

The Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance in the Relationship Between Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction Among Hotel Employees

Tasya Lindia Putri Ayu^{1*}, Arif Adrian²

^{1,2}Hospitality Management, Universitas Negeri Padang

Copyright©2026 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0 International License.

Article Info

Article history:

Received July 27, 2026

Revised August 7, 2026

Accepted August 8, 2026

Keywords:

Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Hotel Employees, Partial Least Squares.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction among employees of Four Points by Sheraton Jakarta, Thamrin. A quantitative causal-associative survey design was employed, involving 49 employees who had worked at the hotel for at least one year. Data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. Internal consistency reliability and convergent validity were satisfactory; however, the Fornell-Larcker criterion was not fully met, suggesting possible overlap among the constructs and requiring cautious interpretation of the structural relationships. Employee engagement had positive effects on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.747$, $t = 6.462$, $p < 0.001$) and work-life balance ($\beta = 0.645$, $t = 5.853$, $p < 0.001$). Work-life balance also had a positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.445$, $t = 3.584$, $p < 0.001$). The indirect effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction through work-life balance was significant ($\beta = 0.287$, $t = 2.933$, $p = 0.003$). Because both the direct and indirect effects were significant, work-life balance was interpreted as a partial mediator. The findings suggest that hotel management should strengthen employee engagement while implementing work arrangements that help employees manage their work and personal responsibilities.

Corresponding Author:

Tasya Lindia Putri Ayu

Hospitality Management, Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: tasyalindiaputriayu8@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry is a service-intensive sector that depends heavily on the quality of its human resources because guest experiences are shaped largely through direct interactions with employees. In this context, job satisfaction is important not only for employee well-being but also for service consistency, motivation, and organizational performance. In the hotel sector, job satisfaction has been associated with employee performance [1]. Other research indicates that job satisfaction, together with organizational factors, can influence the motivation and performance of hotel employees [2]. Workplace facilities also contribute to employee satisfaction [3], while the work environment has been shown to be associated with job satisfaction among hotel employees [4]. Four Points by Sheraton Jakarta, Thamrin was selected as the research setting because an urban hotel environment requires service continuity, close work coordination, and rapid responses to guest needs. These operational characteristics make employee engagement and the balance between work and personal life particularly relevant issues to examine.

Employee engagement refers to a state in which employees invest physical, cognitive, and emotional energy in their work roles [5]. In the work engagement literature, engagement is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption [6]. This conceptual structure also underpins the engagement measurement framework developed by Schaufeli and colleagues [7]. From a social exchange perspective, valuable organizational support and resources can encourage employees to reciprocate through stronger engagement [8]. More broadly, engagement is associated with employee satisfaction and organizational outcomes [9]. In the hotel context, job resources and work engagement have also been linked to employee outcomes [10]. Other hospitality research suggests that engagement can operate alongside job satisfaction

as an important mechanism shaping employees' work-related responses [11]. A similar pattern has been reported in hospitality studies comparing the roles of work engagement and job satisfaction in explaining employee behavioral outcomes [12]. Employee engagement is therefore particularly important in hotels, where service demands are intensive and employees are often required to respond quickly to guest needs.

However, a high level of engagement may not be sufficient to produce job satisfaction when employees struggle to balance work demands with their personal lives. Work-life balance refers to an individual's ability to fulfill work and nonwork responsibilities in a compatible manner so that involvement in one domain does not excessively reduce the quality of the other [13]. Previous research has identified a relationship between employee engagement and work-life balance [14]. Another study found that work-life balance can function as an intervening variable between employee engagement and job satisfaction [15]. This relationship may also be shaped by employees' psychological conditions, including cynicism [16]. In the hospitality industry, work-life balance is particularly important because work schedules are not always regular and service demands are continuous. In five-star hotels in Jakarta, work-life balance has been associated with employee performance [17]. In other hotel settings, work-life balance has also been positively related to job satisfaction [18]. In addition, work-life balance has been recognized as relevant to employee loyalty [19]. When job demands are not accompanied by adequate recovery time and appropriate work arrangements, conflict between work and personal roles may worsen employees' evaluations of their jobs.

Although the relationships among employee engagement, work-life balance, and job satisfaction have received considerable attention, the hospitality literature has developed along several relatively separate streams. Some studies discuss work-life balance as part of retention and talent management strategies in the hospitality industry [20]. Other research emphasizes its role in reducing employee stress when employees have sufficient job control and access to work-life balance practices [21]. In terms of employee outcomes, work-life balance has been associated with employee satisfaction in hotels [22] and with psychological well-being and job satisfaction [23]. Meanwhile, the engagement literature has more often examined the relationship between job resources, work engagement, and hotel employee outcomes [10], or the association between engagement and job satisfaction [11]. Other hospitality studies have positioned engagement and job satisfaction as distinct mechanisms in explaining employee behavior [12]. In the Indonesian context, work-life balance has been associated with employee productivity [24] and hotel employee performance [25], while workload has been linked to burnout [26]. Work-life balance has also been examined as a mediator between perceived organizational support and hotel employee performance [27]. These findings indicate that further research is needed to examine more integratively whether work-life balance serves as a mechanism through which employee engagement contributes to job satisfaction among employees of star-rated hotels in Jakarta. The novelty of this study does not lie merely in testing the direct relationships among the variables, but in examining work-life balance as a mediating mechanism that explains how employee engagement may translate into job satisfaction within a hotel operational context. Accordingly, this study examines the effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction, the effect of employee engagement on work-life balance, the effect of work-life balance on job satisfaction, and the mediating role of work-life balance in the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction at Four Points by Sheraton Jakarta, Thamrin.

2. METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with a causal-associative survey design [28]. The research was conducted from June to July 2025 at Four Points by Sheraton Jakarta, Thamrin. The population consisted of 49 employees who had worked at the hotel for at least one year. A minimum tenure of one year was used as an eligibility criterion to ensure that respondents had sufficient exposure to the hotel's work routines and operational practices assessed in the study. Because the population was relatively small, all members of the population were included through total sampling, resulting in a final sample of 49 respondents. Data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire comprising 33 indicators in the measurement model: 9 indicators of employee engagement, 15 indicators of job satisfaction, and 9 indicators of work-life balance. Employee engagement was specified as the independent variable, job satisfaction as the dependent variable, and work-life balance as the mediating variable.

The data were analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4 [29], [30]. Measurement model evaluation included outer loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and the Fornell-Larcker criterion. The structural model was assessed using R^2 values, path coefficients, t-statistics, and p-values obtained through bootstrapping. A relationship was considered statistically significant when the t-statistic exceeded 1.96

and the p-value was below 0.05 [30], [31]. Mediation was classified as partial when both the direct and indirect effects were statistically significant. Because the Fornell-Larcker criterion was not fully satisfied and HTMT values were not available in the results reported in the manuscript, discriminant validity was treated as a limitation and the structural relationships were interpreted cautiously.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Measurement Model

3.1.1. Convergent Validity

The outer loading results in Table 1 show that all indicators had loadings above 0.60. Indicators with loadings between 0.60 and 0.69 were retained because the corresponding constructs still met the recommended thresholds for composite reliability above 0.70 and AVE above 0.50. Removing indicators solely to increase loading values was therefore considered unnecessary and could have reduced the content coverage of the constructs [30]. Convergent validity at the construct level was subsequently assessed using the AVE values presented in Table 2.

Table 1. Outer loading results

	Employee Engagement	Job Satisfaction	Work-Life Balance
X1	0.712		
X2	0.678		
X3	0.698		
X4	0.722		
X5	0.753		
X6	0.791		
X7	0.672		
X8	0.800		
X9	0.671		
Y1		0.749	
Y2		0.762	
Y3		0.651	
Y4		0.736	
Y5		0.673	
Y6		0.670	
Y7		0.707	
Y8		0.743	
Y9		0.772	
Y10		0.695	
Y11		0.673	
Y12		0.687	
Y13		0.717	
Y14		0.670	
Y15		0.722	
Z1			0.742
Z2			0.835
Z3			0.662
Z4			0.775
Z5			0.865
Z6			0.629
Z7			0.799

Employee Engagement	Job Satisfaction	Work-Life Balance
Z8		0.672
Z9		0.728

Source: *SmartPLS 4 output (2025)*.

3.1.2. Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity

Table 2 shows that Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values for all constructs exceeded 0.70. The AVE values were also above 0.50, specifically 0.523 for employee engagement, 0.503 for job satisfaction, and 0.561 for work-life balance. These results indicate adequate internal consistency reliability and convergent validity.

Table 2. Reliability and convergent validity

	Cronbach's alpha	rho_A	rho_C	AVE
Employee Engagement	0.886	0.889	0.908	0.523
Job Satisfaction	0.930	0.932	0.938	0.503
Work-Life Balance	0.902	0.920	0.919	0.561

Source: *SmartPLS 4 output (2025)*.

3.1.3. Discriminant Validity

The Fornell-Larcker results presented in Table 3 indicate that discriminant validity was not fully established. The correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction was 0.747, which exceeded the square roots of the AVE values for employee engagement (0.723) and job satisfaction (0.709). The correlation between job satisfaction and work-life balance was 0.742, which also exceeded the square root of the AVE for job satisfaction. This pattern suggests possible empirical overlap among the constructs. Accordingly, the magnitude and distinctiveness of the relationships among the variables should not be overinterpreted. HTMT values were not available in the results reported in the manuscript; therefore, future studies should confirm discriminant validity using HTMT or other complementary criteria.

Table 3. Fornell-Larcker criterion

	Employee Engagement	Job Satisfaction	Work-Life Balance
Employee Engagement	0.723		
Job Satisfaction	0.747	0.709	
Work-Life Balance	0.645	0.742	0.749

Source: *SmartPLS 4 output (2025)*.

3.2. Structural Model

The coefficients of determination presented in Table 4 show that employee engagement and work-life balance jointly explained 67.3% of the variance in job satisfaction, whereas employee engagement explained 41.7% of the variance in work-life balance. In the context of PLS-SEM, these values indicate relatively strong explanatory power for job satisfaction and moderate explanatory power for work-life balance, although the interpretation of R^2 remains context dependent [30]. The unexplained variance suggests that other organizational and individual factors outside the model may also contribute to these outcomes.

Table 4. Coefficient of determination

	R-square	Adjusted R-square
Job Satisfaction	0.673	0.659
Work-Life Balance	0.417	0.404

Source: *SmartPLS 4 output (2025)*.

3.3. Hypothesis Testing

Table 5 shows that all reported direct effects were statistically significant. Employee engagement had a positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.747$; $t = 6.462$; $p < 0.001$) and on work-life balance ($\beta = 0.645$; $t = 5.853$; $p < 0.001$). Work-life balance also had a positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.445$; $t = 3.584$; p

< 0.001). Therefore, the hypotheses concerning the direct effects were supported by the reported coefficients.

Table 5. Direct effects

Relationship	O	M	STDEV	t-statistic	p-value
Employee Engagement → Job Satisfaction	0.747	0.733	0.116	6.462	< 0.001
Employee Engagement → Work-Life Balance	0.645	0.647	0.110	5.853	< 0.001
Work-Life Balance → Job Satisfaction	0.445	0.461	0.124	3.584	< 0.001

Source: SmartPLS 4 output (2025).

The indirect effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction through work-life balance was also statistically significant ($\beta = 0.287$; $t = 2.933$; $p = 0.003$), as shown in Table 6. Based on the reported results, the mediation was classified as partial because both the direct effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction and the indirect effect through work-life balance remained significant.

Table 6. Indirect effect

Indirect relationship	O	M	STDEV	t-statistic	p-value
Employee Engagement → Work-Life Balance → Job Satisfaction	0.287	0.298	0.098	2.933	0.003

Source: SmartPLS 4 output (2025).

3.4. Discussion

3.4.1. Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction

The positive effect of employee engagement on job satisfaction indicates that employees who work with enthusiasm, dedication, and a sense that their contributions matter are more likely to evaluate their jobs positively. This relationship is consistent with research directly linking employee engagement to job satisfaction [32]. In hotel settings, engagement has also been associated with employee performance through the role of job satisfaction [33]. Research in other organizational contexts shows that engagement can strengthen work-related outcomes [34], while job crafting and job satisfaction are also related to employee engagement [35]. Evidence from banking employees likewise indicates a positive relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction [36]. Findings from Swiss-Belinn Surabaya reveal a similar pattern in the hotel industry, including its association with turnover intention [37]. Theoretically, these findings are consistent with the social exchange perspective on engagement [8] and with meta-analytic evidence linking engagement, employee satisfaction, and business outcomes [9]. In the international hospitality context, job resources that foster engagement are also associated with hotel employee outcomes [10]. Employee engagement in hotels should therefore be understood as a psychological state that develops alongside adequate job resources and organizational support, rather than as an expectation that employees continually increase work intensity without sufficient support.

3.4.2. Employee Engagement and Work-Life Balance

Employee engagement had a positive effect on work-life balance. This finding suggests that healthy engagement may help employees manage their energy, time, and work priorities more effectively. A direct relationship between engagement and work-life balance has been reported in previous research [14]. The role of work-life balance as a link between engagement and job satisfaction has also been supported by another study [15]. However, this relationship is not necessarily straightforward because factors such as employee cynicism may influence its strength [16]. In the hospitality industry, work-life balance is strongly affected by job design and retention strategies [20]. Job control and work-life balance practices are also important for reducing stress in hotel and catering work [21]. In Indonesian hotel settings, work-life balance has been associated with employee productivity [24] and performance [25]. Conversely, poorly managed workloads may increase burnout [26]. Therefore, the present finding should not be interpreted to mean that greater engagement automatically improves work-life balance. In hotel management practice, engagement should be accompanied by well-planned shift schedules, proportionate workload distribution across shifts, clear shift-exchange procedures, and supervisory communication that does not encourage employees to remain continuously available outside working hours.

3.4.3. Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction

The positive effect of work-life balance on job satisfaction indicates that the ability to meet work responsibilities without sacrificing personal life creates a more supportive psychological condition for employees. A positive relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction has been reported directly among hotel employees [18]. Similar findings have also been observed outside the hotel sector, including among corporate employees [38] and healthcare workers [39]. Work-life balance is also associated with job satisfaction and other organizational outcomes such as commitment and motivation [40]. In the telecommunications context, work-life balance together with the work environment has been shown to explain job satisfaction [41]. Other research indicates that this relationship may interact with employee engagement and mental health conditions [42]. Within hospitality, work-life balance has been linked to employee satisfaction at Grand Hyatt Jakarta [22]. The psychological well-being and job satisfaction of hotel employees also become particularly relevant when work-life balance is taken into account [23]. A study published in JoMM likewise found that the work environment was associated with hotel employee job satisfaction [4]. For hotel management, the implication is not merely to establish formal policies, but to ensure that scheduling, workload allocation, and supervisory communication genuinely enable employees to make use of those policies.

3.4.4. Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance partially mediated the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction. This means that employee engagement contributes to job satisfaction through two pathways. The first pathway is direct, because engagement can make work more meaningful and provide employees with a stronger sense of accomplishment. The second pathway operates through work-life balance, whereby well-managed engagement helps employees meet work and personal demands in a more compatible manner. This finding is consistent with research positioning work-life balance as a mediator between employee engagement and job satisfaction [32]. Support for this intervening mechanism has also been reported in another study [15]. In the hotel context, work-life balance has likewise been examined as a mediator between perceived organizational support and employee performance [27]. In the present study, the mediation was classified as partial because the reported direct and indirect effects were both statistically significant. Consequently, work-life balance initiatives cannot substitute for meaningful work, recognition, supervisory support, and opportunities for employee development.

4. CONCLUSION

The main finding of this study is that work-life balance plays a partial mediating role in the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction among employees of Four Points by Sheraton Jakarta, Thamrin. Employee engagement was positively associated with both job satisfaction and work-life balance, while work-life balance was positively associated with job satisfaction. From a practical perspective, hotel management should combine efforts to strengthen engagement, including clear communication, recognition, and development opportunities, with scheduling and workload arrangements that help employees maintain their personal lives. These conclusions should be interpreted cautiously because the sample was limited to a single hotel and the Fornell-Larcker criterion was not fully satisfied. The observed construct overlap may affect the strength of claims regarding the distinct effects among the variables. Future research should use larger samples across multiple hotels, confirm discriminant validity using HTMT, and examine additional organizational factors relevant to job satisfaction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their appreciation to all respondents who participated in this study and to the hotel management for facilitating the data collection process.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Suryani and R. Resniawati, "Pengaruh kepuasan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada Hotel Harper Purwakarta," *Journal of Indonesian Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 79-90, 2022, doi: 10.17509/jithor.v5i1.46913.
- [2] M. Syamsir and H. Tamsah, "Pengaruh kepuasan kerja dan kompensasi terhadap kinerja melalui motivasi karyawan Hotel Claro Makassar," *Jurnal Mirai Management*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 48-77, 2018.

- [3] S. Rianti, "Pengaruh fasilitas kerja terhadap kepuasan karyawan di Truntum Hotel Padang," *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Sains dan Humaniora*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 7-12, 2023, doi: 10.23887/jppsh.v7i1.38666.
- [4] M. A. F. Editra and K. I. Manvi, "The influence of work environment on employee job satisfaction at Turi Beach Resort Batam," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 246-251, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.51.
- [5] W. A. Kahn, "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 692-724, 1990, doi: 10.2307/256287.
- [6] A. B. Bakker, W. B. Schaufeli, M. P. Leiter, and T. W. Taris, "Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology," *Work & Stress*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 187-200, 2008, doi: 10.1080/02678370802393649.
- [7] W. B. Schaufeli, M. Salanova, V. Gonzalez-Roma, and A. B. Bakker, "The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach," *Journal of Happiness Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 71-92, 2002, doi: 10.1023/A:1015630930326.
- [8] A. M. Saks, "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, vol. 21, no. 7, pp. 600-619, 2006, doi: 10.1108/02683940610690169.
- [9] J. K. Harter, F. L. Schmidt, and T. L. Hayes, "Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 268-279, 2002, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268.
- [10] O. M. Karatepe, "Job resources, work engagement, and hotel employee outcomes: A time-lagged analysis," *Economic Research-Ekonomika Istrazivanja*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1127-1139, 2012, doi: 10.1080/1331677X.2012.11517553.
- [11] O. M. Karatepe and G. Karadas, "Do psychological capital and work engagement foster frontline employees' satisfaction? A study in the hotel industry," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 1254-1278, 2015, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-01-2014-0028.
- [12] A. Ozturk, O. M. Karatepe, and F. Okumus, "The effect of servant leadership on hotel employees' behavioral consequences: Work engagement versus job satisfaction," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 97, Art. no. 102994, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102994.
- [13] J. H. Greenhaus, K. M. Collins, and J. D. Shaw, "The relation between work-family balance and quality of life," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 510-531, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8.
- [14] R. R. N. Ariawaty, "Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap work-life balance karyawan," *BISMA*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 97, 2019, doi: 10.19184/bisma.v13i2.9864.
- [15] N. A. Atthohiri and D. T. Wijayati, "Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja dengan work-life balance sebagai variabel intervening," *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1092-1100, 2021.
- [16] I. Iqbal, M. Zia-ud-Din, A. Arif, M. Raza, and Z. Ishtiaq, "Impact of employee engagement on work-life balance with the moderating role of employee cynicism," *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 1088-1101, 2017, doi: 10.6007/IJARBS/v7-i6/3068.
- [17] A. Noviadi, N. M. D. R. Putri, B. Harwindito, and A. Nagara, "Work life balance mempengaruhi kinerja karyawan di Hotel XYZ bintang lima Jakarta," *Jurnal Sains Terapan Pariwisata*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 84-93, 2024.
- [18] F. A. Rondonuwu, W. Rumawas, and S. Asaloei, "Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada Hotel Sintesa Peninsula Manado," *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 30-39, 2018.
- [19] L. Qi, C. M. Yee, B. Chan, and Y. Fah, "The role of work-life balance in enhancing employee loyalty," *Accounting and Corporate Management*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 43-47, 2024, doi: 10.23977/acccm.2024.060106.

- [20] M. Deery and L. Jago, "Revisiting talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 453-472, 2015, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-12-2013-0538.
- [21] F. F. T. Chiang, T. A. Birtch, and H. K. Kwan, "The moderating roles of job control and work-life balance practices on employee stress in the hotel and catering industry," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 25-32, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.005.
- [22] S. Tanuputri, Nurbaeti, and F. Asmaniaty, "The influence of work life balance on employee satisfaction at Grand Hyatt Jakarta Hotel (case study of food and beverage service department employees)," *TRJ Tourism Research Journal*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 28-34, 2019, doi: 10.30647/trj.v3i1.50.
- [23] H.-S. Jung, Y.-H. Hwang, and H.-H. Yoon, "Impact of hotel employees' psychological well-being on job satisfaction and pro-social service behavior: Moderating effect of work-life balance," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 15, Art. no. 11687, 2023, doi: 10.3390/su15111687.
- [24] A. Rismaulana and Hermansyah, "The influence of work discipline and work-life balance on employee productivity at Aston Batam Hotel & Residence," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 95-100, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.22.
- [25] F. Adrizal and K. Saladin, "The influence of work-life balance and work discipline on employee performance at Aston Batam Hotel and Residence," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 161-166, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.37.
- [26] V. Anjelita and R. Fadilah, "The effect of workload on burnout among employees at The Balcone Suites and Resort Bukittinggi," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 227-233, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.48.
- [27] A. Kamal and A. Kahar, "The influence of perceived organizational support on employee performance mediated by work-life balance at The Balcone Suites & Resort Bukittinggi," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 78-87, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.23.
- [28] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2022.
- [29] A. M. Musyaffi, H. Khairunnisa, and D. K. Respati, *Konsep Dasar Structural Equation Model-Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) Menggunakan SmartPLS*. Pascal Books, 2022.
- [30] J. F. Hair, Jr., G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage, 2022.
- [31] B. Darma, *Statistika Penelitian Menggunakan SPSS*. Guepedia, 2021.
- [32] Z. M. Putri and N. F. Hermiati, "Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja yang dimediasi oleh work-life balance pada Perusahaan Optik Putra Sawargi Mandiri di Majalengka," *JEMSI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi)*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 602-610, 2023, doi: 10.35870/jemsi.v9i3.1095.
- [33] O. D. Setiawan and D. C. Widjaja, "Analisa pengaruh employee engagement terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening di Shangri-La Hotel Surabaya," *Jurnal Hospitality dan Manajemen Jasa*, pp. 120-134, 2019.
- [34] P. G. Lewiuci, "Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap kinerja karyawan pada perusahaan keluarga produsen senapan angin," *Agora*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 101-107, 2016.
- [35] R. Rahardini, "Hubungan job crafting terhadap keterikatan kerja melalui kepuasan kerja," *BIMA: Journal of Business and Innovation Management*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 73-85, 2020.
- [36] T. A. Ravelby, M. R. Linda, and A. Nurofik, "Pengaruh self-efficacy dan employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan perbankan di Padang," *Media Bina Ilmiah*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 4239-4248, 2020.
- [37] S. E. Kristanti, M. Purnamasari, and D. C. Widjaja, "Pengaruh employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja dan turnover intention di Swiss-Belinn Surabaya," *Jurnal Hospitality dan Manajemen Jasa*, pp. 141-152, 2017.
- [38] I. M. D. Ganapathi, "Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan: Studi pada PT Bio Farma Persero," *Ecodemica*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 125-135, 2016.

- [39] N. Maslichah and K. Hidayat, "Pengaruh work-life balance dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan: Studi pada perawat RS Lavalette Malang," *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2017.
- [40] R. Rene and S. Wahyuni, "Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap komitmen organisasi, kepuasan kerja, dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja individu pada karyawan perusahaan asuransi di Jakarta," *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Sriwijaya*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 53-63, 2018, doi: 10.29259/jmbs.v16i1.6247.
- [41] G. R. Aliya and R. Saragih, "Pengaruh work-life balance dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan di PT Telkom Divisi Telkom Regional III Jawa Barat," *Jurnal Ilmiah MEA*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 84-95, 2020.
- [42] N. K. Saptono and E. Supriyadi, "Pengaruh work-life balance dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja melalui employee engagement dengan kesehatan mental sebagai variabel moderator pada karyawan generasi milenial," *Jurnal Ekobisman*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 88-108, 2020.