



The Effect of Work-Study Conflict on Student Engagement in Working Student

Haifa Auliya¹, Lupi Yudhaningrum², Herdiyan Maulana³, Mohamad Abdilah Nuradhi³

¹⁾ haifaauliya@gmail.com, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

²⁾ lupiyudhaningrum@unj.ac.id, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

³⁾ herdiyan-maulana@unj.ac.id, State University of Jakarta, Indonesia

³⁾ mohamad.abdilah@gmail.com, Muhammadiyah University of Tangerang, Indonesia

Article Info:

Keywords:

Student Engagement
Working Students
Work-Study Conflict

Article History:

Received : May 25th, 2025
Revised : May 29th, 2025
Accepted : May 30th, 2025

Article Doi:

10.22441/merpsy.v17i1.33692

Abstract:

This research aims to determine the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement in working students. The subjects of this research were 266 undergraduate students in Indonesia who were actively working. Sampling used a non-probability sampling technique with a purposive sampling method. The measuring tool uses the Student Engagement Scale and the Work-Study Conflict Scale. The results indicate a negative and significant effect of work-study conflict on student engagement in students working. This study is expected to provide an understanding of the condition of students who pursue higher education while working, by examining whether their dual roles lead to work-study conflict and influence their level of student engagement.

How to cite :

Auliya, H., Yudhaningrum, L., Maulana, H., & Nuradhi, M.A. (2025). The effect of work-study conflict on student engagement in working student. *Merpsy Journal*, 1(1), 36-52.

Introduction

Education is one of the key factors in a nation's success. Therefore, education plays a crucial role in shaping individuals who can contribute to and benefit society. The need for education exists in every individual, and many even continue their studies at higher levels, such as universities. In Indonesia alone, there are 4,717 higher education institutions, consisting of universities, academies, polytechnics, colleges, and institutes (Setiawan & Lenawati, 2020). Among these categories, one of the most

prominent is the university. Within the university education system, students are the main actors. Students are expected to bring about positive intellectual change and deepen their knowledge (Papilaya & Huliselan, 2016). Furthermore, according to Wulandari & Pratama (2023), students are also obligated to study, and the outcomes of this learning process can be measured through their Grade Point Average (GPA).

To achieve a good GPA, students are required to demonstrate strong student engagement, meaning they are prepared to complete assignments in various forms, handle a heavy course load, and adapt to various academic conditions. According to Fredricks et al. (2004), student engagement refers to a condition in which individuals actively participate in activities, both academic and extracurricular, as seen through several aspects: behavioral engagement, emotional engagement, and cognitive engagement (Ginting & Ratnaningsih, 2021). This engagement is crucial to support the learning process and achieve satisfying results, such as a high GPA. Students with high academic involvement tend to employ effective learning strategies during their studies. In addition, student engagement can also serve as a predictor that reflects a learner's level of attention, effort, persistence, positive emotions, and commitment in the learning process (Pratama & Guspa, 2022).

On the other hand, some individuals not only take on the role of a student but also work simultaneously. Despite this, working students are still expected to manage themselves in completing both sets of tasks—academic and professional—divide their focus between the two activities, and maintain their physical well-being to avoid exhaustion. The phenomenon of students studying while working has become increasingly common (Robert, 2012, as cited in Mardelina & Muhson, 2017). In fact, according to Indonesia's Central Statistics Agency (BPS), in 2020, 6.98% of individuals aged 10–24 were both attending school/university and working (Databoks, 2021). Working students are defined as individuals who carry out their university activities while also holding part-time or full-time jobs (Febrianti et al., 2020).

There are several reasons why students choose to work while studying, such as to survive, to gain experience, to improve their skills, to expand their networks, and to increase their presence before eventually entering the workforce (Lestari, 2011, as cited

in Rifda & Pratiwi, 2020). Moreover, this phenomenon is also driven by the fact that many university graduates struggle to find employment. As a result, some students begin seeking work even while they are still in university. Internship programs are among the most popular forms of work taken on by students.

)To strengthen the research rationale and as an initial step in developing the research model, the researcher conducted a preliminary study by interviewing five students who both study and work, namely students with the initials AM, TF, SZ, ZA, and BM. Based on the interview results, it can be concluded that working students experience role conflict, which affects their engagement in academic activities. This was evidenced by a decline in their concentration on coursework and a tendency to prioritize work over university tasks. Furthermore, their work involvement disrupted their academic focus, causing their student role to be frequently sacrificed. Additionally, some students admitted to occasionally paying others to complete their assignments and acknowledged that they pursued a degree mainly for the sake of obtaining a diploma, signaling low academic engagement. The subjects also reported using their days off or free time to rest due to work-related exhaustion, and sometimes they even skipped classes when they were too tired from work.

Given the fact that working students face challenges in their academic process, they are increasingly required to balance their dual roles by effectively managing time between studying and working. Studying while working can pose a threat to students if these two roles are not balanced, as it often leads to one activity being sacrificed, ultimately impacting academic performance. Typically, the most frequently sacrificed activity is time allocated for studying on campus (Octavia & Nugraha, 2013). Ideally, students should maintain a high level of commitment to their academic responsibilities. The interview results also confirmed that many students tend to prioritize their jobs over their academic demands.

This reality reinforces the assertion that students who choose to study while working are more likely to experience role conflict. In fact, they often struggle to balance their role as students with their role as employees. This was also reflected in

the interview findings, where subjects reported difficulties managing time between studying and working. Such imbalances lead to what is known as work-study conflict. Work-study conflict refers to a conflict between the demands of the work role and the demands of the student role in participating in campus learning. This can be seen through several aspects: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict (Mills et al., 2007; Ginting & Ratnaningsih, 2021).

A study conducted by Ginting & Ratnaningsih (2021) on working students revealed that there is a relationship between work-study conflict and student engagement among full-time working students in the Informatics Engineering program at UNISBANK Semarang. The relationship was negative, meaning that the higher the level of work-study conflict, the lower the level of student engagement. The study also found that most participants experienced low levels of work-study conflict and high levels of student engagement. Nevertheless, the study reported that work-study conflict contributed effectively by 43.7% in predicting student engagement, while the remaining 56.3% was effected by other factors not identified in the study. Although many previous studies have revealed that working students tend to have a negative relationship with student engagement, prior research by Creed et al. (2015) found that student self-development can actually emerge from working students. Moreover, that study indicated no conflict between work and university roles in terms of engagement (dedication or enthusiasm) and general well-being. This finding suggests that not all research aligns with the notion that there is a negative relationship between work-study conflict and student engagement. Therefore, a gap exists between this study and previous research due to the differences in findings, as other studies have indicated that working students may experience positive impacts

Based on the issues and previous studies, the researcher is interested in investigating and confirming whether working students experience work-study conflict that affects their academic engagement as university students (student engagement). Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working students. The hypothesis in this study

is that there is a significant effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working students.

Method

This study employs a quantitative research approach. Furthermore, it uses an explanatory research design. This type of research was chosen to allow the researcher to observe the causal (cause-and-effect) relationship between variables (Siyoto & Sodik, 2015; as cited in Priyono, 2018). In this study, the independent variable is work-study conflict, while the dependent variable is student engagement.

The population of this study consists of university students in Indonesia who are also working. A sample is defined as a subset of the population selected for study (Priyono, 2018). The criteria for the research sample are as follows: (1) active undergraduate (S1) students enrolled in public or private universities in Indonesia; (2) actively participating in coursework in accordance with the syllabus (RPS); and (3) currently working (either full-time, part-time, or in an internship). This study employs a non-probability sampling technique using purposive sampling. According to Roscoe, as cited in the book *Research Methods for Business*, an appropriate sample size for research ranges between 30 and 500 respondents (Sugiyono, 2019).

The data collection technique used in this research is a questionnaire. The questionnaire applies a Likert scale, which is a measurement scale used to assess individuals' or groups' attitudes, opinions, and perceptions regarding social phenomena (Sugiyono, 2019). The data collection procedure was carried out using Google Forms.

This study uses two instruments: the student engagement instrument and the work-study conflict instrument. The student engagement instrument employed in this research is the student engagement scale developed by Mafaza et al. (2021), which was designed based on the aspects of student engagement proposed by Fredricks et al. (2004). Mafaza et al. (2021) created this instrument to examine the relationship between happiness, optimism, and student engagement among university students. The student engagement instrument consists of three aspects: behavioral engagement, emotional

engagement, and cognitive engagement. There are 42 items on the student engagement scale (21 favorable items and 21 unfavorable items). The student engagement scale was modified by the researcher to ensure its contextual relevance. The modification was necessary because the original instrument was developed to assess engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic, specifically within the context of online learning. Consequently, four items containing the terms "online," "pandemic," and "camera" were removed or rephrased to better reflect the current learning environment, which may involve either online or offline modalities. Furthermore, the removal of certain items was also based on findings from the pilot testing phase, which indicated the need for refinement to enhance the instrument's validity and reliability.

The work-study conflict instrument used in this study is the work-study conflict scale developed by Zamarni (2022), which was constructed based on the aspects of work-study conflict identified by Markel & Frone (1998). Zamarni (2022) developed this instrument to examine the relationship between self-management and work-study conflict among psychology students at Sultan Syarif Kasim State Islamic University in Riau who are also working. The work-study conflict instrument consists of two aspects: time-based conflict and strain-based conflict. There are 30 items on the work-study conflict scale (15 favorable items and 15 unfavorable items). The work-study conflict scale was modified by the researcher to improve its linguistic accuracy and measurement quality. The modification was initiated due to the presence of nonstandard spelling in the original instrument. For example, a typographical error in the item "When my work schedule is close to my class schedule, I *regu* to attend class" was corrected by replacing "*regu*" with the appropriate word "*ragu*" (hesitate). In addition to correcting such errors, certain items were removed based on the results of the pilot testing, which further justified the need to revise the instrument to enhance its overall validity and reliability. The analytical techniques employed in this study include descriptive statistical analysis, normality tests, linearity tests, correlation tests, and hypothesis testing.

Result

This study collected data from a total of 266 participants, and demographic data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS 27 for Windows. The participants were predominantly female, totaling 202 individuals, which represents 75.9% of the sample. Furthermore, the largest number of participants fell within the GPA range of 3.51–4.00, totaling 218 individuals (82.0%), while the fewest participants were in the GPA range of ≤ 3.00 , with only 7 individuals (2.6%). Additionally, the study participants were mostly enrolled in offline classes, totaling 154 individuals (57.9%).

Type of Class	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Online	31	11,7
Offline	154	57,9
Hybrid	81	30,5
Total	266	100

Next, categorization was conducted, revealing that the number of participants in the low student engagement category was 10 individuals (3.8%), while those in the high student engagement category totaled 256 individuals (96.2%). Based on these data, it can be concluded that the majority of participants in this study were categorized as having high student engagement. Furthermore, the number of participants in the low work-study conflict category was 221 individuals (83.1%), while those in the high work-study conflict category totaled 45 individuals (16.9%). From these data, it can be concluded that the majority of participants were categorized as having low work-study conflict.

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Low	10	3,8
High	256	96,2
Total	266	100

The normality test in this study employed the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The results showed that the significance value for the unstandardized

residual was 0.200, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the residual values are normally distributed.

The linearity test used the test for linearity method. The results showed that the significance value for the linearity test between the student engagement and work-study conflict variables was 0.000, which is less than the significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0,05$). Therefore, it can be concluded that the data are linear, meaning the relationship between student engagement and work-study conflict is linear.

The correlation test used Pearson product-moment correlation because the data were normally distributed. The results showed that the significance value for the correlation between the student engagement and work-study conflict variables was 0.000, which is less than the significance level of 0.05. Furthermore, based on the correlation degree guidelines, the relationship between the two variables is considered strong, as it has a coefficient value of 0.653. Additionally, the negative coefficient value of -0.653 indicates that the relationship direction is negative, meaning that as work-study conflict increases, student engagement decreases. Conversely, as work-study conflict decreases, student engagement increases. Based on the above analyses, it can be concluded that there is a significant, strong, and negatively directed relationship between student engagement and work-study conflict among working students.

The hypothesis testing employed simple linear regression analysis because this study used one independent variable. The regression analysis showed a significance value of 0.000, which is less than the significance level of 0.05.

Variable	R	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjust R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>
Student Engagement	0,653	0,427	0,424	10,144
Work-Study Conflict				

An additional analysis was conducted to determine the magnitude of the effect of the independent variable (work-study conflict) on the dependent variable (student engagement). The R square value was 0.427 (42.7%). From this R square value, it can be concluded that the contribution of work-study conflict to student engagement among

working students is 42.7%, while the remaining 57.3% is effected by other factors not examined in this study.

Variable	Constant	Regression Coefficient
Student Engagement	149,293	- 0,723
Work-Study Conflict		

The regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = a + bX$$

$$\text{Student Engagement} = 149.293 - 0.723 (\text{Work-Study Conflict})$$

From the simple linear regression equation above, it can be seen that if the work-study conflict variable increases by one unit, student engagement will decrease by 0.723 units.

Discussion

This study aims to examine the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working university students. Before analyzing the effect, a correlation test was conducted. The correlation test results indicated that there is a significant relationship between student engagement and work-study conflict among working students, showing a negative and strong correlation. This means that the higher the work-study conflict experienced by working students, the lower their student engagement. Conversely, the lower the work-study conflict, the higher the student engagement of these students. This finding aligns with the study by Wulandari & Pratama (2023), which demonstrated a negative relationship between work-study conflict and student engagement among part-time working students at UNP.

Since a significant relationship was found, a regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement. Based of the analysis, it can be concluded that work-study conflict has a significant effect on student engagement among working students. The direction of the effect is negative, meaning

that for every one-unit increase in work-study conflict, student engagement decreases by 0.723.

This study also found that the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working students is 42.7%, while the remaining 57.3% is effected by other factors not examined in this research. Some possible additional factors that could serve as independent variables affecting student engagement in working students include academic self-efficacy and self-regulated learning. In the study by Rufaida & Prihatsanti (2018), academic self-efficacy was found to have a 29.5% effect on student engagement. Furthermore, in the study by Fakhirah & Aslamawati (2021), self-regulated learning was shown to have a 43.1% effect on student engagement.

The results of this research are also relevant and consistent with the findings of Ginting & Ratnaningsih (2021), who reported that work-study conflict effected student engagement by 43.7%, while the remaining 56.3% was effected by other factors not examined in that study. Additionally, based on the analysis, the number of participants categorized as having low student engagement was 10 people (3.8%), while those categorized as having high student engagement numbered 256 people (96.2%). From this data, it can be concluded that the majority of participants in this study are categorized as having high student engagement. Furthermore, the number of participants categorized as having low work-study conflict was 221 people (83.1%), while those with high work-study conflict numbered 45 people (16.9%). From this, it can be concluded that the majority of participants are categorized as experiencing low work-study conflict.

This study also conducted a tabulation test examining the relationship between gender, grade point average (GPA), and type of course delivery on student engagement categories. The gender tabulation was conducted because, according to Ratnaningsih et al. (2018), gender is one factor that can effect student engagement. This study found that gender does affect student engagement, although not significantly. This is because female participants had a slightly higher percentage of student engagement compared to male participants, with only a 7.4% difference. This aligns

with the study by Lietaert et al. (2015), cited in Ratnaningsih et al. (2018), which concluded that female students have higher student engagement than male students and tend to receive greater support from their teachers.

A tabulation test was also conducted based on GPA. This was done because, according to Jamaluddin et al. (2022), GPA can be a factor influencing student engagement. This study found that GPA does effect student engagement, but the effect is relatively small. Specifically, lower GPA was associated with higher student engagement, although the differences between GPA categories were minimal — only 1.7% between GPAs of 3.51–4.00 and 3.01–3.50, and 2.4% between GPAs of 3.01–3.50 and ≤ 3.00 . This finding aligns with the study by Jamaluddin et al. (2022), which concluded that students with unsatisfactory GPAs (1.25–2.75) tend to have lower student engagement and are less involved in the learning process.

Additionally, a tabulation test was conducted based on the type of course delivery. According to Lanasa et al. (2009), five factors effect student engagement, two of which are the level of academic challenge and student relationships with the institution. Both of these factors are closely related to course delivery types. This study found that course delivery type does effect student engagement, though only slightly. Online courses showed a slightly higher percentage of student engagement compared to hybrid and offline courses, although the differences were only 0.5% and 0.7%, respectively. These results are less consistent with the study by Ni'am Muzakki et al. (2022), which stated that students feel they understand the material better in offline classes due to access to physical resources and the ability to interact directly with instructors without network issues. Additionally, offline learning was found to be more effective because students can directly consult with instructors.

In this study, work-study conflict serves as a predictor of student engagement. According to Markel & Frone (1998), one factor influencing work-study conflict is the number of working hours. This is also supported by the study of Nonis & Hudson (2006), which stated that high working hours leave students with less time for studying both inside and outside the classroom, thus correlating positively with work-study conflict. However, this study found that the number of working hours did not

significantly affect work-study conflict. This is because, based on the data tabulation, the distribution of average working hours did not follow a consistent pattern in relation to work-study conflict levels.

Conclusion

This study aims to examine the effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working university students. Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that there is a significant effect of work-study conflict on student engagement among working students. The direction of the effect is negative or inverse, meaning that as work-study conflict decreases, student engagement increases.

Suggestion

Working students are advised to develop effective and appropriate strategies for managing the learning process during their university studies, even while working. This includes managing time for studying despite work obligations and taking note of key points in each class to facilitate easier recall of the material taught. Additionally, working students may benefit from adopting a mindset that working does not necessarily interfere with their academic activities. On the other hand, before enrolling in higher education, working students are encouraged to consider enrolling in evening or part-time programs (employee classes) so that their work commitments do not disrupt their academic activities.

Universities are encouraged to provide constructive guidance to working students, taking into account the variables of work-study conflict and student engagement experienced by these students. Furthermore, institutions may consider offering programs specifically designed for working students, such as evening or employee classes, which could help reduce the level of work-study conflict.

Future researchers are advised to include additional independent variables by considering other factors that were not examined in this study. Moreover, it is recommended that future researchers carefully select their sampling methods to ensure a more balanced distribution of participants (i.e., not predominantly from Java Island), thus allowing for more generalizable findings across the population of working

students in Indonesia. If the research aims to study the national population, it is important to allocate sufficient time in preparation to secure a larger sample size. Lastly, since the current study involved a broad sample, future research may consider narrowing the focus, for example, by limiting the sample to part-time working students or full-time working students only.

References

- A. Fredericks, J., & McColskey, W. (2012). The measurement of student engagement: a comparative analysis of various methods and student self-report instruments. *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*, 1–840. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7>
- Amirullah. (2015). Populasi dan sampel. *Bayumedia Publishing Malang*.
- Ardani, N., Dantes, I., & Marhaeni, A. A. I. N. (2020). Pengembangan instrumen literasi humanistik dan hasil belajar ipa tema lingkungan sahabat kita kompetensi dasar menganalisis siklus air dan dampaknya pada peristiwa di bumi dan kelangsungan makhluk hidup untuk siswa kelas V SD. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar Indonesia*, 4(2), 112–121.
- Azwar, S. (2012). *Reliabilitas dan validitas*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Azwar, S. (2013). *Penyusunan skala psikologi*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: a systematic evidence map. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8>
- Creed, P. A., French, J., & Hood, M. (2015). Working while studying at university: The relationship between work benefits and demands and engagement and well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 86, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.002>
- Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design; qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*.
- Fadhilah, A., & Nurtjahjanti, H. (2018). Hubungan antara work study conflict dengan kepuasan kerja pada mahasiswa kelas karyawan Universitas Semarang. *Jurnal Empati*, 7(4), 126–131.
- Fakhirah, H. N., & Aslamawati, Y. (2021). Pengaruh self-regulated learning terhadap student engagement pada mahasiswa Fakultas Pertanian. *Prosiding Psikologi*, 7(2), 356–361.
- Febrianti, Y. P., Nuqul, F. L., & Khotimah, H. (2020). Academic hardiness pada mahasiswa aktivis dan mahasiswa yang bekerja. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 13(1), 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.35134/jpsy165.v13i1.65>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 59–109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Ginting, R. O. B., & Ratnaningsih, I. Z. (2021). Hubungan antara work-study conflict dengan student engagement pada mahasiswa pekerja full-time di program studi s-1 teknik informatika universitas stikubank (unisbank) Semarang. *Jurnal EMPATI*, 10(2), 78–85. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2021.30996>
- Hakiki, M. S., & Anggraini, D. A. (2022). Studi literatur kepemimpinan, konflik dan manajemen konflik. *Mandar: Social Science Journal*, 1, 121–131.
- Hulukati, W., & Djibran, M. R. (2018). Analisis tugas perkembangan mahasiswa fakultas ilmu pendidikan Universitas Negeri Gorontalo. *Bikotetik (Bimbingan Dan*

- Konseling Teori Dan Praktik*), 2(1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.26740/bikotetik.v2n1.p73-80>
- Jabnabillah, F., & Margina, N. (2022). Analisis korelasi pearson dalam menentukan hubungan antara motivasi belajar dengan kemandirian belajar pada pembelajaran daring. *Jurnal Sintak*, 1(1), 14–18.
- Jamaluddin, N., Daud, M., & Indahari, A. N. (2022). Student engagement dan prestasi akademik pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi Talenta Mahasiswa*, 1(4), 173–182.
- Kastaman, A. K., & Coralia, F. (2022). Pengaruh work study conflict terhadap academic burnout pada mahasiswa yang bekerja di Kota Jambi. *Bandung Conference Series: Psychology Science*, 2(1), 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.29313/bcsps.v2i1.809>
- Klem, A. M., & Connell, J. P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74, 262–173.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What Student Affairs Professionals Need to Know About Student Engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 683–709. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0099>.
- Kurniawan, A. W., & Puspitaningtyas, Z. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif*.
- Lanasa, S. M., Cabrera, A. F., & Trangsrud, H. (2009). The construct validity of student engagement: A confirmatory factor analysis approach. *Research in Higher Education*, 50(4), 315–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-009-9123-1>
- Lestari, R. D. (2011). *Lima alasan mengapa mahasiswa kuliah sambil bekerja*.
- Mafaza, N., Kawuryan, F., & Pramono, R. B. (2021). Kebahagiaan mahasiswa ditinjau dari optimisme dan student engagement. *Jurnal Psikologi Perseptual*, 6(2), 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.24176/perseptual.v6i2.6877>
- Mardelina, E., & Muhson, A. (2017). Mahasiswa bekerja dan dampaknya pada aktivitas belajar dan prestasi akademik. *Jurnal Economia*, 13(2), 201. <https://doi.org/10.21831/economia.v13i2.13239>
- Markel, K. S., & Frone, M. R. (1998). Job characteristics, work-school conflict, and school outcomes among adolescents: Testing a structural model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.2.277>
- Mills, A., Lingard, H., & Wakefield, R. (2007). Work-study conflict: Managing the demands of work and study in built environment undergraduate education. *CME 2007 Conference - Construction Management and Economics: "Past, Present and Future,"* 981–992.
- Muhson, A., Wahyuni, D., & Mulyani, E. (2012). Analisis relevansi lulusan perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Economia*, 42–52.
- Mujiasih, E. (2015). Hubungan antara persepsi dukungan organisasi (perceived organizational support) dengan keterikatan karyawan (employee engagement). *Jurnal Psikologi Undip*, 14(1), 40–51.
- Mulyadi, M. (2013). Penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif serta pemikiran dasar menggabungkannya. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi Dan Media*, 15(1), 128. <https://doi.org/10.31445/jskm.2011.150106>
- Ni'am Muzakki, S., Ahyani, L. N., Rismawati, R., & Kharisma, B. A. (2022). Analisis faktor yang mempengaruhi student engagement dalam model pembelajaran blended learning. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Seminar Nasioanal Dies Natalis ke-42:*

- Pendidikan Tinggi Berdaya Saing untuk Peningkatan Mutu*, 1(1), 296–302.
- Nilakusmawati, D. P. E., & Susilawati, M. (2012). Studi faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi wanita bekerja di Kota Denpasar. *Piramida*, VIII(1), 26–31.
- Nonis, S. A., & Hudson, G. I. (2006). Academic performance of college students: Effect of time spent studying and working. *Journal of Education for Business*, 81(3), 151–159. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.81.3.151-159>
- Nurfitria, Y., & Masykur, A. M. (2017). Hubungan antara work study conflict dengan work engagement pada pegawai starbucks coffee di semarang. *Jurnal EMPATI*, 5(4), 765–769. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2016.15419>
- Nuryadi, Astuti, T. D., Utami, E. S., & Budiantara, M. (2017). *Dasar-dasar statistika penelitian*.
- Octavia, E., & Nugraha, S. P. (2013). Hubungan antara adversity quotient dan work-study conflict pada mahasiswa yang bekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi Integratif*, 1(1), 44–51.
- Pangestu, FA & Rahayu, E. (2022). Korelasi antara gratitude dan student engagement pada siswa sma x yang menggunakan kurikulum merdeka. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Konseling*, 4(2), 1349–1358. <https://doi.org/10.30829/alirsyad.v13i2.18197>
- Papilaya, J. O., & Huliselan, N. (2016). Identifikasi gaya belajar mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi Undip*, 15(1), 56. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jpu.15.1.56-63>
- Pratama, M., & Guspa, A. (2022). Analisis properti psikometrik skala student engagement versi bahasa Indonesia psychometric properties analysis of the indonesian version of student engagement scale. *Psycho Idea*, 20(2), 1–5.
- Priyono. (2018). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. In *Analytical Biochemistry*. 11 (1).
- Quraisy, A. (2022). Normalitas data menggunakan uji kolmogorov-smirnov dan saphiro-wilk. *J-HEST Journal of Health Education Economics Science and Technology*, 3(1), 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.36339/jhest.v3i1.42>
- Rabbani, D. R. (2019). Kerja layak bagi mahasiswa pekerja kontrak paruh waktu (garda depan) di pt.aseli dagadu djokdja. *Jurnal Studi Pemuda*, 6(2), 605. <https://doi.org/10.22146/studipemudaugm.39490>
- Rahmi, A., & Walidi, A. (2023). Hubungan motivasi terhadap hasil belajar pendidikan pancasila bagi siswa kelas v sekolah dasar islam terpadu Kota Padang. 11, 633–644.
- Rangkuti, A. A. (2011). Konsep dan teknik analisis data penelitian kuantitatif bidang psikologi dan pendidikan.
- Ratnaningsih, I. Z., Prihatsanti, U., & Prasetyo, A. R. (2018). Perbedaan student engagement pada mahasiswa ditinjau dari jenis kelamin dan masa studi. *Journal of Psychology*, 2002, 67–73. <http://hdl.handle.net/11617/11895>
- Reeve, J. (2005). *Understanding motivation and emotion*. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley.
- Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S., & Barch, J. (2004). Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support. *Motivation and Emotion*, 28(2), 147–169.
- Rice, F. P., & Dolgin, K. G. (2008). *The adolescent: development, relationships, and culture* (12th ed.).
- Rifda, U. A., & Pratiwi, M. (2020). Work-study conflict pada mahasiswa yang bekerja: dampak locus of control. *Psychology Journal of Mental Health*, 1(1), 37–48

- Rufaida, A.-R. A., & Prihatsanti, U. (2018). Hubungan efikasi diri akademik dengan student engagement pada mahasiswa fsm undip yang bekerja paruh waktu. *Jurnal EMPATI*, 6(4), 143–148. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2017.20003>
- Sa'adah, U., & Ariati, J. (2020). Hubungan antara student engagement (keterlibatan siswa) dengan prestasi akademik mata pelajaran matematika pada siswa kelas xi sma negeri 9 Semarang. *Jurnal EMPATI*, 7(1), 69–75. <https://doi.org/10.14710/empati.2018.20148>
- Saifuddin, A. (2021). *Validitas dan reliabilitas alat ukur psikologi*.
- Sari, C. A. P., & Damayant, T. (2024). Pengaruh work study conflict terhadap work engagement pada mahasiswa pekerja part time di coffee shop Kota Bandung. *Bandung Conference Series: Psychology Science*, 4(1), 711–716. <https://doi.org/10.29313/bcsp.v4i1.12463>
- Sari, M., Rachman, H., Juli Astuti, N., Win Afgani, M., & Abdullah Siroj, R. (2022). Explanatory survey dalam metode penelitian deskriptif kuantitatif. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains Dan Komputer*, 3(01), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.47709/jpsk.v3i01.1953>
- Sedyati, R. N. (2022). Perguruan tinggi sebagai agen pendidikan dan agen pertumbuhan ekonomi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, Ilmu Ekonomi, Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 16(1), 155–160. <https://doi.org/10.19184/jpe.v16i1.27957>
- Setiawan, D., & Lenawati, M. (2020). Peran dan strategi perguruan tinggi dalam menghadapi era society 5.0. *RESEARCH: Computer, Information System & Technology Management*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.25273/research.v3i1.4728>
- Siregar, E., & Widyaningrum, R. (2015). Belajar dan pembelajaran. 09(02), 193-210.
- Siti, N. (2008). Pengaruh ibu bekerja dan peran ayah dalam coparenting terhadap prestasi belajar anak. *Jurnal Soul*, 1(2), 2–14.
- Siyoto, S., & Sodik, A. (2015). *Dasar metodologi penelitian*.
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*.
- Virtanen, T. E. ., Kiuru, N., Lerkkanen, M.-K., Poikkeus, A.-M., & Matti, K. (2015). Assessment of student engagement among junior high school students and associations with self-esteem, burnout, and academic achievement. *International Journal of Special Education*, 30(2), 70–84.
- Wang, M.-T., & Holcombe, R. (2010). Adolescents' Perceptions of School Environment, Engagement, and Academic Achievement in Middle School. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(3), 633–662.
- Widhiarso, W. (2014). *Pengategorian data dengan menggunakan statistik hipotetik dan statistik empirik*. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Gajah Mada., 1–3.
- Wulandari, R., & Pratama, M. (2023). Hubungan work-study conflict dengan student engagement pada mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Padang yang bekerja part-time. *Innovative*, 3(4), 1554–1561.
- Zamarni, R. R. (2022). *Hubungan antara self-management dengan work-study- conflict pada mahasiswa psikologi Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau yang bekerja*. Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau, 1(69).