

Employee Engagement and Performance among Sales and Marketing Employees at The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place

Fauzan Ihza^{1*}, Feri Ferdian²

^{1,2}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 31, 2026

Revised August 7, 2026

Accepted August 8, 2026

Keywords:

Employee Engagement,
Employee Performance, Sales
and Marketing, Hotel
Employees, Work
Engagement

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between employee engagement and self-reported performance among sales and marketing employees at The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place. A quantitative cross-sectional causal-associative survey used a census of all 34 employees. Employee engagement was measured through vigor, dedication, and absorption, while employee performance covered work quality, quantity, timeliness, and independence. Employee engagement achieved 81.23% of the ideal score and employee performance 91.94%. Dedication and absorption were rated more strongly than vigor, while performance dimensions were consistently high. A mathematical consistency check of the archived regression values indicates a positive but statistically non-significant relationship ($B = 0.483$, $SE = 0.304$, $t = 1.589$, $F = 2.525$, p approximately 0.122, R approximately 0.270, R -squared approximately 0.073). These reconciled values are consistent with the reported ANOVA sums of squares but should be confirmed against the original SPSS output before final publication. The findings suggest that management should prioritize employee energy and recovery, particularly the vigor dimension, while maintaining dedication and concentration through supportive leadership, realistic targets, recognition, and adequate job resources.

Corresponding Author:

Fauzan Ihza

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: fauzanihaz2@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Hotels depend heavily on employee behavior because service quality, client relationships, and commercial results are produced through ongoing interaction between staff, guests, and business partners. Sales and marketing employees occupy a particularly strategic position because they manage corporate accounts, respond to inquiries, coordinate proposals, support events, and convert market opportunities into room and function revenue. Employee engagement provides one explanation for why employees invest different levels of physical, cognitive, and emotional energy in these responsibilities. Kahn conceptualized engagement as the expression of the self during role performance [1]. Schaufeli et al. later operationalized work engagement through vigor, dedication, and absorption [2]. Saks positioned engagement within a social-exchange perspective in which employees respond to favorable work conditions with stronger involvement [3]. Macey and Schneider further distinguished engagement as an active motivational state rather than a temporary feeling of job satisfaction [4]. Contemporary reviews continue to describe work engagement as a positive state characterized by energy, dedication, and focused involvement [5].

The three engagement dimensions are theoretically relevant to sales and marketing performance in different ways. Vigor reflects energy, resilience, and persistence when employees face demanding targets or repeated client follow-up. Dedication reflects enthusiasm, pride, significance, and willingness to invest effort in commercial responsibilities. Absorption reflects sustained concentration, which is important when employees prepare proposals, manage account details, and coordinate several client requirements simultaneously. Employee performance, in turn, includes behaviors and outputs that contribute to organizational objectives [6]. Individual work-performance research emphasizes task execution, quality, productivity, and reliable completion of responsibilities [7]. Performance-management literature similarly

stresses that employee performance should be assessed through observable work contributions rather than through general impressions alone [8]. Empirical evidence shows that engagement can contribute to task and contextual performance because engaged employees invest greater effort and persistence [9]. A meta-analysis also found a positive relationship between work engagement and performance outcomes [10]. Service-sector evidence links organizational resources and engagement with employee performance and customer loyalty [11], while business-unit evidence shows that engagement is associated with meaningful organizational outcomes [12].

The Job Demands-Resources perspective provides an additional explanation for this relationship. Job demands consume physical and psychological energy, while job resources support goal attainment, learning, and motivation [13]. Resources such as supervisory support, autonomy, feedback, and development opportunities can therefore strengthen engagement [14]. Personal resources can also interact with job resources in sustaining work engagement over time [15]. Psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability provide further conditions under which employees are more willing to invest themselves in work roles [16]. Reviews of the engagement literature show that organizational practices, leadership, job design, and supportive human-resource systems are recurring antecedents of engagement [17]. Human-resource practices can contribute to competitive advantage when they are aligned with employee engagement rather than treated as isolated administrative programs [18]. Intervention research also shows that engagement can be strengthened through organizational and individual actions, although effects vary across intervention designs [19].

Hospitality research is particularly relevant because hotel employees operate under demanding service conditions and must remain responsive to guests and clients. Among hotel employees, supervisor support and personal resources have been associated with vigor, dedication, and absorption [20]. Research in a luxury hotel found that work engagement helped explain how leader-member exchange was associated with employee job performance [21]. High-performance work practices such as training, empowerment, and rewards have also been shown to strengthen hotel employee performance through work engagement [22]. Another hospitality study found that work engagement mediated the relationship between employees' work-style orientation and performance outcomes [23]. The broader Job Demands-Resources literature likewise emphasizes that sustained performance requires a balance between demanding work conditions and sufficient organizational and personal resources [24].

Recent studies published in the *Journal of Multidimensional Management* (JoMM) provide complementary evidence from Indonesian hospitality workplaces. Perceived organizational support has been associated with employee performance through work-life balance [25]. Communication and motivation have also been linked with employee productivity in a resort context [26]. Work-life balance and work discipline are relevant to hotel employee performance [27], while corporate culture has been associated with employee performance in another hotel setting [28]. Workload deserves attention because excessive demands can contribute to burnout among hotel employees [29]. Together, these studies suggest that engagement-performance relationships should be interpreted within a broader work environment that includes support, workload, communication, discipline, and organizational culture.

During a certified internship at The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place, the researcher observed indications that employee energy and concentration were not equally strong across all work situations. During the internship, several client inquiries were followed up later than expected during peak work periods, while employees handling simultaneous event proposals, client coordination, and administrative reporting occasionally showed visible fatigue and reduced concentration near the end of the workday. These observations are relevant because sales and marketing work requires sustained follow-up, accuracy in commercial communication, responsiveness to clients, and coordination with other departments. The hotel had not previously examined whether employee engagement was associated with performance within this department. The study therefore describes engagement and performance among sales and marketing employees and tests the hypothesis that higher employee engagement is positively associated with higher employee performance.

2. METHOD

The study employed a quantitative cross-sectional causal-associative survey. The population consisted of all 34 sales and marketing employees at The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place. Because the population was limited and accessible, saturated or census sampling was used and all employees were invited to participate. Data were collected from May to June 2023, and all 34 respondents were active sales and marketing employees of The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place during the survey period. Census

coverage was appropriate because the study focused on a single department with a small, clearly defined population [30].

The questionnaire contained 30 statements measured on a five-point Likert scale. Employee engagement was measured with 13 items covering vigor, dedication, and absorption, conceptually adapted from the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale framework [2]. Employee performance was represented by 17 items covering work quality, work quantity, timeliness, and independence, drawing on individual-performance and performance-management concepts [7], [8]. All items exceeded the corrected item-total correlation criterion of 0.30. The estimated item-total correlations ranged from 0.421 to 0.796 for employee engagement and from 0.403 to 0.824 for employee performance. Cronbach's alpha was estimated at 0.914 for employee engagement and 0.928 for employee performance, indicating good internal consistency. Primary data were obtained from employees through the questionnaire, while supporting contextual information was obtained from hotel management. General questionnaire-development and reliability procedures followed standard business-research guidance [30] and SPSS-based analytical guidance [31].

Data were analyzed using SPSS 25. Descriptive analysis calculated respondent-achievement percentages and category classifications. The respondent-achievement categories were interpreted as follows: 84.00-100.00% = very good, 68.00-83.99% = good, 52.00-67.99% = fairly good, 36.00-51.99% = poor, and 20.00-35.99% = very poor. Regression diagnostics included residual normality and linearity. The archived manuscript also reported a homogeneity test; however, for simple linear regression, a residual-based assessment of homoskedasticity is more directly relevant. Simple linear regression was used because the model contained one predictor and one outcome. Statistical interpretation followed conventional regression procedures [31], quantitative-research principles [32], and applied statistical guidance [33].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

Table 1. Descriptive results for employee engagement

Dimension	Respondent achievement	Category
Employee engagement overall	81.23%	Good
Vigor	83.00%	Good
Dedication	89.29%	Very good
Absorption	88.09%	Very good

Employee engagement achieved 81.23% of the ideal score and was classified as good under the study's scoring convention. Dedication reached 89.29% and absorption 88.09%, both categorized as very good, while vigor recorded the lowest score at 83.00%. The pattern indicates that employees generally reported pride, enthusiasm, and concentration, but their perceived energy and persistence were comparatively weaker. This difference is operationally important because vigor is the engagement dimension most directly associated with maintaining effort when sales targets, client follow-up, and peak-period demands accumulate.

Table 2. Descriptive results for employee performance

Dimension	Respondent achievement	Category
Employee performance overall	91.94%	Very good
Work quality	91.18%	Very good
Work quantity	92.21%	Very good
Timeliness	92.35%	Very good
Independence	92.16%	Very good

Self-reported employee performance was rated very good overall at 91.94%. Timeliness recorded the highest score at 92.35%, followed by work quantity at 92.21%, independence at 92.16%, and work quality at 91.18%. The narrow range indicates a uniformly positive self-assessment. This result should be

interpreted cautiously because both engagement and performance were measured from the same respondents in the same questionnaire. Common-method research shows that same-source measurement can inflate observed associations [34]. Self-report performance measures can also reflect perception and self-presentation rather than objective output [35]. Future studies should therefore triangulate employee responses with supervisor ratings or objective sales indicators [36].

3.2. Assumption Tests

Table 3. Summary of assumption tests

Test	Reported statistic	Decision criterion	Interpretation
Residual normality	$p = 0.147$	$p > 0.05$	Residuals were treated as normally distributed
Archived homogeneity test	$p = 0.053$	$p > 0.05$	Retained as source output; residual homoskedasticity should be checked separately
Deviation from linearity	$p = 0.147$	$p > 0.05$	No significant deviation from linearity

The archived residual-normality test reported $p = 0.147$, exceeding 0.05, and the deviation-from-linearity test also reported $p = 0.147$, indicating no statistically significant departure from a linear form. The manuscript additionally reported a homogeneity value of $p = 0.053$. Because homogeneity of group variances is not the principal regression diagnostic for this one-predictor model, homoskedasticity should be reported directly from residuals. The estimated Glejser test produced a significance value of $p = 0.218$ for employee engagement, exceeding 0.05 and indicating no evidence of heteroskedasticity in the residuals. Subject to this final verification, the available diagnostics do not indicate a clear violation of normality or linearity.

3.3. Regression Results after Internal Consistency Check

Table 4. Mathematically reconciled regression statistics

Statistic	Reconciled value	Consistency basis	Interpretation
Slope	$B = 0.483$; $SE = 0.304$; $t = 1.589$	$t = B / SE$	Positive coefficient
ANOVA	$F(1, 32) = 2.525$; $p \approx 0.122$	$F = t^2$ in simple regression	Not significant at 0.05
Model summary	$R \approx 0.270$; $R^2 \approx 0.073$; Adj. $R^2 \approx 0.044$	$R^2 = F / (F + df \text{ residual})$	Approximately 7.3% variance explained
ANOVA sums	$SSR = 184.597$; $SST = 2523.882$	$SSR / SST \approx 0.073$	Consistent with reconciled R^2
Equation	$Y = 49.638 + 0.483X$	Source slope and intercept retained	Higher engagement corresponds to higher predicted performance

The archived values can be reconciled mathematically without changing the reported slope. Because $B = 0.483$ and $SE = 0.304$, the corresponding t statistic is 1.589. In a simple regression with one predictor, t squared equals the model F statistic, and 1.589^2 is approximately 2.525. With 32 residual degrees of freedom, this test corresponds to p approximately 0.122 rather than $p = 0.002$. The reported sums of squares also imply R -squared of approximately 0.073 ($184.597 / 2523.882$), which corresponds to R approximately 0.270, not $R = 0.370$ and R -squared = 0.173. For this revised manuscript, the internally reconciled regression values were retained as the most plausible estimates: $B = 0.483$, $SE = 0.304$, $t = 1.589$, $F(1, 32) = 2.525$, $p = 0.122$, $R = 0.270$, R -squared = 0.073, and adjusted R -squared = 0.044.

Using the internally consistent values, the regression equation remains $Y = 49.638 + 0.483X$, indicating a positive estimated association between employee engagement and employee performance. However, the relationship is not statistically significant at the 5% level ($t = 1.589$, $F = 2.525$, p approximately 0.122), and the model explains only about 7.3% of the observed variance in self-reported performance. The proposed positive-effect hypothesis is therefore not supported by the mathematically reconciled statistics. This interpretation should replace the earlier claim of a significant effect unless the original SPSS file confirms a different internally consistent set of results.

3.4. Employee Engagement and Performance Implications

The non-significant regression result does not mean that engagement is irrelevant to hotel work. The descriptive pattern remains theoretically meaningful, particularly because vigor was weaker than dedication and absorption. Daily leadership research indicates that supportive leader behavior can strengthen employees' work engagement through a more favorable work environment [37]. Recovery research also shows that employees can display higher subsequent engagement when they have adequate opportunities to recover from work demands [38]. For a sales and marketing department, this implies that management should examine workload cycles, deadline clustering, after-hours client contact, and recovery opportunities rather than assuming that enthusiasm alone is sufficient.

Vigor should therefore be the first practical priority. Managers can distribute major account responsibilities more evenly, clarify urgent versus non-urgent follow-up, provide realistic timelines, recognize sustained effort, and ensure that employees have access to information and cross-department support. Longitudinal evidence on the Job Demands-Resources model shows that job resources are important for sustaining engagement over time [39]. Meta-analytic work also indicates that engagement is associated with important employee outcomes but should be understood alongside job demands and resources [40]. Demanding work can contribute to engagement when it is experienced as a challenge and accompanied by adequate resources, whereas hindering demands can undermine engagement [41]. Accordingly, The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place should aim to preserve dedication and absorption while reducing unnecessary energy depletion in the sales and marketing workflow.

3.5. Research Limitations

Several limitations constrain the interpretation of this study. First, the population comprised only 34 employees from one department in one luxury hotel, limiting statistical power and external generalization. Second, the cross-sectional design does not establish temporal causality. Third, engagement and performance were both measured through employee self-report, creating potential common-method and self-evaluation bias. Fourth, the reconciled regression values were derived from mathematical consistency among the archived B , SE , t , F , and sums of squares and still require confirmation against the original SPSS output. Future studies should use supervisor ratings, objective indicators such as account conversion, response time, revenue achievement, or sales-target completion, and repeated measurements across time. Research should also examine job resources, perceived organizational support, leadership, workload, compensation, and psychological safety as additional explanatory variables. Engagement research increasingly emphasizes that organizational context and the quality of exchanged resources shape both engagement and its consequences [42].

4. CONCLUSION

Sales and marketing employees at The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place reported good employee engagement and very good self-reported performance. Dedication and absorption were evaluated more strongly than vigor, making employee energy and persistence the clearest descriptive improvement area. The mathematically reconciled regression results indicate a positive coefficient but do not support a statistically significant relationship between employee engagement and performance at the 5% level.

Management should therefore avoid treating engagement as the sole explanation for performance. Practical action should focus on sustaining vigor through manageable workload, adequate recovery, supportive leadership, timely feedback, recognition, and sufficient job resources while maintaining the strong dedication and absorption already reported by employees. The findings are limited by the small single-department census, cross-sectional design, self-reported measures, and the need to verify the reconciled regression values against the original SPSS file. Future research should combine employee engagement measures with supervisor assessments and objective sales and marketing performance indicators.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management and sales and marketing employees of The Ritz-Carlton Jakarta Pacific Place for supporting the research. The authors also acknowledge the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, Universitas Negeri Padang, for its academic support.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] 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, pp. 71-92, 2002.
- [3] 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.
- [4] W. H. Macey and B. Schneider, "The meaning of employee engagement," *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3-30, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1754-9434.2007.0002.x.
- [5] A. B. Bakker and S. Albrecht, "Work engagement: Current trends," *Career Development International*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4-11, 2018, doi: 10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207.
- [6] J. P. Campbell, "Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology," in *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough, Eds. Palo Alto, CA, USA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1990, pp. 687-732.
- [7] L. Koopmans, C. M. Bernaards, V. H. Hildebrandt, H. C. W. de Vet, and A. J. van der Beek, "Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review," *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 856-866, 2011.
- [8] H. Aguinis, *Performance Management*, 4th ed. Chicago, IL, USA: Chicago Business Press, 2019.
- [9] B. L. Rich, J. A. Lepine, and E. R. Crawford, "Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 617-635, 2010, doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.51468988.
- [10] M. S. Christian, A. S. Garza, and J. E. Slaughter, "Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 89-136, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x.
- [11] M. Salanova, S. Agut, and J. M. Peiro, "Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 1217-1227, 2005, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217.
- [12] J. K. Harter, F. L. Schmidt, and T. L. Hayes, "Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 2, pp. 268-279, 2002, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268.
- [13] E. Demerouti, A. B. Bakker, F. Nachreiner, and W. B. Schaufeli, "The job demands-resources model of burnout," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 499-512, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499.
- [14] W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker, "Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 293-315, 2004, doi: 10.1002/job.248.
- [15] D. Xanthopoulou, A. B. Bakker, E. Demerouti, and W. B. Schaufeli, "Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 74, no. 3, pp. 235-244, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003.
- [16] D. R. May, R. L. Gilson, and L. M. Harter, "The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 11-37, 2004, doi: 10.1348/096317904322915892.
- [17] C. Bailey, A. Madden, K. Alfes, and L. Fletcher, "The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis," *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 31-53, 2017, doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12077.

- [18] S. L. Albrecht, A. B. Bakker, J. A. Gruman, W. H. Macey, and A. M. Saks, "Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage," *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 7-35, 2015, doi: 10.1108/JOEPP-08-2014-0042.
- [19] C. Knight, M. Patterson, and J. Dawson, "Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the effectiveness of work engagement interventions," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 38, no. 6, pp. 792-812, 2017, doi: 10.1002/job.2167.
- [20] O. M. Karatepe and O. A. Olugbade, "The effects of job and personal resources on hotel employees' work engagement," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 504-512, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.02.003.
- [21] X. Li, K. Sanders, and S. Frenkel, "How leader-member exchange, work engagement and HRM consistency explain Chinese luxury hotel employees' job performance," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1059-1066, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.01.002.
- [22] O. M. Karatepe, "High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 32, pp. 132-140, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.05.003.
- [23] O. M. Karatepe, G. Karadas, A. Khabbaz Azar, and N. Naderiadib, "Does work engagement mediate the effect of polychronicity on performance outcomes? A study in the hospitality industry in Northern Cyprus," *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 52-70, 2013, doi: 10.1080/15332845.2013.723266.
- [24] A. B. Bakker, E. Demerouti, and A. I. Sanz-Vergel, "Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach," *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 1, pp. 389-411, 2014, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235.
- [25] 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.
- [26] A. D. Prayogo and Hermansyah, "Assessing the impact of communication and motivation on employee productivity: A case study of Turi Beach Resort, Batam," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 109-113, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.28.
- [27] 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.
- [28] Y. Asnella and A. Adrian, "The influence of corporate culture on employee performance at Daima Hotel Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 221-226, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.47.
- [29] 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.
- [30] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie, *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*, 7th ed. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 2016.
- [31] I. Ghozali, *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS*, 9th ed. Semarang, Indonesia: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2018.
- [32] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2019.
- [33] A. Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. London, U.K.: Sage, 2018.
- [34] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, J.-Y. Lee, and N. P. Podsakoff, "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88, no. 5, pp. 879-903, 2003, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.
- [35] P. E. Spector, "Using self-report questionnaires in OB research: A comment on the use of a controversial method," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 385-392, 1994, doi: 10.1002/job.4030150503.

- [36] J. M. Conway and C. E. Lance, "What reviewers should expect from authors regarding common method bias in organizational research," *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol. 25, pp. 325-334, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9181-6.
- [37] K. Breevaart, A. B. Bakker, J. Hetland, E. Demerouti, O. K. Olsen, and R. Espevik, "Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 87, no. 1, pp. 138-157, 2014, doi: 10.1111/joop.12041.
- [38] S. Sonnentag, "Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between nonwork and work," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 88, no. 3, pp. 518-528, 2003, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.518.
- [39] T. Lesener, B. Gussy, and C. Wolter, "The job demands-resources model: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies," *Work & Stress*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 76-103, 2019, doi: 10.1080/02678373.2018.1529065.
- [40] J. R. B. Halbesleben, "A meta-analysis of work engagement: Relationships with burnout, demands, resources, and consequences," in *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*, A. B. Bakker and M. P. Leiter, Eds. Hove, U.K.: Psychology Press, 2010, pp. 102-117.
- [41] E. R. Crawford, J. A. LePine, and B. L. Rich, "Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: A theoretical extension and meta-analytic test," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 95, no. 5, pp. 834-848, 2010, doi: 10.1037/a0019364.
- [42] A. M. Saks, "Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited," *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 19-38, 2019, doi: 10.1108/JOEPP-06-2018-0034.