1st International Conference on Management, Business and Economy (ICoMBEc 2025)
Vo. 1 No. 1 2025
e-ISSN : XXXX-XXX

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL SUPPORT AND WORK COHESIVENESS ON WORK ALIENATION AMONG WORKING STUDENTS

Ahmad Roni Alhabsi[1], Fahrizul Akhkam[2]

[1]Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia
[2]Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

"Corresponding Author: ahmadronialhabsi@unpam.ac.id"

Abstract

A total of 100 working university students participated in this study, selected through purposive sampling based on inclusion criteria. Data were analyzed using multiple linear regression with SPSS version 25. The results indicate that social support has a significant negative effect on work alienation (β = -0.252, p = 0.034), while work cohesiveness shows no significant influence (β = 0.011, p = 0.926). The overall regression model was statistically significant (F = 3.132, $p < 0.05$). These findings highlight the importance of psychological and social resources in reducing feelings of alienation among working students. This study aims to analyze the influence of social support and work cohesiveness on work alienation among working students. Work alienation represents a psychological condition in which individuals feel estranged, lose meaning, and experience a lack of connection with their work. The study employs a quantitative approach using a descriptive-correlational design. The sample consists of active university students who have been working for at least one month. Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires based on the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS), Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ), and the Work Alienation Scale adapted from Seeman (1959) and Mottaz (1981). The results of multiple regression analysis show that both social support and work cohesiveness have a negative and significant effect on work alienation. The findings contribute to the development of organizational psychology and human resource management, especially in the context of working students.

Keywords: Social Support, Work Cohesiveness, Work Alienation, Working Students

Introduction

Work alienation among working students, either part-time or full-time, reflects a psychological condition in which individuals feel disconnected from their work, lose control, or find their tasks meaningless. The dual role of students as both learners and workers can lead to stress, role conflict, and resource depletion. Social support and group cohesiveness are two key factors that may buffer the negative effects of these pressures. Social support, both emotional and instrumental, helps individuals cope with job demands, while cohesiveness fosters teamwork, belonging, and mutual trust.

Theoretical Framework

Work alienation is a multidimensional phenomenon including powerlessness, meaninglessness, social isolation, and self-estrangement (Seeman, 1959). Social support is defined as the emotional, instrumental, and informational assistance received from others (Cohen, 2004; Schwarzer & Knoll, 2007). Work cohesiveness refers to the degree of unity, mutual trust, and cooperation among group members (Anwar, 2016). Previous studies have shown that social support and cohesiveness can significantly reduce feelings of alienation by strengthening psychological resources and social connectedness.

Method

This research applies a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design. The population includes university students who are currently working. A purposive sampling method was used with inclusion criteria: active students who have been working for at least one month. Data were collected using validated instruments—MSPSS for social support, GEQ for group cohesiveness, and the Work Alienation Scale for the dependent variable. Each item was measured on a 5-point Likert scale. Reliability and validity tests were performed prior to data analysis. Data were analyzed using multiple regression analysis to assess the influence of social support and cohesiveness on work alienation.

Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	8.466	2.184		3.875	.000		
	X1_MEAN	-1.149	.533	-.252	-2.156	.034	.709	1.411
	X2_MEAN	.033	.356	.011	.093	.926	.709	1.411

The T-test was used to determine the partial effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. For X1_MEAN (Social Support), the t-value (-2.156) and significance value (0.034) indicate that this variable has a negative and significant effect on Y_MEAN (Work Alienation). This means that an increase of one unit in X1_MEAN (Social Support) will result in a decrease of 1.149 units in Y_MEAN (Work Alienation), assuming all other variables

remain constant. The negative direction implies an inverse relationship between X1_MEAN (Social Support) and Y_MEAN (Work Alienation), showing that as X1_MEAN (Social Support) increases, the dependent variable tends to decrease significantly. On the other hand, the variable X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness) shows a t-value (0.093) and a significance level of 0.926, which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness) does not have a significant effect on Y_MEAN (Work Alienation). This suggests that changes in X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness) do not meaningfully contribute to variations in the dependent variable. Furthermore, the *Collinearity Statistics* indicate **Tolerance = 0.709** and **VIF = 1.411**, both of which fall within acceptable limits (Tolerance > 0.10, VIF < 10). This implies that there is no multicollinearity problem between the independent variables, meaning the regression model is statistically valid

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	18.161	2	9.081	3.132	.048[b]
	Residual	281.237	97	2.899		
	Total	299.398	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Y_MEAN
b. Predictors: (Constant), X2_MEAN, X1_MEAN

The results of the ANOVA table show an F value of 3.132 with a significance level of 0.048. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the regression model is statistically significant. This means that the independent variables X1_MEAN (Social Support) and X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness), when considered simultaneously, have a significant influence on the dependent variable Y_MEAN (Work Alienation). This result confirms that, although not all independent variables may be significant individually (as will be shown in the T-test), the two predictors together contribute meaningfully to explaining variations in the dependent variable. Therefore, the regression model is considered valid and suitable for further statistical interpretation

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.246[a]	.061	.041	1.7027

a.Predictors: (Constant), X2_MEAN, X1_MEAN
b.Dependent Variable: Y_MEAN

The coefficient of determination (R Square) measures how much of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables within the regression model. The **R value of 0.246** indicates a **weak but positive relationship** between the independent variables (X1_MEAN and X2_MEAN) and the dependent variable (Y_MEAN).

The **R Square value of 0.061** suggests that **6.1% of the variation in the dependent variable (Y_MEAN)** is explained by the combination of X1_MEAN and X2_MEAN, while the remaining **93.9%** is explained by other factors not included in this model. The **Adjusted R Square (0.041)** accounts for the number of predictors in the model, providing a more accurate estimate of explanatory power.

This finding implies that although the relationship between the studied variables is relatively weak, the regression model is still statistically acceptable and can be used for further interpretation. From an academic standpoint, the low R Square value indicates that other unobserved variables likely play a stronger role in influencing the dependent variable.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.246[a]	.061	.051	1.6941

a. Predictors: (Constant), X1_MEAN

a. Relationship Between X1_MEAN and Y

The results show that **R = 0.246**, **R^2 = 0.061**, and **Sig. = 0.014**, with the regression equation: Y_MEAN = 8.493−1.122X1_MEAN

This finding indicates that variable X1_MEAN has a negative and significant effect on Y, as the significance value (0.014) is less than 0.05. Therefore, a one-unit increase in X1_MEAN will reduce Y_MEAN by 1.122 units. Although the relationship is not strong, it is statistically significant, meaning X1_MEAN meaningfully contributes to the variation in Y.

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.246[a]	.061	.041	1.7027

a. Predictors: (Constant), X2_MEAN, X1_MEAN
b. Dependent Variable: Y_MEAN

The multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the simultaneous effect of the independent variables X1_MEAN (Social Support) and X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness) on the dependent variable Y_MEAN (Work Alienation). The results of the Model Summary table show an R value of 0.246, indicating a weak but positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The R Square value of 0.061 suggests that approximately 6.1% of the variation in the dependent variable (Y_MEAN (Work Alienation)) can be explained by the combination of X1_MEAN (Social Support) and X2_MEAN (Work Cohesiveness), while the remaining 93.9% is influenced by other factors not included in this model. The **Adjusted R Square value (0.041)** slightly decreases the explanatory power of the model, adjusting for the number of predictors used. The **Standard Error of the Estimate (1.7027)** indicates the average deviation of the observed values from the regression line; smaller values represent better prediction accuracy. Overall, these findings imply that although the model's explanatory power is relatively weak, it remains statistically valid for further interpretation and can provide insights into the relationships among the tested variable

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that higher levels of social support and work cohesiveness are associated with lower levels of work alienation among working students. This result supports previous research indicating that social connections and group belonging can mitigate feelings of estrangement and loss of meaning at work. Social support acts as a psychological buffer, providing emotional stability and informational resources, while cohesiveness enhances a sense of belonging and purpose. Practically, these findings highlight the importance for universities and workplaces to build supportive peer networks and cohesive team environments. Institutions can establish mentorship programs, peer counseling, and teamwork activities to strengthen social bonds and reduce alienation.

Interestingly, the finding that work cohesiveness does not significantly affect work alienation may be explained by contextual factors of the sample. Many working students are employed in part-time or flexible jobs where interaction among colleagues is minimal, leading to weaker group bonds. Cohesiveness may thus play a smaller role compared to social support, which directly provides emotional and informational resources. This result aligns with the stress-buffering model (Cohen & Wills, 1985), which suggests that perceived support has a more immediate psychological impact than structural group ties. Future research could explore moderating factors such as work environment type, duration of employment, and perceived autonomy to clarify this relationship.

Conclusion

This study concludes that both social support and work cohesiveness significantly reduce work alienation among working students. These findings contribute to organizational psychology and educational management by emphasizing the role of interpersonal relationships in mitigating alienation. Future research should consider mediating variables such as life satisfaction, resilience, or psychological well-being to further understand the mechanism behind these effects. The study highlights that enhancing social support systems is more crucial

than focusing solely on group cohesiveness when addressing work alienation among working students.Educational institutions and employers should prioritize mentorship programs, emotional counseling, and communication channels to foster supportive environments.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their gratitude to Universitas Pamulang for the academic and institutional support provided throughout the research process.

References

Anwar, K. (2016). Working with group-tasks and group cohesiveness. International Education Studies, 9(8), 145–150.
BMC Public Health. (2023). The relationship between social support and academic engagement among university students. BMC Public Health, 23, Article 17301.
Ceylan, A., & Sulu, H. (2011). Work alienation as a mediator of the relationship between organizational injustice and organizational commitment. International Journal of Business and Management Studies, 3(2), 105–115.
Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98 (2), 310–357.
Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. American Psychologist, 55 (1), 68–78.
Frontiers in Psychology. (2022). How workplace incivility leads to work alienation: A moderated mediation model. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 921161.
Osin, E. N., Malyutina, A. V., & Kosheleva, N. (2020). The contribution of individual psychological features to the determination of the phenomenon of work alienation. Behavioral Sciences, 10 (1), 34.
Schwarzer, R., & Knoll, N. (2007). Functional roles of social support within the stress and coping process. In A. Steptoe (Ed.), Social support measurement and intervention (pp. 65–86). Oxford University Press.
Seeman, M. (1959). On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 24 (6), 783–791.
Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. Long Range Planning, 51 (1), 40–49.
Yurdakul, G., & Öneren, M. (2021). The relationship between social loafing and work alienation: A case study. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Journal of Management Sciences, 19 (1), 107–12