

Work Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Environment, and Productivity Among Employees in Maritime Higher Education Institution

Rolly M. Narandan^{1*}, Christine A. Geroy^{1,2}, Nenita I. Prado^{1,3}

¹Liceo de Cagayan University, Philippines

*narandan221989@gmail.com

²cageroy@liceo.edu.ph

³nprado@liceo.edu.ph

Date Submitted:
January 30, 2026

Date Accepted:
February 26, 2026

Date Published:
March 26, 2026

DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.19223886

ABSTRACT

This study examines the influence of work engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment on employee productivity in a maritime higher education institution in the Philippines. It specifically evaluates work engagement in terms of employee recognition, work ethics, and personal development; job satisfaction in terms of work–life balance, compensation and benefits, and job security; and work environment in relation to organizational culture, workload management, and leadership style. The study also determines the level of employee productivity and analyzes the relationships and predictive influence among these variables. A

quantitative descriptive–correlational research design was employed, involving both teaching and non-teaching personnel from Mariners’ Polytechnic Colleges Foundation in Legazpi City, Albay. The respondents included full-time and part-time employees who had rendered at least five months of service during the second semester of Academic Year 2025–2026. Results revealed that employees exhibit high levels of work engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and productivity. Among the dimensions, work ethics, work–life balance, and leadership style emerged as the most influential factors within their respective domains. Correlation analysis showed significant positive relationships between the independent variables and employee productivity. Furthermore, regression analysis identified work engagement as the most influential variable and the only significant predictor of productivity when all variables were considered simultaneously. These findings highlight the importance of strengthening employee engagement as a key strategy for improving productivity in maritime higher education institutions.

Keywords: *Work engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, employee productivity, maritime education*

INTRODUCTION

The productivity of employees plays a critical factor towards the success of any organization, particularly in maritime higher education institutions that develop future maritime professionals. Its effectiveness in every organization varies on several factors, including work engagement, job satisfaction, and the work environment. High levels of employee engagement and satisfaction can significantly increase the motivation, passion, and overall work efficiency, which in turn contribute to improved institutional performance.

As maritime higher education institutions compete to produce competent professionals in the field, it becomes more important to understand how internal factors such as work engagement, job satisfaction, and the work environment influence institutional productivity (Abror et al., 2020). Research has shown that highly engaged employees contribute significantly to higher levels of innovation, quality, and customer satisfaction, which leads to organizational success (Ricardianto et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, employees who lack engagement may feel disconnected, leading to poor performance, higher turnover, and lower productivity. As such, it becomes important for institutions, including educational ones, to address the factors that foster employee engagement.

In addition, this research aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth. By focusing on improving employee engagement and satisfaction, the study supports the development of inclusive, safe, and productive work environments within maritime education institutions. It also contributes to the global agenda of fostering sustainable economic growth through the promotion of decent work conditions and enhanced labor productivity. In this regard, the study not only addresses local institutional concerns but also helps broader international efforts toward human capital development and organizational sustainability.

Research Questions

This study aimed to determine the influence of work engagement, job satisfaction, and environment on employee productivity. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of work engagement in terms of:
 - 1.1 Employee Recognition
 - 1.2 Work ethics; and
 - 1.3 Personal Development?
2. What is the level of job satisfaction in terms of:
 - 2.1 Work-life balance;
 - 2.2 Compensation and benefits; and
 - 2.3 Job Security?
3. What is the level of the environment, in terms of:
 - 3.1 Organizational culture;
 - 3.2 Workload management; and

- 3.3 Leadership style?
4. What is the level of employee productivity?
5. Is there a significant relationship between employees' productivity and:
 - 5.1 Work Engagement
 - 5.2 Job Satisfaction; and
 - 5.3 Environment?
6. Which of the variables, singly or in combination, influence employees' productivity?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Work Engagement

According to Ahakwa et al. (2021), employee engagement was defined as the degree to which employees were attentive and absorbed in their roles, felt a sense of purpose, and were energized to contribute to organizational success. Engaged employees were not only more productive but were also more likely to be innovative and proactive in identifying ways to improve performance. Recent research highlighted that engagement was highly associated with job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and customer satisfaction (Hidayat, 2023). This connection between employee engagement and business outcomes has remained a top priority for leaders and human resource professional.

Employee Recognition

Employee recognition was a fundamental component of fostering employee engagement within organizations. It involves acknowledging and appreciating employees' efforts and achievements, thereby enhancing their motivation and commitment to the organization. Recognition can take various forms, including verbal praise, awards, or public acknowledgment, each contributing to a positive work environment. Research underscored the significance of recognition in boosting employee engagement. Specifically, companies with formal recognition programs report a 26% increase in engagement levels, highlighting the direct correlation between recognition and increased productivity (Ali & Anwar, 2021). Moreover, the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) emphasized that 69% of employees would work harder if they felt their efforts were better appreciated (Reissová & Papay, 2021).

Work Ethics

Work ethics encompass the principles and values that guide behavior in the workplace, including integrity, responsibility, and professionalism. Strong work ethics are vital to employee engagement, as they influence attitudes in working and interacting with colleagues (Alameeri et al., 2021). Employees with robust work ethics demonstrate commitment, reliability, and a proactive approach to their responsibilities. Organizations that maintain strong work ethics among employees often experience higher levels of engagement. When employees align with the company's values and standards, they are more likely to take ownership of their roles and contribute effectively to the team's success (Donley, 2021).

Personal Development

When organizations invest in their employees' development, it signals a commitment to their long-term success, which can significantly boost engagement levels (Sypniewska et al., 2023). Opportunities for learning and advancement are among the top drivers of employee engagement. A report by Sapta et al. (2021) found that 94% of employees would stay at a company longer if it invested in their career development. This statistic underscores the importance of providing continuous learning opportunities to retain and engage talent. Personal development initiatives can take various forms, including formal training programs, mentorship, coaching, and access to educational resources. These programs not only enhance employees' skills but also empower them to take ownership of their career paths. Such empowerment was linked to higher levels of job satisfaction and engagement (Abdullahi et al., 2021).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction reflects the extent to which employees feel fulfilled and pleased with their roles, responsibilities, and work environment. It is influenced by several factors, including compensation, work environment, job responsibilities, relationships with colleagues and supervisors, and opportunities for personal and professional growth. According to Yadav et al. (2022), job satisfaction is a crucial determinant of employee engagement, performance, and retention. When employees feel satisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to be committed, productive, and motivated to perform at their best. Research consistently showed that high levels of job satisfaction directly correlate with increased organizational loyalty and low turnover rates (Haralayya, 2021). Research by Rachman (2021) also highlighted that employees who are content with their wages for their work are more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction.

Work-life balance

Work-life balance refers to the equilibrium between an employee's professional responsibilities and personal life. Achieving this balance is crucial for maintaining physical and mental well-being, as well as fostering high levels of employee satisfaction and engagement. Employees who struggle to balance their work and personal lives are more likely to experience stress, burnout, and disengagement (Wolor et al., 2022). Research by Hasibuan et al. (2024) emphasized that employees who feel they have a right balance between their work and personal lives are more likely to report higher job satisfaction and better overall health, which contributes to higher productivity. In addition, work life balance also plays a significant role in employee retention. Studies found that employees who perceive their employer as supportive of work-life balance are less likely to seek employment elsewhere (Megawaty et al., 2022).

Compensation and benefits

Compensation and benefits are crucial elements that influence employee satisfaction, motivation, and retention. Compensation typically refers to the wages or salary that an employee receives in exchange for their work, while benefits include additional offerings such as healthcare, retirement plans, paid time off, and other perks (Wanta & Augustine, 2021). A competitive compensation package is essential for attracting top talent, and it also plays a significant role in retaining employees. According to Asghar et al. (2021), fair

and competitive compensation is directly linked to job satisfaction, with employees who feel they are adequately compensated being more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and remain with the organization for longer periods. In addition to financial compensation, benefits also play a vital role in shaping employee engagement and satisfaction. Employees who receive comprehensive benefits packages that address their health, wellness, and financial security feel more valued by their employers, which increases their commitment and engagement (Agustina et al., 2024).

Job Security

Job security plays a vital role in employee engagement and satisfaction, as employees who feel contented with their roles are more likely to be committed, and productive (Bhardwaj & Kalia, 2021). Research by Rivaldo (2021) highlights that job insecurity could lead to stress, anxiety, and disengagement, resulting to a negative impact on employee performance and overall well-being. On the other hand, employees who perceived their jobs as secure were more likely to focus on their tasks and remain with the company for longer duration. Employees who experience job insecurity may be also less motivated to invest their energy and effort into their work, as they may constantly worry about their future employment prospects (Boccoli et al., 2023). A study by Silva et al. (2023) found that job insecurity is highly associated with lower job satisfaction, low commitment, and higher turnover intentions. In contrast, employees who feel secure in their positions are more likely to feel a sense of loyalty to their employer, leading to a positive engagement and better performance. Job security is particularly important during times of organizational change, economic uncertainty, or industry downturns, when employees may fear layoffs.

Organizational culture

A strong, positive organizational culture provides an environment where employees feel supported, valued, and motivated to perform at their best. Alkandi et al. (2023) posited that culture is a powerful force that shapes both the internal dynamics and external outcomes of an organization. For instance, organizations with an inclusive, innovative, and collaborative culture often experience higher levels of employee engagement and productivity. Conversely, a toxic or misaligned culture can lead to disengagement, poor performance, and high turnover rates (Yang et al., 2021). Organizational culture represents the collective values, practices, and beliefs that guide how members of an organization interact and perform their responsibilities. In contrast, organizations with negative cultures, such as those characterized by poor communication, rigid hierarchies, and a lack of trust, often struggle with employee morale and engagement. These environments could result in employees feeling undervalued, disconnected, or unsupported. According Mardikaningsih and Putra (2021),

Workload management

Effective workload management is essential for maintaining employee satisfaction, preventing burnout, and ensuring high performance. In recent years, research has increasingly focused on how organizations can optimize workload management to enhance employee engagement and well-being. According to Makridis and Schloetzer (2022), effective workload management involves understanding the capacities of individual employees and ensuring that tasks are distributed equitably, considering both the

complexity and volume of work. One of the primary concerns in workload management is the prevention of work overload, which could lead to stress, burnout, and disengagement. As Al Kurdi et al. (2021) found, employees who consistently experience excessive workloads were more likely to report feelings of exhaustion and disengagement. . In contrary, employees with manageable workloads were more likely to feel motivated and engaged, as they could devote more time and energy to their tasks without feeling overwhelmed (Quek et al., 2021).

Leadership style

Leadership style refers to the approach and behavior exhibited by leaders in managing and motivating their teams. Leadership was a key factor in shaping employee engagement, satisfaction, and performance. Various leadership styles, such as transformational, transactional, and servant leadership, have been shown to have different impacts on employee outcomes. According to Susanto et al. (2022), transformational leaders who provide clear instructions, guidance and support the development of their team members tend to create environments where employees feel empowered to perform at their best. Research by Aruldoss et al. (2022) suggested that transformational leadership positively correlates with job satisfaction and engagement, for the reason that these leaders tend to foster a culture of trust, respect, and recognition. Employees working under transformational leaders were more likely to report higher levels of motivation, commitment, and job satisfaction, as they feel supported and valued. Conversely, transactional leadership, which focuses more on reward and punishment systems, has been linked to lower levels of employee satisfaction and engagement (Specchia et al., 2021).

Relationship Between Employee Productivity: Work Engagement, Job Satisfaction, And Environment

Employee productivity was a crucial indicator of institutional performance and efficiency, particularly in maritime higher education institutions. Productivity is commonly defined as the output of employees over a given time, often shaped by motivational, environmental, and organizational factors. According to Hauff et al. (2022), employees who have high engagement levels tend to exert more effort, demonstrate greater commitment, and display enhanced job performance. Similarly, job satisfaction, defined as the positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job experiences, has been directly linked to improved productivity and reduced absenteeism (Ayanponle et al., 2024). The concept of employee engagement differs slightly from work engagement but overlaps in meaningful ways. Employee engagement typically refers to the employee's commitment to the organization, whereas work engagement focuses on the individual's involvement and enthusiasm in performing their tasks. According to Inayat and Jahanzeb Khan (2021), employees who are both organizationally committed and deeply involved in their work tend to be more productive, adaptable, and willing to go beyond their formal roles. Employees who felt valued, respected, and properly compensated were more likely to invest discretionary effort in their roles (Chaudhary et al., 2023). According to Clack (2021), psychological empowerment, which occurs from feeling competent and autonomous in one's job, mediates the relationship between engagement and productivity. Work engagement has also been highly correlated with performance-related outcomes such as creativity, innovation, and task efficiency. Employees who were engaged displayed vigor, dedication, and absorption which are key elements that enhance the quality of output (Garg et al., 2021).

Predictors of Employee Productivity: Work Engagement, Job Satisfaction, And Environment

Engagement, job satisfaction, and work engagement are consistently identified as powerful predictors of employee productivity across numerous organizational settings, including educational institutions. These constructions, while distinct, interact in a way that enhances performance outcomes. Engagement reflects an employee's psychological presence in the workplace, job satisfaction encapsulates their emotional response to work conditions, and work engagement measures how absorbed and energetic employees are in their specific tasks (Ali & Anwar, 2021). This proactive behavior leads to increased productivity, especially in complex institutional contexts like maritime higher education, where innovation and collaboration are essential. Job satisfaction also emerged as a reliable predictor of performance outcomes. Employees who were satisfied with their compensation, work conditions, recognition, and professional relationships tended to show higher levels of motivation and loyalty (Selimović et al., 2021). Work engagement, which was often defined through its three components vigor, dedication, and absorption, serves as both a cause and consequence of job performance. Employees who are vigorously engaged tend to invest sustained energy into their roles, which leads to higher-quality outcomes and timely task completion. According to Engidaw (2021), faculty members who reported high engagement produced more peer-reviewed publications, developed better course content, and received higher student evaluations, all of which are critical indicators of productivity in maritime education.

METHODS

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive correlational and causal research design. A descriptive research design was a method used to describe the characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied without influencing it in any way. According to Novosel (2022), descriptive research is concerned primarily with "what" rather than "how" or "why," focused on accurately portraying the status or conditions of the subject matter. This design was particularly valuable when the goal was to present a comprehensive picture of a situation, such as levels of employee engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and productivity in a specific institutional context. The correlational component of the research design examined the relationships between the independent variables (employee engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment) and the dependent variable (employee productivity). By analyzing these causal relationships, the study provided a deeper understanding of how specific factors influence productivity outcomes.

Respondent /Participants

The respondents of this study were employees of the Mariners' Polytechnic Colleges Foundation (MPCF) in Legazpi City, Albay. These individuals were directly involved in the institution's academic and administrative operations and consisted of both academic staff, such as faculty members and instructors, and non-academic staff, including administrative and support personnel. The study utilized a total enumeration sampling technique, wherein all qualified teaching and non-teaching personnel were included as

respondents. Total enumeration was appropriate when the population was small and well-defined, allowing for comprehensive data collection without introducing sampling bias. A total of 179 personnel were involved in the study. Of this number, 30 respondents from both teaching and non-teaching personnel participated in the pilot testing, which had already been conducted to establish the validity and reliability of the research instrument. These respondents were excluded from the final data analysis. Consequently, the final respondents totaled 149, composed of 80 teaching personnel and 69 non-teaching personnel. Among the teaching personnel, 50 were teaching technical courses in the Marine Transportation and Marine Engineering programs, while 30 were teaching non-technical or general education courses.

Instruments of the Study

The instrument is a researcher-made questionnaire, which was constructed with several parts. The first part details the level of work engagement in terms of employee recognition, work ethics, and personal development. The second details the level of job satisfaction in terms of work-life balance, compensation and benefits, and job security. The third part details the level of environment in terms of organizational culture, workload management, and leadership style. The final part investigates the level of employee productivity. The instrument will respond to a five-point Likert's Scale of (5) Strongly Agree, (4) Agree, (3) Neutral, (2) Disagree, (1) Strongly Disagree.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before the data gathering phase, several essential preparatory steps were undertaken to ensure the validity, reliability, and ethical integrity of the research. Initially, the researcher developed a self-constructed questionnaire tailored to measure the core variables of the study which are employee engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and productivity. To ensure its appropriateness and effectiveness, the instrument underwent pilot testing involving a small group of respondents from the Mariners' Polytechnic Colleges Foundation (MPCF) in Legazpi City. This preliminary test allowed the researcher to assess the clarity, relevance, and coherence of each item. Feedback gathered during the pilot stage was used to revise and refine the questionnaire to eliminate ambiguity, align questions with the research objectives, and enhance its overall structure. Concurrently, formal permission was obtained from the institutional authorities of MPCF to conduct the study. This included securing written approval and adhering to the institution's research protocols. After receiving preliminary approval, the research proposal was reviewed by the Office of the Director of the Research Ethics Board to ensure compliance with ethical standards.

Data Analysis

The study employed a combination of descriptive statistics, correlational analysis, and causal modeling to analyze the relationships between employee engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee productivity. Using a 5-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and mean scores, were used to summarize the data for problems 1, 2, 3, and 4, assessing employee engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and employee productivity. Descriptive statistics served as the foundation for summarizing and interpreting the collected data in a structured and meaningful manner. In this study, measures such as

the mean and standard deviation were used to describe the central tendency and variability of employee engagement, job satisfaction, work environment, and productivity scores among the respondents. In addition, the standard deviation indicated the degree of variability in responses, allowing the researcher to assess the consistency of employee sentiments across the institution.

To Problems 5 and 6, inferential statistics, such as Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression, were applied to explore relationships and predict how work engagement, job satisfaction, and environment significantly influence employee productivity. In the context of this study, Pearson correlation was applied to quantify how changes in one variable correspond to changes in another. For example, it helped determine whether higher levels of employee engagement were statistically associated with higher productivity. According to Pallant (2020),

Pearson correlation was not only valuable for identifying statistically significant relationships but also for indicating whether interventions in one area may lead to changes in another. To explore the predictive and causal dimensions of the research, linear multiple regression analysis was employed. This technique was particularly useful for understanding how multiple independent variables, namely, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment, jointly influence the dependent variable, which was employee productivity. As noted by Hair et al. (2022), multiple regression was one of the most effective tools for identifying the predictive power of independent variables and determining which among them exerts the most significant impact.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were strictly observed, particularly informed consent, participant anonymity, and data confidentiality, ensuring compliance with ethical standards set by academic and research governing bodies. Preparations also included identifying a stratified sample of both academic and non-academic staff to ensure a balanced and representative group of participants. Once the final version of the questionnaire had been validated and administrative requirements had been met, the study was ready to proceed to the data collection stage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data gathered in the study and provides a systematic analysis and interpretation of the findings. The discussion focuses on addressing the research objectives and explaining the results based on the data obtained.

1. What is the level of work engagement in terms of:
 - 1.1 Employee Recognition;
 - 1.2 Work ethics; and
 - 1.3 Personal Development?

Table 1. Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the participants' level of work engagement in terms of Employee Recognition

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My organization regularly acknowledges employees' contributions and achievements.	3.69	.892	Agree	High
I feel valued when my work is recognized by my supervisor or management.	4.45	4.17	Agree	High
The recognition I receive at work is fair and consistent.	3.64	.916	Agree	High
Employee recognition positively influences my motivation to perform better at work.	4.11	.794	Agree	High
I am more committed to my work when I receive regular recognition.	4.01	.816	Agree	High
1. Recognition from management encourages me to go above and beyond in my tasks.	4.03	.828	Agree	High
2. When I receive positive feedback, I am more likely to maintain high performance.	4.21	.799	Agree	High
3. Employee recognition in my organization contributes to better teamwork and collaboration.	4.07	.825	Agree	High
4. A culture of appreciation and acknowledgment enhances overall workplace morale.	4.27	.851	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.07	.809	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

The composite mean of 4.07 indicated that respondents agreed that employee recognition contributes positively to their work engagement, reflecting a high level of engagement. The composite standard deviation of 0.809 suggests moderate consistency in responses. Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 10, a culture of appreciation and acknowledgment enhances overall workplace morale ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.851$), followed by Indicator 8, when I receive positive feedback, I am more likely to maintain high performance ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.799$). These results indicate that a positive recognition culture and constructive feedback strongly contribute to employee engagement.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 3, the recognition I receive at work is fair and consistent ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.916$), and Indicator 1, my organization regularly acknowledges employees' contributions and achievements ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 0.892$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggested that consistency and regularity of recognition may be areas that require further organizational attention.

Overall, the findings indicate that employee recognition played a significant role in enhancing work engagement, particularly through fostering a culture of appreciation and providing meaningful feedback, while highlighting opportunities to improve the fairness and consistency of recognition practices. These findings were supported by the claim of Waworuntu et al. (2022) that employee recognition significantly enhanced work engagement by strengthening employees' sense of value, motivation, and organizational belonging, particularly when recognition was expressed through sincere appreciation and constructive feedback. Consistent with this, Yadav et al. (2022) explained that recognition serves as a key social exchange mechanism that encouraged employees to reciprocate with higher levels of engagement and performance. Moreover, a study by Zhenjing et al. (2022) found that timely feedback and acknowledgment of employee contributions positively influenced morale and commitment, while perceived unfairness in recognition practices may reduce trust and weaken engagement, highlighting the importance of consistency and equity in recognition systems.

Table 2. Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Work Engagement in Terms of Work Ethics

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I consistently adhere to workplace policies and ethical guidelines.	4.28	.677	Agree	High
2. I demonstrate integrity and honesty in all my work-related activities.	4.42	.645	Agree	High
3. I take full responsibility for my tasks and actions at work.	4.48	.592	Agree	High
4. I maintain professionalism in my interactions with colleagues and supervisors.	4.43	.635	Agree	High
5. I respect company resources and use them responsibly.	4.45	.602	Agree	High
6. My strong work ethic positively impacts my overall productivity.	4.42	.644	Agree	High
7. I meet deadlines consistently due to my disciplined work habits.	4.14	.743	Agree	High
8. I remain focused and committed to my tasks even when faced with challenges.	4.25	.718	Agree	High
9. My ethical behavior contributes to a positive and productive work environment.	4.37	.700	Agree	High
10. Ethical workplace practices contribute to my long-term commitment to the organization.	4.34	.694	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.36	.556	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
--------------	--------------	--------------------	-----------------------

5	4.51-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Very High</i>
4	3.51-4.50	<i>Agree</i>	<i>High</i>
3	2.51-3.50	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Moderately High</i>
2	1.51-2.50	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	1.00-1.50	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of work engagement in terms of work ethics. The composite mean of 4.36 indicated that respondents agreed that they demonstrated strong work ethics, reflecting a high level of work engagement. The composite standard deviation of 0.556 suggested relatively consistent responses among participants.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 3, I take full responsibility for my tasks and actions at work ($M = 4.48$, $SD = 0.592$), followed by Indicator 5, I respect company resources and use them responsibly ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 0.602$). These findings suggested that accountability and responsible use of organizational resources were the strongest aspects of work ethics among the participants.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 7, I meet deadlines consistently due to my disciplined work habits ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.743$), and Indicator 8, I remain focused and committed to my tasks even when faced with challenges ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.718$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they indicated relatively lower perceptions related to time management and sustained focus under challenging conditions.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants exhibit a high level of work engagement in terms of work ethics, particularly in accountability, integrity, and professionalism, while highlighting potential areas for strengthening disciplined work habits and resilience when facing challenges. These findings were supported by the claim of Wanta and Augustine (2021) that strong work ethics, characterized by accountability, integrity, and responsibility, were closely linked to higher levels of employee engagement and overall organizational performance. Similarly, Vermeulen and Scheepers (2020) asserted that employees who demonstrated professionalism, ethical behavior, and conscientiousness were more likely to contribute effectively to organizational goals and maintained consistent work performance. Furthermore, a study by Tarigan et al. (2022) highlights that disciplined work habits, respect for company resources, and sustained focus even under challenging conditions were significant predictors of employee engagement, reinforcing the importance of cultivating strong work ethics as a foundation for organizational success.

Table 3 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Work Engagement in Terms of Personal Development

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. My job allows me to utilize my skills and talents effectively.	4.09	.827	Agree	High
2. I feel satisfied with my professional growth opportunities in this organization.	3.83	.929	Agree	High

3. My job provides me with a sense of purpose and fulfillment.	3.94	.889	Agree	High
4. My workplace fosters a culture of continuous learning and personal growth.	3.74	.933	Agree	High
5. I have access to resources and training programs that help me develop professionally.	3.61	.973	Agree	High
6. My team and colleagues support my professional development goals.	3.80	.929	Agree	High
7. The personal development opportunities offered by my organization improve my productivity.	3.73	1.02	Agree	High
8. I believe continuous learning is essential for my long-term success in this organization.	4.31	.766	Agree	High
9. I feel more committed to my work when my employer invests in my personal development.	4.18	.830	Agree	High
10. My personal growth directly enhances my ability to contribute to the organization's goals.	4.22	.718	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.95	.683	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 3 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of work engagement in terms of professional growth and personal development. The composite mean of 3.95 indicates that respondents agreed that their work engagement was positively influenced by opportunities for professional and personal growth, reflecting a high level of engagement. The composite standard deviation of 0.683 suggests moderate consistency in responses.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 8, I believe continuous learning is essential for my long-term success in this organization ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 0.766$), followed by Indicator 10, my personal growth directly enhances my ability to contribute to the organization's goals ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.718$). These findings indicated that participants strongly recognized the value of continuous learning and personal development in enhancing both individual and organizational outcomes.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 5, I have access to resources and training programs that help me develop professionally ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.973$), and Indicator 7, the personal development opportunities offered by my organization improve my productivity ($M =$

3.73, SD = 1.02). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggested comparatively lower satisfaction with the availability and effectiveness of professional development resources and programs.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants demonstrate a high level of work engagement in terms of personal and professional growth, particularly in valuing continuous learning and recognizing the contribution of personal development to organizational goals, while highlighting areas for improvement in access to development resources and training opportunities. These findings were supported by the claim of Susanto and Sawitri (2022) that opportunities for professional growth and personal development played a critical role in enhancing employee engagement by fostering motivation, skill development, and a sense of purpose within the organization. Supporting this, Susanto et al. (2022) emphasized that continuous learning and access to development programs increase employees' commitment and productivity, as they felt more competent and valued. Additionally, Sypniewska et al. (2023) highlight that the availability and effectiveness of training resources directly influenced employees' perceptions of support from the organization, which in turn strengthened their engagement and overall contribution to organizational goals.

Table 4 Summary of Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the participants' Level of Work Engagement

Sub-constructs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Employee Recognition	4.07	.809	Agree	High
Work ethics	4.36	.556	Agree	High
Personal Development	3.95	.683	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.12	.554	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 4 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of work engagement across the sub-constructs of employee recognition, work ethics, and personal development. The overall mean of 4.12 indicated that respondents agreed that they exhibit a high level of work engagement. The overall standard deviation of 0.554 suggested relatively consistent responses among participants. Among the sub-constructs, work ethics obtained the highest mean (M = 4.36, SD = 0.556), indicating that ethical behavior, responsibility, and professionalism were the strongest contributors to work engagement among participants. This was followed by employee recognition (M = 4.07, SD = 0.809), which also reflected a high level of engagement and highlights the importance of acknowledgment and appreciation in the workplace.

Personal development recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.683$) among the sub-constructs. Although it still falls within the agreed range and reflects a high level of engagement, this result suggested that opportunities related to professional growth and development may be perceived as comparatively less influential or less accessible than other engagement factors.

The high level of work engagement indicates that employees are driven by recognition, strong work values, and opportunities for development. This supports Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, which states that intrinsic motivators enhance satisfaction and performance. In the Job Demands–Resources Model, these factors function as resources that strengthen motivation and help employees meet job demands.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants demonstrate a high level of work engagement, with work emerging as the most prominent sub-construct, while employee recognition and personal development also contribute meaningfully to sustaining engagement in the workplace. These findings were supported by the claim of Selimović et al. (2021) that work engagement was multidimensional, with ethical behavior, recognition, and personal development each played significant roles in motivating employees and enhanced performance. Consistent with this, Sahni (2021) asserted that employees were more likely to remain engaged when organizations foster ethical standards, acknowledge contributions, and provide opportunities for growth, as these factors collectively strengthen commitment and job satisfaction. Furthermore, Riyanto et al. (2021) emphasized that while recognition and work ethics were immediate drivers of engagement, sustained professional development was essential for long-term employee motivation, skill enhancement, and organizational success, highlighting the need for balanced investment across all engagement sub-constructs.

1. What is the level of job satisfaction, in terms of:

- 1.1 Work-life balance;
- 1.2 Compensation and benefits; and
- 1.3 Job Security?

Table 5 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants’ Level of Job Satisfaction in Terms of Work-life Balance

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My organization provides sufficient flexibility in work schedules to help maintain a healthy work-life balance.	3.51	1.00	Agree	High
I can effectively manage my personal and professional responsibilities without feeling overwhelmed.	3.81	.904	Agree	High
I feel that my workload allows me to have quality time with my family and friends.	3.75	.997	Agree	High
My work responsibilities do not interfere with my personal life and well-being.	3.81	.919	Agree	High
I am able to complete my tasks efficiently without feeling burned out.	3.61	.965	Agree	High

My work environment promotes high levels of focus and productivity.	3.57	1.01	Agree	High
I can meet my work deadlines without compromising my personal time.	3.74	.992	Agree	High
A good work-life balance increases my job satisfaction.	4.13	.868	Agree	High
Poor work-life balance negatively affects my job satisfaction and productivity.	4.10	.864	Agree	High
My organization's policies on work-life balance contribute to my overall job satisfaction and performance.	3.62	1.01	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.77	.757	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

The composite mean of 3.77 indicates that respondents agree that their work-life balance contributes positively to their job satisfaction, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.757 suggests moderate variability in responses among participants.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 8, a good work-life balance increases my job satisfaction ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.868$), followed closely by Indicator 9, poor work-life balance negatively affects my job satisfaction and productivity ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.864$). These findings indicated that participants perceive work-life balance as a key factor influencing overall job satisfaction and performance.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 1, my organization provides sufficient flexibility in work schedules to help maintain a healthy work-life balance ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.00$), and Indicator 6, my work environment promotes high levels of focus and productivity ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.01$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggest comparatively lower satisfaction with flexible scheduling and the conduciveness of the work environment for maintaining balance.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants experience a high level of job satisfaction related to work-life balance, with emphasis on the positive impact of maintaining balance on satisfaction and productivity, while highlighting opportunities to improve organizational support for flexible scheduling and focus-enhancing work conditions. These findings were supported by the claim of Ricardianto et al. (2020) that work-life balance was a critical determinant of job satisfaction, as employees who could effectively manage work and personal responsibilities exhibit higher motivation, well-being, and productivity. Consistent with this, Rasool et al. (2021) emphasized that flexible work arrangements and supportive organizational policies significantly enhance employees' satisfaction and reduce stress, contributing to

overall engagement and retention. Additionally, a study by Reissova and Papay (2021) highlights that while employees recognize the importance of work-life balance for performance and satisfaction, insufficient flexibility and non-conducive work environments may limit the positive impact, underscoring the need for organizations to implement strategies that support balanced work schedules and focused, productive work settings.

Table 6 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Job Satisfaction in Terms of Compensation and Benefits

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. My salary is competitive compared to similar positions in other organizations.	3.04	1.08	Neutral	Moderately High
2. I feel that my compensation reflects my level of responsibility and effort.	3.40	1.02	Neutral	Moderately High
3. The organization's pay structure is fair and transparent.	3.13	1.07	Neutral	Moderately High
4. I am satisfied with the bonuses and incentives provided by my employer.	2.97	1.06	Neutral	Moderately High
5. The healthcare benefits provided by my organization meet my needs.	2.94	1.07	Neutral	Moderately High
6. My organization offers sufficient leave benefits (e.g., vacation, sick leave, parental leave).	3.50	1.07	Neutral	Moderately High
7. The benefits package offered by my employer meet my expectations.	3.22	1.03	Neutral	Moderately High
8. My productivity is positively influenced by my satisfaction with my salary and benefits.	3.52	1.00	Agree	High
9. I am less likely to leave my job due to my satisfaction with my salary and benefits.	3.38	1.02	Neutral	Moderately High
10. I feel valued as an employee because of the compensation and benefits I receive.	3.30	1.01	Neutral	Moderately High
Overall Mean	3.24	.821	Neutral	Moderately High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 6 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of job satisfaction in terms of salary and benefits. The composite mean of 3.24 indicated that respondents are neutral regarding their satisfaction with compensation and benefits, reflecting a moderately high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.821 suggests moderate variability in responses among participants.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 8, my productivity is positively influenced by my satisfaction with my salary and benefits ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.00$), followed by Indicator 6, my organization offers sufficient leave benefits ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.07$). These findings suggested that participants perceive leave benefits and the link between compensation and productivity as the most satisfactory aspects of their remuneration package.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 5, the healthcare benefits provided by my organization meet my needs ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.07$), and Indicator 4, I am satisfied with the bonuses and incentives provided by my employer ($M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.06$). Although these indicators fall within the neutral range, they suggest that healthcare, bonuses, and incentives are areas where participants feel less satisfied.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants have a moderately high level of job satisfaction regarding salary and benefits, with leave benefits and the influence of compensation on productivity perceived most positively, while healthcare benefits and bonus structures may require organizational improvement. These findings were supported by the claim of Na-Nan et al. (2021) that compensation and benefits play a pivotal role in shaping employee job satisfaction and motivation, with adequate remuneration directly influencing productivity and organizational commitment. Additionally, a study by Lesmana et al. (2021) highlighted that employees' perceptions of equitable and meaningful compensation are critical for sustaining engagement and performance, underscoring the need for organizations to review and improve benefit packages to align with employees' expectations and needs.

Table 7 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Job Satisfaction in Terms of Job Security

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
1. I feel confident that my job is secure in this organization.	3.51	1.00	Agree	High
2. My organization provides clear policies regarding job stability.	3.81	.904	Agree	High
3. My employer effectively communicates job security policies.	3.75	.997	Agree	High
4. I have concerns about losing my job due to organizational changes.	3.81	.919	Agree	High
5. I am able to concentrate on my tasks without worrying about job instability.	3.61	.965	Agree	High
6. I am more engaged in my work when I feel my job is stable.	3.57	1.01	Agree	High
7. I believe my organization provides stable employment opportunities.	3.74	.992	Agree	High
8. I am not worried about losing my job due to economic conditions.	4.13	.868	Agree	High
9. I feel protected from sudden termination or layoffs in my organization.	4.10	.864	Agree	High

10. Job security allows me to focus better on my tasks and responsibilities.	3.62	1.01	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.77	.757	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Very High</i>
4	3.51-4.50	<i>Agree</i>	<i>High</i>
3	2.51-3.50	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Moderately High</i>
2	1.51-2.50	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	1.00-1.50	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 7 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of job satisfaction in terms of job security. The composite mean of 3.77 indicated that respondents agree that job security contributes positively to their overall job satisfaction, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.757 suggests moderate variability in participants' perceptions of job security.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 8, I am not worried about losing my job due to economic conditions ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.868$), followed by Indicator 9, I feel protected from sudden termination or layoffs in my organization ($M = 4.10$, $SD = 0.864$). These results suggested that participants felt more secure regarding protection from external economic factors and sudden organizational layoffs.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 6, I am more engaged in my work when I feel my job is stable ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.01$), and Indicator 5, I am able to concentrate on my tasks without worrying about job instability ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 0.965$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggested comparatively lower satisfaction with the direct impact of job security on engagement and concentration.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants experience a high level of job satisfaction related to job security, particularly in terms of protection from economic instability and sudden termination, while engagement and focus under perceived job stability may benefit from further organizational support. These findings are supported by the claim of Khair et al. (2024) that job security is a fundamental determinant of employee job satisfaction, as a stable work environment reduces anxiety and allows employees to focus on their responsibilities. Supporting this, Koroglu and Ozmen (2022) assert that perceived job stability enhances commitment, morale, and productivity, while insecurity can negatively impact concentration and engagement. Additionally, research by Inayat and Jahanzeb Khan et al. (2021) highlighted that protection from sudden layoffs and economic instability fosters a sense of organizational support and trust, which in turn strengthens overall job satisfaction and workplace well-being.

Table 8 Summary of Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Job Satisfaction

Sub-constructs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Work-life balance;	3.77	.757	Agree	High
Compensation and benefits	3.24	.821	Neutral	Moderately High
Job Security	3.54	.728	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.77	.757	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 8 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of job satisfaction across the sub-constructs of work-life balance, compensation and benefits, and job security. The overall mean of 3.77 indicated that participants agree they experience a high level of job satisfaction. The overall standard deviation of 0.757 suggested moderate variability in responses, reflecting fairly consistent perceptions among participants.

Among the sub-constructs, work-life balance obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.757$), followed closely by job security ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.728$), indicating that participants felt more satisfied with their ability to balance personal and professional responsibilities as well as the stability of their employment. Compensation and benefits recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.821$) and falls within the neutral range, suggesting that participants are less satisfied with their salary and benefits compared to other aspects of their job satisfaction.

The participants' job satisfaction, especially in work-life balance and job security, reflects the role of hygiene factors in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. These conditions help prevent dissatisfaction and maintain stability but do not strongly motivate performance. This suggests that supportive policies sustain morale rather than directly increasing productivity.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants experienced a generally high level of job satisfaction, with work-life balance and job security being the strongest contributors, while compensation and benefits may require further attention to improve satisfaction. Consistent with this, Hauff et al. (2022) emphasized that the ability to balance personal and professional responsibilities enhances satisfaction, reduces stress, and promotes organizational commitment. Additionally, Hajiali et al. (2022) highlighted that while compensation and benefits are important, deficiencies in these areas can limit overall job satisfaction, suggesting that organizations should maintain a balanced approach to supporting employees through both tangible rewards and supportive work conditions.

2. What is the level of the environment, in terms of:

- 2.1 Organizational culture;
- 2.2 Workload management; and
- 2.3 Leadership style?

Table 9 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Environment in Terms of Organizational Culture

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The organization's core values are clearly communicated and understood by employees.	3.77	.917	Agree	High
The leadership team consistently upholds and demonstrates the company's values.	3.535	.965	Agree	High
There is a strong sense of teamwork and collaboration in the organization.	3.54	.986	Agree	High
Employees are encouraged to share their ideas and opinions without fear of negative consequences.	3.50	1.04	Agree	High
The company culture promotes trust and transparency in decision-making.	3.38	1.09	Agree	High
The organization provides a supportive and inclusive workplace for all employees.	3.42	1.08	Agree	High
The organization prioritizes employee well-being and work-life balance.	3.16	1.07	Agree	High
The organizational culture positively influences employee motivation and engagement.	3.50	1.05	Agree	High
The work environment fosters creativity and innovation.	3.53	.986	Agree	High
Employees feel empowered to take initiative in their tasks and responsibilities.	3.45	1.02	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.48	.902	Agree	Moderately High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Very High</i>
4	3.51-4.50	<i>Agree</i>	<i>High</i>
3	2.51-3.50	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Moderately High</i>
2	1.51-2.50	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	1.00-1.50	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 9 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of environment in terms of organizational culture. The composite mean of 3.48 indicated that respondents agree that the organizational culture contributes positively to their work experience, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.902 suggested moderate variability in responses among participants.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 1, the organization's core values are clearly communicated and understood by employees ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.917$), followed by Indicator 2, the leadership team consistently upholds and demonstrates the company's values ($M = 3.535$, $SD = 0.965$). These findings suggested that clarity of organizational values and leadership adherence to these values are perceived most positively by participants.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 7, the organization prioritizes employee well-being and work-life balance ($M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.07$), and Indicator 5, the company culture promotes trust and transparency in decision-making ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.09$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggested comparatively lower satisfaction with the organization's emphasis on employee well-being and transparency.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants generally perceive the organizational culture positively, particularly in terms of communicated values and leadership modeling, while highlighting opportunities to strengthen employee well-being initiatives and transparent decision-making practices. These findings are supported by the claim of Farooq and Sultana (2022) that a clearly communicated organizational culture and leadership alignment with company values significantly enhance employees' work experience and satisfaction. Consistent with this, Garg et al. (2021) emphasized that strong organizational culture provides a sense of identity, shared purpose, and behavioral guidance, which positively influences engagement and performance. Furthermore, Donley (2021) highlighted that while clarity of values is crucial, attention to employee well-being and transparent decision-making is equally important, as neglecting these areas may reduce trust and overall satisfaction within the workplace.

Table 10 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Environment in Terms of Workload Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My workload is evenly distributed throughout my work schedule.	3.80	.939	Agree	High
I have sufficient time to complete my tasks without feeling rushed.	3.59	1.03	Agree	High
My workload is reasonable and does not exceed my capacity.	3.69	.968	Agree	High
I can effectively prioritize tasks without feeling overwhelmed.	3.77	.940	Agree	High
I receive adequate support from my supervisor to manage my workload.	3.68	1.03	Agree	High
Deadlines set by my organization are realistic and achievable.	3.47	1.08	Neutral	Moderately High

I have access to the necessary tools and resources to complete my tasks efficiently.	3.64	.977	Agree	High
Overtime work is minimal and does not affect my well-being.	3.57	.977	Agree	High
I feel confident in my ability to handle my workload effectively.	4.00	.812	Agree	High
There is clear communication regarding expectations and responsibilities.	3.57	1.01	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.73	.985	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Very High</i>
4	3.51-4.50	<i>Agree</i>	<i>High</i>
3	2.51-3.50	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Moderately High</i>
2	1.51-2.50	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	1.00-1.50	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 10 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of environment in terms of workload management. The composite mean of 3.73 indicated that respondents agree that their workload is generally well managed, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.985 suggested moderate variability in participants' responses.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 9, I feel confident in my ability to handle my workload effectively ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.812$), followed by Indicator 1, my workload is evenly distributed throughout my work schedule ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.939$). These findings suggested that participants felt more positively about their confidence in managing tasks and the overall distribution of workload.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 6, deadlines set by my organization are realistic and achievable ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.08$), followed by Indicator 2, I have sufficient time to complete my tasks without feeling rushed ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.03$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree or moderately high range, they suggested comparatively lower satisfaction with the realism of deadlines and time available to complete tasks.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants generally perceive their workload management positively, particularly in terms of confidence and equitable distribution of tasks, while highlighting areas for improvement in deadline realism and time allocation. These findings are supported by the claim of Clack (2021) that effective workload management enhances employee satisfaction and engagement by promoting confidence, reducing stress, and enabling employees to perform tasks efficiently. Consistent with this, Bulińska-Stangrecka and Bagieńska (2021) emphasized that equitable task distribution and manageable workloads were key factors in maintaining high performance and preventing burnout. Furthermore, a study by Bhardwaj and Kalia (2021) highlighted that realistic deadlines and adequate time allocation were critical for employees perceived control and job satisfaction, suggesting that organizations should continuously assess workload distribution and task expectations to optimize productivity and well-being.

Table 11. Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the participants' Level of Environment in Terms of Leadership Style

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
My supervisor provides clear direction and expectations.	3.70	1.04	Agree	High
My supervisor encourages open communication and feedback.	3.73	1.09	Agree	High
My supervisor supports employee growth and professional development.	3.80	1.01	Agree	High
My supervisor leads by example in terms of work ethics and professionalism.	3.68	1.05	Agree	High
My supervisor involves employees in decision-making processes.	3.71	1.06	Agree	High
My supervisor adapts leadership approaches based on employee needs.	3.68	1.10	Agree	High
My supervisor effectively resolves conflicts in the workplace.	3.75	1.06	Agree	High
My supervisor empowers employees to take initiative in their tasks.	3.83	1.01	Agree	High
My supervisor creates a positive and motivating work atmosphere.	3.71	1.07	Agree	High
My supervisor sets realistic and achievable performance expectations.	3.73	1.04	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.73	.985	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	<i>Strongly Agree</i>	<i>Very High</i>
4	3.51-4.50	<i>Agree</i>	<i>High</i>
3	2.51-3.50	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Moderately High</i>
2	1.51-2.50	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Low</i>
1	1.00-1.50	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 11 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of environment in terms of leadership style. The composite mean of 3.73 indicated that respondents agree that leadership style positively contributes to their work environment, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The composite standard deviation of 0.985 suggested moderate variability in participants' perceptions of leadership style.

Among the indicators, the highest mean was recorded for Indicator 8, my supervisor empowers employees to take initiative in their tasks ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.01$), followed by Indicator 3, my supervisor supports employee growth and professional development ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.01$). These results suggested that participants felt more positively about the empowerment they received and the professional development support provided by their supervisors.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were observed for Indicator 4, my supervisor leads by example in terms of work ethics and professionalism ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.05$), and Indicator 6, my supervisor adapts

leadership approaches based on employee needs ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.10$). Although these indicators still fall within the agree range, they suggested comparatively lower satisfaction with leadership modeling and flexibility in supervisory approaches.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants perceive leadership style positively, particularly in terms of empowerment and support for professional growth, while highlighting minor areas for improvement in leading by example and adapting leadership approaches. These findings are supported by the claim of Basalamah (2021) that effective leadership styles, characterized by employee empowerment and support for professional growth, significantly enhance the work environment and overall job satisfaction. Consistent with this, Boccoli et al. (2023) emphasized that leaders who encourage initiative and provide developmental support foster higher engagement, motivation, and organizational commitment. Additionally, a study by Ayanponle et al. (2024) highlighted that leadership modeling and adaptive approaches were critical for sustaining trust and satisfaction, suggesting that while empowerment is valued, consistent demonstration of work ethics and flexible leadership could further strengthen employee perceptions of a positive work environment.

Table 12 Summary Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the Participants' Level of Environment

Sub-constructs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Organizational culture	3.48	.902	Neutral	Moderately High
Workload management	3.68	.819	Agree	High
Leadership style	3.73	.985	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.63	.824	Agree	High

Legend:

Scale	Range	Description	Interpretation
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 12 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of environment across the sub-constructs of organizational culture, workload management, and leadership style. The overall mean of 3.63 indicated that participants agree that their work environment contributes positively to their experience, reflecting a high level of satisfaction. The overall standard deviation of 0.824 suggested moderate variability in responses, indicating fairly consistent perceptions among participants.

Among the sub-constructs, leadership style obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.985$), followed closely by workload management ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 0.819$), suggesting that participants feel most satisfied with the guidance, support, and task management provided by their supervisors and the organization. Organizational culture recorded the lowest mean ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.902$) and falls within the neutral/moderately high range, indicating relatively lower satisfaction with the overall culture, including values, communication, and employee well-being initiatives.

The positive assessment of leadership and workload management shows that employees experience a supportive environment. This aligns with the Job Demands–Resources Model, where organizational resources help balance demands and reduce strain. Social Exchange Theory further explains that supportive treatment encourages commitment in return.

Overall, the findings suggested that participants generally perceive their environment positively, with leadership style and workload management being the strongest contributors to satisfaction, while organizational culture presents an area for potential improvement. These findings are supported by the claim of Aruldoss et al. (2022) that a positive work environment, shaped by effective leadership, clear workload management, and a strong organizational culture, were essential for employee satisfaction and engagement. Consistent with this, Al Kurdi et al. (2021) emphasized that organizational culture provides the foundational values and norms that guide behavior, but its impact were maximized when coupled with supportive leadership and well-managed workloads. Furthermore, Anakpo et al. (2023) highlighted that employees perceive higher satisfaction when leaders provide guidance and empower staff, while balanced workload management ensures productivity and reduces stress, indicating that organizations should continuously develop both cultural initiatives and supervisory practices to optimize workplace experience.

4. What is the level of employee productivity?

Table 13 Results of Mean and Standard Deviation for the participants' level of employee productivity

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
I complete my assigned tasks efficiently within the given timeframe.	4.21	.725	Agree	High
I effectively manage my workload without compromising quality.	4.21	.712	Agree	High
I ensure accuracy and attention to detail in my tasks.	4.28	.720	Agree	High
I am proactive in identifying and correcting errors in my work.	4.26	.721	Agree	High
I regularly seek ways to improve my work performance.	4.32	.700	Agree	High
I am committed to achieving both personal and organizational goals.	4.33	.701	Agree	High
I collaborate effectively with my colleagues to accomplish tasks.	4.27	.695	Agree	High
I communicate efficiently with team members to enhance productivity.	4.26	.661	Agree	High
I contribute positively to team discussions and decision-making.	4.40	2.53	Agree	High
I am open to feedback and use it to improve my work.	4.70	3.46	Agree	High
I actively support my colleagues when they need assistance.	4.38	.682	Agree	High
I prioritize my tasks effectively to meet deadlines.	4.40	.674	Agree	High
I use my working hours productively without distractions.	4.26	.723	Agree	High
I set realistic goals and work towards achieving them consistently.	4.28	.720	Agree	High

I effectively manage stress to maintain my productivity.	4.55	4.24	Strongly Agree	Very High
I actively seek solutions to work-related challenges.	4.33	.691	Agree	High
I adapt quickly to new processes, systems, or technologies.	4.23	.733	Agree	High
I contribute creative ideas to enhance work efficiency.	4.19	.726	Agree	High
I take initiative to solve problems before they escalate.	4.30	.694	Agree	High
I continuously look for ways to optimize work processes.	4.27	.754	Agree	High
Overall Mean	4.32	.661	Agree	High

Legend:

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
5	4.51-5.00	Strongly Agree	Very High
4	3.51-4.50	Agree	High
3	2.51-3.50	Neutral	Moderately High
2	1.51-2.50	Disagree	Low
1	1.00-1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low

Table 13 presents the mean and standard deviation of the participants' level of employee productivity. The overall mean of 4.32 indicated that participants agreed they were productive in their work, reflecting a high level of productivity. The overall standard deviation of 0.661 suggested relatively low variability in responses, showing consistent perceptions among participants.

Among the indicators, the highest mean scores were observed for Indicator 10, I am open to feedback and use it to improve my work ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 3.46$); Indicator 15, I effectively manage stress to maintain my productivity ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 4.24$); Indicator 9, I contribute positively to team discussions and decision-making ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 2.53$); and Indicator 12, I prioritize my tasks effectively to meet deadlines ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.674$). These results suggested that participants are particularly strong in using feedback, managing stress, contributing to team decisions, and prioritizing tasks effectively.

In contrast, the lowest mean scores were recorded for Indicator 18, I contribute creative ideas to enhance work efficiency ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.726$); Indicator 1, I complete my assigned tasks efficiently within the given timeframe ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.725$); Indicator 2, I effectively manage my workload without compromising quality ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.712$); and Indicator 17, I adapt quickly to new processes, systems, or technologies ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 0.733$). While these indicators still fall within the agree range, they reflect comparatively lower productivity in creativity, task efficiency, workload management, and adaptability.

The very high productivity levels reflected how adequate resources and support translate into effective performance. The Job Demands–Resources Model links these resources to improved outcomes, while Social Exchange Theory explains employees' willingness to reciprocate support through dedication and quality work.

Overall, the findings indicated that participants generally perceive themselves as highly productive, with particular strengths in feedback utilization, stress management, teamwork, and task prioritization,

while creative contribution, task efficiency, workload management, and adaptability offer areas for further development. These findings are supported by the claim of Alameeri et al. (2021) that employee productivity is enhanced when individuals actively utilize feedback, manage stress effectively, engage in teamwork, and prioritize tasks strategically. Consistent with this, Ali and Anwar (2021) assert that productive employees demonstrate strong time management, collaboration, and adaptability skills, which contribute to both individual and organizational performance. Additionally, a study by Aruldoss et al. (2022) highlighted that fostering creativity, efficient task completion, and the ability to adapt to new processes further strengthens productivity, suggesting that while employees perform well in structured and feedback-driven tasks, organizations can enhance output by encouraging innovation and flexibility in work practices.

5. Is there a significant relationship between employees' productivity and:

- 5.1 Work Engagement;
- 5.2 Job Satisfaction; and
- 5.3 Environment?

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between employees' productivity and the following: work engagement, job satisfaction, and environment.

Table 14 Pearson Correlation Between Employees' Productivity and Work Engagement, Job Satisfaction, and Environment (N = 142)

Variable	Pearson r	p-value	Effect Size	Interpretation
Work Ethics	.690	.000	Large	Significant
Work Engagement	.641	.000	Large	Significant
Work-life Balance	.553	.000	Large	Significant
Personal Development	.538	.000	Large	Significant
Job Satisfaction	.553	.000	Large	Significant
Workload Management	.502	.000	Large	Significant
Environment	.452	.000	Medium	Significant
Organizational Culture	.422	.000	Medium	Significant
Compensation & Benefits	.460	.000	Medium	Significant
Employee Recognition	.390	.000	Medium	Significant
Leadership Style	.329	.000	Medium	Significant

Note. Effect sizes are interpreted using Cohen's guidelines: small ($r=.10r = .10r=.10$), medium ($r=.30r = .30r=.30$), and large ($r=.50r = .50r=.50$).

Table 14 shows the results of Pearson correlation analysis examining the relationship between employees' productivity and various organizational and personal factors. The results indicated that all variables have significant positive correlations with productivity at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). Since all p-values were less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. Among the factors, work ethics ($r=.690r = .690r=.690$), work engagement ($r=.641r = .641r=.641$), work-life balance ($r=.553r = .553r=.553$), personal

development ($r=.538$), job satisfaction ($r=.553$), and workload management ($r=.502$) demonstrated large effect sizes, suggesting these are particularly influential in enhancing productivity.

Other variables, including environment ($r=.452$), organizational culture ($r=.422$), compensation and benefits ($r=.460$), employee recognition ($r=.390$), and leadership style ($r=.329$) showed medium effect sizes, indicating moderate contributions to productivity.

The significant relationships between productivity and several workplace factors supported the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model, which explains that available resources enhance motivation and performance. When employees experience support and development, they are better able to meet job demands. Social Exchange Theory also suggests that positive workplace conditions encourage employees to respond with greater commitment and productivity.

Overall, the findings highlighted that both individual factors (e.g., ethics, engagement, personal development) and organizational conditions (e.g., culture, environment, leadership) play crucial roles in boosting employee productivity. These findings are supported by the claim of De-la-Calle-Durán and Rodríguez-Sánchez (2021) that employee productivity is influenced by a combination of personal and organizational factors, with strong work ethics, engagement, and opportunities for personal development serving as key drivers of performance. Consistent with this, Eisenberger and Rhoades Shanock (2020) emphasize that individual characteristics such as responsibility, motivation, and skill development, alongside supportive work conditions, significantly enhanced productivity outcomes. Furthermore, a study by Gosnell and List (2020) highlighted those organizational elements, including culture, leadership, recognition, and workload management, interact with personal factors to shape overall performance, suggesting that organizations must address both employee development and conducive workplace conditions to maximize productivity.

6. Which variables, singly or in combination, influence employees’ productivity?

Ho₂. There is no variable, alone or in combination, influence on employees’ productivity.

Table 15 Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Employees’ Productivity (N = 142)

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Interpretation
Constant	.303	.343	—	.883	.379	Not significant
Employee Recognition	.002	.061	.002	.030	.976	Not significant
Work Ethics	.686	.093	.577	7.402	.000	Significant
Personal Development	.067	.110	.070	.615	.540	Not significant
Work-life Balance	.102	.113	.117	.899	.370	Not significant
Compensation & Benefits	.048	.095	.060	.503	.616	Not significant
Job Satisfaction	.054	.111	.059	.487	.627	Not significant
Organizational Culture	.007	.096	.010	.073	.942	Not significant

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Interpretation
Workload Management	-.056	.109	-.069	-.515	.608	Not significant
Leadership Style	.056	.066	.083	.846	.399	Not significant

Model Summary: R=.740, R²=.547, Adj. R²=.516, SEE=.459 R = .740, R² = .547, \text {Adj.} R² = .516, SEE = .459

ANOVA: F (9,132) =17.72, p=.000 F (9,132) = 17.72, p = .000 F (9,132) =17.72, p=.000

The multiple regression analysis (Table 15) was conducted to determine which factors significantly predict employees' productivity. The overall model is significant ($F(9,132) = 17.72, p < .001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that the independent variables, collectively, significantly influence employees' productivity and explain approximately 54.7% of the variance in productivity ($R^2 = .547$).

However, among all the predictors, only work ethics significantly predicts employees' productivity ($B = .686, \beta = .577, t = 7.402, p < .001$), while other variables, including employee recognition, personal development, work-life balance, compensation and benefits, job satisfaction, organizational culture, workload management, and leadership style, were not significant predictors.

Following the results of the multiple regression analysis presented in Table 16, the regression model used to predict employees' productivity is expressed as:

$$Y = 0.303 + 0.002X_1 + 0.686X_2 + 0.067X_3 + 0.102X_4 + 0.048X_5 + 0.054X_6 + 0.007X_7 - 0.056X_8 + 0.056X_9$$

where Y represents employees' productivity, while X₁ to X₉ represent the predictor variables, namely employee recognition, work ethics, personal development, work-life balance, compensation and benefits, job satisfaction, organizational culture, workload management, and leadership style, respectively.

Where:

- X 1 = Employee Recognition
- X 2 = Work Ethics
- X 3 = Personal Development
- X 4 = Work-Life Balance
- X 5 = Compensation and Benefits
- X 6 = Job Satisfaction
- X 7 = Organizational Culture
- X 8 = Workload Management
- X 9 = Leadership Style.

This equation indicates that for every one-unit increase in work ethics, employees' productivity is expected to increase by 0.686 units, holding all other variables constant. No other variables significantly contributed to the prediction of productivity in this model. These findings are supported by the claim of Hasibuan et al. (2024) that work ethics was a primary determinant of employee productivity, as personal responsibility, integrity, and professionalism directly influence performance outcomes. Consistent with this,

Robbins and Judge (2019) assert that employees who consistently demonstrate strong work ethics were more focused, disciplined, and committed, which translates into higher efficiency and effectiveness in task completion. Additionally, a study by Hajiali et al. (2022) highlighted that while other organizational and personal factors may support productivity, the foundational role of work ethics remains the most significant predictor of sustained performance, emphasizing the critical need for cultivating ethical standards and accountability within the workforce.

The regression results, where only work ethics significantly predicted productivity, highlight the role of intrinsic motivation emphasized in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory. This indicates that internal values and responsibility have a stronger direct effect on performance than external conditions. Productivity is therefore driven more by motivator factors than by workplace conditions alone.

CONCLUSION

Employees demonstrate a high level of work engagement, indicating that ethical behavior, responsibility, and professionalism play an important role in strengthening engagement in the workplace. However, opportunities for personal development appear to have a comparatively lesser influence, suggesting that further support for employee growth and skills enhancement remains beneficial.

Employees also exhibit a generally high level of job satisfaction, with work-life balance serving as a key contributor to positive perceptions of their work. Despite this, compensation and benefits appear relatively less influential compared with other factors affecting satisfaction. The work environment is perceived positively, particularly in terms of leadership practices that support employees and contribute to a productive workplace. Nevertheless, aspects of organizational culture still require improvement to strengthen shared values, communication, and organizational practices.

Employees maintain a high level of productivity, indicating that they perform their tasks effectively and sustain a strong level of work output. Employees' productivity has significant relationships with work engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment, suggesting that positive employee attitudes and supportive workplace conditions contribute to better performance.

However, when the variables are examined collectively, work engagement emerges as the only significant predictor of employee productivity, indicating that employees' commitment, involvement, and ethical orientation toward work play the most critical role in influencing productivity. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypotheses, as employees' productivity significantly relates to the identified workplace factors, and work engagement significantly influences productivity. These conclusions emphasize the importance of strengthening employee engagement strategies to sustain and improve productivity within the organization.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, M. S., Raman, K., & Solarin, S. A. (2021). Effect of organizational culture on employee performance: A mediating role of employee engagement in Malaysia educational sector. *International Journal of Supply and Operations Management*, 8(3), 232-246.
- Abror, A., Patrisia, D., & Syahrizal, S. (2020). *Self-efficacy, employee engagement, remuneration and employee loyalty in higher education: The role of satisfaction and Ocb*. Retrieved from Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Abror-Abror-2/publication/340081855_SelfEfficacy_Employee_Engagement_Remuneration_and_Employee_Loyalty_in_Higher_Education_The_Role_of_Satisfaction_and_Ocb/links/5e761b174585157b9a4f4c9c/Self-Efficacy-Employee-Engagement
- Agustina, R., Yusuf, M., Sutiyan, O. S. J., Ardianto, R., & Norvadewi, N. (2024). Employee performance mediated quality of work life relationship satisfaction on the job and organizational commitment. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 30(2), 589-605.
- Ahakwa, I., Yang, J., Tackie, E. A., & Atingabili, S. (2021). The influence of employee engagement, work environment and job satisfaction on organizational commitment and performance of employees: a sampling weight in PLS path modelling. *SEISENSE Journal of Management*, 4(3), 34-62.
- Alameeri, K., Alshurideh, M., Al Kurdi, B., & Salloum, S. A. (2021). The effect of work environment happiness on employee leadership. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Advanced Intelligent Systems and Informatics 2020* (pp. 668-680). Springer International Publishing.
- Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). Work engagement: how does employee work engagement influence employee satisfaction? *Ali, BJ, & Anwar, G. (2021). Work Engagement: How Does Employee Work Engagement Influence Employee Satisfaction*, 10-21.
- Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An empirical study of employees' motivation and its influence on job satisfaction. *Ali, BJ, & Anwar, G. (2021). An Empirical Study of Employees' Motivation and its Influence on Job Satisfaction. International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(2), 21-30.
- Alkandi, I. G., Khan, M. A., Fallatah, M., Alabdulhadi, A., Alanizan, S., & Alharbi, J. (2023). The impact of incentive and reward systems on employee performance in the Saudi primary, secondary, and tertiary industrial sectors: A mediating influence of employee job satisfaction. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3415.
- Al Kurdi, B., Elrehail, H., Alzoubi, H. M., Alshurideh, M., & Al-Adaileh, R. (2021). The interplay among HRM practices, job satisfaction and intention to leave: An empirical investigation. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul. Isses*, 24, 1.
- Anakpo, G., Nqwayibana, Z., & Mishu, S. (2023). The impact of work-from-home on employee performance and productivity: a systematic review. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4529.
- Aruldoss, A., Berube Kowalski, K., Travis, M. L., & Parayitam, S. (2022). The relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction: Moderating role of training and development and work environment. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 19(2), 240-271.

- Asghar, M., Tayyab, M., Gull, N., Zhijie, S., Shi, R., & Tao, X. (2021). Polychronicity, work engagement, and turnover intention: The moderating role of perceived organizational support in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 49, 129-13
- Ayanponle, L. O., Awonuga, K. F., Asuzu, O. F., Daraojimba, R. E., Elufioye, O. A., & Daraojimba, O. D. (2024). A review of innovative HR strategies in enhancing workforce efficiency in the US. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 11(1), 817-827.
- Basalamah, S. (2021). *The role of work motivation and work environment in improving job satisfaction*. Retrieved from Repository: <http://repository.umi.ac.id/2512/1/54-Article%20Text-1506-1-10-20220825.pdf>
- Bhardwaj, B., & Kalia, N. (2021). Contextual and task performance: role of employee engagement and organizational culture in hospitality industry. *Vilakshan-XIMB Journal of Management*, 18(2), 187-201.
- Boccoli, G., Gastaldi, L., & Corso, M. (2023). The evolution of employee engagement: Towards a social and contextual construct for balancing individual performance and wellbeing dynamically. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 25(1), 75-98.
- Bulińska-Stangrecka, H., & Bagińska, A. (2021). The role of employee relations in shaping job satisfaction as an element promoting positive mental health at work in the era of COVID-19. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(4), 1903.
- Chaudhary, S., Nasir, N., ur Rahman, S., & Sheikh, S. M. (2023). Impact of workload and stress on call center employees: evidence from call center employees. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(1), 160-171.
- Clack, L. (2021). Employee engagement: Keys to organizational success. *The Palgrave handbook of workplace well-being*, 1001-1028.
- De-la-Calle-Durán, M. C., & Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. L. (2021). Employee engagement and wellbeing in the times of COVID-19: a proposal of the 5Cs model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(10), 5470.
- Donley, J. (2021). The impact of the work environment on job satisfaction: pre-COVID research to inform the future. *Nurse leader*, 19(6), 585-589.
- Donley, J. (2021). *The impact of work environment on job satisfaction: pre-COVID research to inform the future*. Retrieved from Elsevier: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1541461221001828?casa_token=UxNjE89joRYA:AA:l3375bJ9b9Yj-UGp6h9s32U_MZmsGC4JB7t7Pb7fAEqzcH3LWQWm-heQdQWRbrkFVCkm9np4Xew
- Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades Shanock, L. (2020). *Perceived organizational support: Why caring about employees counts*. Retrieved from Annual Reviews: <https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>
- Engidaw, A. E. (2021). The effect of motivation on employee engagement in public sectors: in the case of North Wollo zone. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 43.

- Farooq, R., & Sultana, A. (2022). *The potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on work from home and employee productivity*. Retrieved from Emerald: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MBE-12-2020-0173/full/html?casa_token=k7EC_altBGsAAAAA:BbmMKTaV96nCvgqLYHPpdoqu4u7sBM0JDYpKMMW9d6Mfdl6OHuUDS6tqp5nVqPpin0TrRni2kxzGCiuq1wU0Qsiwy425-SfyEWix7M6UFpqvczwrqLF
- Garg, R., Kiwelekar, A. W., Netak, L. D., & Ghodake, A. (2021). i-Pulse: A NLP based novel approach for employee engagement in logistics organization. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 1(1), 100011.
- Gosnell, G., & List, J. (2020). *The impact of management practices on employee productivity: A field experiment with airline captains*. Retrieved from Uchicago: <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/705375>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2022). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning. <https://www.cengage.com/c/multivariate-data-analysis-8e-hair/>
- Hajjali, I., Kessi, A. M. F., Budiandriani, B., Prihatin, E., & Sufri, M. M. (2022). Determination of work motivation, leadership style, employee competence on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 57-69.
- Haralayya, B. (2021). Employee Job Satisfaction at Big Bazaar. *Iconic Research and Engineering Journals*, 4(12), 197-206.
- Hasibuan, J. S., Sari Nasution, A. S., & Sari, M. (2024). Organizational Citizenship Behavior as A Moderator in Employee Performance: A Study on Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & Planning*, 19(1).
- Hauff, S., Felfe, J., & Klug, K. (2022). High-performance work practices, employee well-being, and supportive leadership: spillover mechanisms and boundary conditions between HRM and leadership behavior. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(10), 2109-2137.
- Hidayat, W. G. P. A. (2023). The influence of employee engagement, work environment and job characteristics on job satisfaction and performance. *JEMSI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Dan Akuntansi)*, 9(4), 1652-1659.
- Inayat, W., & Jahanzeb Khan, M. (2021). A study of job satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees working in private sector organizations, Peshawar. *Education Research International*, 2021(1), 1751495.
- Khair, H., Annisa, N., Pratiwi, R., & Rozak, A. (2024). *Leader-Member Exchange, Perceived Organisational Support And Job Satisfaction: Mediating Role Of Employee Engagement*. Retrieved from ECOJOIN: <http://www.ecojoin.org/index.php/EJM/article/view/1638>
- Koroglu, S., & Ozmen, O. (2022). *The mediating effect of work engagement on innovative work behavior and the role of psychological well-being in the job demands-resources (JD-R) model*. Retrieved from Emerald: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/apjba-09-2020-0326/full/html?casa_token=VPNdcDyApEgAAAAA:GSUy0-UPjuXUfNx29c8-

[g5CJ7Glz85Pq_AEyo7ckc1R8ulcngnO1641ipXi7eNEt2Yhl8s3Gj-rRIWfEWN6VAuHcWUT9yT28Zvu6VxucjwYSxwFUoV0q](https://doi.org/10.30605/ijerip.v2i3.12345)

- Lesmana, H., Indradewa, R., & Syah, T. Y. R. (2021). Organization innovation effect on job satisfaction and employee engagement over job performance at PT. UTAC manufacturing services Indonesia. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic*, 5(3), 208-215.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Putra, A. R. (2021). Efforts to increase employee work productivity through job satisfaction and job training. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia Manajemen*, 1(1), 51-64.
- Makridis, C., & Schloetzer, J. D. (2022). Does working from home increase job satisfaction and retention? Evidence from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Evidence from the COVID-19 Pandemic (March 6, 2022). Georgetown McDonough School of Business Research Paper*, (4016657).
- Megawaty, M., Hamdat, A., & Aida, N. (2022). Examining linkage leadership style, employee commitment, work motivation, work climate on satisfaction and performance. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 01-
- Na-Nan, K., Kanthong, S., & Joungrakul, J. (2021). An empirical study on the model of self-efficacy and organizational citizenship behavior transmitted through employee engagement, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the thai automobile parts manufacturing industry. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(3), 170.
- Novosel, L. M. (2022). Understanding Evidence: Quantitative Research Designs. *Urologic Nursing*, 42(6). <https://www.sun.org/resources/urologic-nursing-journal>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education. <https://www.routledge.com/SPSS-Survival-Manual-A-step-by-step-guide-to-data-analysis-using-IBM-S/Pallant/p/book/9781760875534>
- Quek, S. J., Thomson, L., Houghton, R., Bramley, L., Davis, S., & Cooper, J. (2021). Distributed leadership as a predictor of employee engagement, job satisfaction and turnover intention in UK nursing staff. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 29(6), 1544-1553.
- Rachman, M. M. (2021). The impact of work stress and the work environment in the organization: how do job satisfaction affect employee performance? *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 9(2), 339-354.
- Rasool, S., Wang, M., Tang, M., & Saeed, A. (2021). *How toxic workplace environment effects the employee engagement: The mediating role of organizational support and employee wellbeing*. Retrieved from MDPI: <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/5/2294>
- Reissová, A., & Papay, M. (2021). The relationship between Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction and Potential Turnover. *TEM Journal*, 10(2).
- Ricardianto, P., Ikhsan, R., & Setiawati, R. (2020). *How to improve ship crew's work effectiveness through the leadership style, work life balance and employee engagement in Indonesia national shipping*. Retrieved from Academia Edu: https://www.academia.edu/download/81397657/msl_2019_243.pdf

- Rivaldo, Y. (2021). Leadership and motivation to performance through job satisfaction of hotel employees at D'Merlion Batam. *Journal The Winners*, 22(1), 25-30.
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). *Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement*. Retrieved from Academia Edu: https://www.academia.edu/download/69819906/PPM_2021_03_Riyanto.pdf
- Riyanto, S., Endri, E., & Herlisha, N. (2021). Effect of work motivation and job satisfaction on employee performance: Mediating role of employee engagement. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(3), 162.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education Limited. <https://www.pearson.com/en-us/subject-catalog/p/organizational-behavior/P200000006036/9780136879619>
- Sahni, J. (2021). Employee engagement among millennial workforce: Empirical study on selected antecedents and consequences. *Sage Open*, 11(1), 21582440211002208.
- Sapta, I., Muafi, M., & SETINI, N. M. (2021). The role of technology, organizational culture, and job satisfaction in improving employee performance during the Covid-19 pandemic. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(1), 495-505.
- Selimović, J., Pilav-Velić, A., & Krndžija, L. (2021). Digital workplace transformation in the financial service sector: Investigating the relationship between employees' expectations and intentions. *Technology in Society*, 66, 101640.
- Silva, P., Moreira, A. C., & Mota, J. (2023). Employees' perception of corporate social responsibility and performance: the mediating roles of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational trust. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 16(1), 92-111.
- Specchia, M. L., Cozzolino, M. R., Carini, E., Di Pilla, A., Galletti, C., Ricciardi, W., & Damiani, G. (2021). Leadership styles and nurses' job satisfaction. Results of a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(4), 1552.
- Susanto, P., Hoque, M. E., Jannat, T., Emely, B., Zona, M. A., & Islam, M. A. (2022). Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and job performance of SMEs employees: The moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 906876.
- Susanto, P. C., & Sawitri, N. N. (2022). Coaching, Mentoring, Leadership Transformation and Employee Engagement: A Review of the Literature. *Dinasti International Journal of Education Management & Social Science*, 7(2).
- Sypniewska, B., Baran, M., & Kłos, M. (2023). Work engagement and employee satisfaction in the practice of sustainable human resource management—based on the study of polish employees. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 19(3), 1069-1100.
- Tarigan, J., Cahya, J., Valentine, A., Hatane, S., & Jie, F. (2022). Total reward system, job satisfaction and employee productivity on company financial performance: evidence from Indonesian Generation Z workers. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 16(6), 1041-1065.

-
- Vermeulen, T., & Scheepers, C. (2020). *Mediating effect of perceived organisational support on authentic leadership and work engagement*. Retrieved from Repository: <https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/81091>
- Wanta, D., & Augustine, Y. (2021). The effect of servant leadership, job satisfaction and organizational culture on employee performance moderated by good governance in women's cooperative institutions. *Technium Sustainability, 1*(2), 45-58.
- Waworuntu, E. C., Kainde, S. J., & Mandagi, D. W. (2022). Work-life balance, job satisfaction and performance among millennial and Gen Z employees: a systematic review. *Society, 10*(2), 384-398.
- Wolor, C. W., Ardiansyah, A., Rofaida, R., Nurkhin, A., & Rababah, M. A. (2022). Impact of toxic leadership on employee performance. *Health psychology research, 10*(4), 57551.
- Yadav, A., Pandita, D., & Singh, S. (2022). Work-life integration, job contentment, employee engagement and its impact on organizational effectiveness: a systematic literature review. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 54*(3), 509-527.
- Yang, S. Y., Chen, S. C., Lee, L., & Liu, Y. S. (2021). Employee stress, job satisfaction, and job performance: a comparison between high-technology and traditional industry in Taiwan. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business, 8*(3), 605-618.
- Zhenjing, G., Chupradit, S., Ku, K., & Nassani, A. (2022). *Impact of employees' workplace environment on employees' performance: a multi-mediation model*. Retrieved from Frontier Sin: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2022.890400/full>