can be used to justify that the dimensions of vigor, dedication, and absorption, become the preposition of the hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 2: *Vigor has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction.*

Hypothesis 3: *Dedication has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction*

Hypothesis 4: *Absorption has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction*

RESEARCH METHOD

This study aims to determine the effect of employee engagement (along with the dimensions of vigor, dedication, absorption) on job satisfaction. The research approach used is a quantitative method with a causal variable relationship structure design. Data analysis employs statistical techniques of correlation models and simple linear regression (for testing hypotheses 1) and multiple linear regression (testing hypotheses 2, 3, and 4). The research population consists of all employees of PT Pelindo 1, totaling 1,200 individuals based on year-end 2020 data. The research sample size of 225 people was determined as research respondents to generate primary data. The sample was selected using a simple random sampling method. Primary data is used to test the research hypotheses. Primary data for each research variable were collected using a questionnaire. The measured data corresponds to a five-point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. The questionnaire consists of 18 validated items from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) to measure employee engagement and 26 items from the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) to measure job satisfaction. The criteria for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses are based on a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile. The sample of selected respondents was 225 people. The profile of respondents according to gender consisted of 88.71% men and 11.28% women. Respondents by age: under 30 years 17.40%, 30-40 years 2.95%, 41-50 years 32.65%, over 50 years 47.00%. According to education level: less than high school 1.29%, high school and graduate school 33.76%, bachelor's degree 43.89%, master's degree/doctoral degree 7.01%. According to position: supervisor 4.67%, administrative staff 23.90%, technical executive operator 31.16%, executive assistant 16.36%, structural officer 12.4%, director officer 3.80%. According to monthly income: under IDR 10 million 57.66%, IDR 10-20 million 15.76%, above IDR 26.30%.

Correlation Analysis Between Dimensions of Research Variables. Table 1 presents the results of the correlation analysis between dimensions and research variables, all of which show significant positive coefficients. The magnitude of the correlation coefficients is all at a low level and the quality of the relationship is weak. This indicates that everyone has different motivation factors. So, the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction may vary between employees. For example, the vigor dimension of engagement does not always correlate highly with pay satisfaction. The results of the meta-analysis of Harter et al. (2002) show that the relationship between employee engagement dimensions (such as commitment and absorption) and job



satisfaction tends to be weak in certain industrial contexts. Likewise, the results of a study by Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) show that employee engagement dimensions such as vigor and dedication have varying correlations with job satisfaction, often with low to moderate correlation values ($r < 0.40$), especially in high-pressure work environments. For example, an employee may be very engaged but still dissatisfied with the salary or promotion he received.

Table 1. Correlation Coefficient Between Dimensions of Research Variables

Variables		Vigor (VG)	Dedication (DC)	Absorption (AS)	Engagement (EE)
D1JS	Pearson Correlation	.269**	.315**	.306**	.326**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	225	225	225	225
D2JS	Pearson Correlation	.293**	.292**	.236**	.302**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	225	225	225	225
D3JS	Pearson Correlation	.232**	.193**	.165*	.216**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.013	.001
	N	225	225	225	225
D4JS	Pearson Correlation	.238**	.199**	.201**	.234**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.003	.000
	N	225	225	225	225
D5JS	Pearson Correlation	.211**	.240**	.233**	.251**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000
	N	225	225	225	225
D6JS	Pearson Correlation	.379**	.371**	.333**	.397**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	225	225	225	225
Job Satisfaction (JS)	Pearson Correlation	.329**	.327**	.299**	.350**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	225	225	225	225

Source: Primary data processed

Hypothesis Testing Results. Model 1 is a simple linear regression equation $JS = 1.870 + 0.406 EE$. $R^2 = 0.136 = 13.6\%$; F statistic = 35.216 (sig.= 0.000). Coefficient $\beta_1 = 0.406$ (t statistic = 6.047; sig. = 0.000). Conclusion: Hypothesis 1 is accepted. This means that there is a significant positive influence of employee engagement on job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is 13.6%, showing clear evidence that employee engagement has a positive impact on job satisfaction, but the effect is relatively weak. Weakening influence can occur due to high levels of work stress and workload (Karatepe, 2013). Schaufeli et al. (2002) found that employee engagement contributes to job satisfaction, but its influence can be weakened in a less supportive work environment. There are other factors that are more dominant in determining job satisfaction, namely work environment factors and organizational culture (Kahn, 1990), intrinsic job factors (Saks, 2006), strong organizational support and leadership (Rich et al., 2010), work-life balance (Wayne et al., 2004; Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).



Table 2. Regression Coefficient and R² Results from SPSS Version 22

Equation Model	Coefficient	Significancy		R square	F statistic	Sig.
		T statistic	Sig.			
Model 1: JS = 1.870 + 0.406 EE	C ₀ = 1.870 β ₁ = 0.406	6.047 5.934	0.000 0.000	0.136	35.216	0.000
Model 2: JS = 1.892 + 0.200 VG + 0.158 DC + 0.043 AS	C ₁ = 1.892 β ₂ = 0.200 β ₃ = 0.158 β ₄ = 0.043	6.666 2.131 1.455 0.370	 0.034 0.147 0.712	0.140	11.952	0.000

Source: Primary data processed.

Model 2 is a multiple linear regression equation: JS = 1.892 + 0.200 VG + 0.158 DC + 0.043 AS. R² = 0.140; F statistics = 35.216. Coefficient β₂ = 0.200 (t statistic = 2.131; sig. = 0.034); Conclusion: Hypothesis 2 is accepted. This means that there is a significant positive influence of vigor on job satisfaction, but the influence is weak. Table 1 shows the results of calculating the correlation coefficient between vigor and the dimensions of job satisfaction, all of which are at the weak relationship level. Halbesleben (2010) explains that vigor as a dimension of engagement can increase job satisfaction, but its effect can be weakened if there are high work stress factors. Maslach et al. (2001) proves that although vigor contributes positively to job satisfaction, the effect can be weakened if employees experience high work stress and burnout.

Hypothesis test 3: coefficient β₃ = 0.158 (t statistic = 1.455, sig. = 0.147). Conclusion: hypothesis 3 is rejected. This means that there is no significant effect of dedication on job satisfaction. Likewise, the results of hypothesis test 4: coefficient β₄ = 0.043 (t statistic = 0.370, sig. = 0.712). Conclusion: hypothesis 4 is rejected. This means that there is no significant effect of absorption on job satisfaction. In model 2, the coefficient of determination (R²) = 0.140 is obtained. This proves that the simultaneous influence of vigor, dedication and absorption on job satisfaction is relatively small, namely 14%. Saks' research findings (2006) explain that if organizational involvement is low, the impact of dedication and absorption becomes insignificant on job satisfaction. Factors that the basic psychological needs of employees are not met will have an impact on dedication and absorption which is not enough to increase job satisfaction (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Other factors such as low job resources can also weaken the relationship between dedication and absorption and job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The factors that have a significant positive effect on job satisfaction include work autonomy factors (Gagné & Deci, 2005), intrinsic motivation (Parker & Griffin, 2011), job crafting (Tims et al., 2013).

CONCLUSION

This research was conducted at PT Pelindo 1, with a sample of 225 employees as respondents. The findings indicate that employee engagement has a weak positive influence on job satisfaction. A partial analysis reveals that each dimension of employee engagement—vigor, dedication, and absorption—contributes differently to job satisfaction. While these three dimensions collectively have a weak influence on job satisfaction, the coefficient of determination (R²) is 14%, suggesting limited predictive power. Among the dimensions, vigor has the strongest influence, whereas dedication and absorption have a lesser impact. This suggests that job satisfaction is more significantly influenced by other factors, such as organizational culture, work autonomy, compensation, work environment, intrinsic motivation, leadership, and work-life balance.

REFERENCES

1. Albrecht, S. L. (Ed.). (2010). *Handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research and practice*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
2. Ariani, D.W. (2013). The Relationship between Employee Engagement, Organizational Citizenship Behavior, and Counterproductive Work Behavior. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 4(2):46-56
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). *The job demands-resources model: State of the art*. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.
4. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations



- with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 89–136.
5. Gallup. (2013). How Employee Engagement Drives Growth. Business Journal. Retrieved March 11,2016, from: <http://www.gallup.com/businessjournal/163130/employee-engagementdrves-growth.aspx>.
 6. Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
 7. Greenberg, J. & Baron R.A.(2008). *Behavior in Organizations*, Ninth Edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall International Inc.
 8. Gupta, N., Sharma, V. (2016), Exploring employee engagement-a way to better business performance. *Global Business Review*, 17, 45S-63S.
 9. Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513.
 10. Halbesleben, J.R.B. (2010), “A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences”, in Bakker, A.B. and Leiter, M.P. (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, Psychology Press, New York, NY, pp. 102–117
 11. 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. *American Psychological Association*, 87(2), 268-279.
 12. Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, pp. 376–407.
 13. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
 14. Karatepe, O. M. (2013). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 132-140.
 15. Kim, W., Kolb, J.A., Kim, A. (2012), The relationship between work engagement and performance: A review of empirical literature and a proposed research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review*, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 248-276.
 16. Koyuncu, M., Burke, R. J., & Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International*, 25(4), 299–310.
 17. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M. D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
 18. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397-422.
 19. May, D.R., Ison, R.L. & Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
 20. Mone, E., Eisinger, C., Guggenheim, K., Price, B. & Stine, C. (2011). Performance management at the wheel: Driving employee engagement in organizations. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 26, 205–212.
 21. Parker, S. K., & Griffin, M. A. (2011). Understanding Active Psychological States: Embedding Engagement in a Wider Nomological Net and Operationalizing Its Antecedents and Consequences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 23-36.
 22. Rich BL, LePine JA, Crawford ER. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 617–635.
 23. Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
 24. Robbins, SP and Judge, TA (2017). *Organizational Behavior*, Issue 12. Jakarta: Salemba Empat Publisher.
 25. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78
 26. Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227. doi:org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217
 27. Schaufeli, et.al. (2006). “The Measurement of Work Engagement With a Short Questionnaire A Cross-National Study”. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 66 No.5, pp 701-716.



28. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
29. Schaufeli, et.al. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A CrossNational Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 33 No.5, pp 464-481.
30. Shuck, B., Reio, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human Resource Development International*, 14(4), 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2011.601587>
31. Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67(7), 545-556.
32. Tims, M., Bakker, A.B., Derks, D. and van Rhenen, W. (2013), “Job crafting at the team and individual level: Implications for work engagement and performance”, *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 427–454.
33. Wayne, J. H., Musisca, N., & Fleeson, W. (2004). Considering the role of personality in the work–family experience: Relationships of the Big Five to work–family conflict and facilitation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1), 108-130.
34. Wefald, A.J., & Downey, R.G. (2009). Job engagement in organizations: Fad, fashion, or folderol? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 141-145. doi: 10.1002/job.560
35. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235–244. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003

Cite this Article: Ariyanto, E., Wijaya, M.H., Sari, A.N.M. (2025). The Effect of Employee Engagement (Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption) on Job Satisfaction at PT Pelindo 1. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 8(2), pp. 673-679. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i2-11>