



Unlocking Success: How Work-Life Balance and Physical Environment Shape Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction at PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero)

Hemmy Fauzan¹, Nayla Nur Fatimah Syarif², Suhendra³, Bahrul Yaman⁴, Supriyono⁵

Faculty of Economics and Business

Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta^{1,2,3,4,5}

Email : hemmy.fauzan@uinjkt.ac.id¹, naylanurfatihah03@gmail.com²,
suhendra.feb@uinjkt.ac.id³, bahrul.yaman@uinjkt.ac.id⁴, supriyono_1101@uinjkt.ac.id⁵

ABSTRACT

His study analyses the effect of work-life balance and physical work environment on employee performance, with job satisfaction as an intervening variable at PT POS Indonesia. This study uses primary and secondary data and is analysed by path analysis using IBM SPSS 26. The sampling technique used is non-probability sampling with the saturation method, where 42 statements were distributed via Google Forms to 148 respondents. The results showed that work-life balance has a direct effect on job satisfaction, as well as the physical work environment which also has a significant impact on job satisfaction. In addition, work-life balance and physical work environment simultaneously affect job satisfaction. Work-life balance and physical work environment each have a direct impact on employee performance. Job satisfaction also plays a role in improving employee performance. Overall, work-life balance, physical work environment, and job satisfaction simultaneously affect employee performance. Sobel test results confirm that job satisfaction can moderate the relationship between work-life balance and physical work environment on employee performance.

Keyword: Work-life Balance, Physical Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance

INTRODUCTION

The importance of work-life balance (WLB) and the physical work environment has received considerable focus from researchers and practitioners in the modern workplace. The interaction of these factors and their impact on employee performance and job satisfaction is essential, especially in Indonesia, where cultural and organizational dynamics may markedly differ from Western contexts. An effective work-life balance enables people to handle their professional and personal obligations efficiently, which is crucial for improving overall job satisfaction and performance. Recent research has repeatedly demonstrated that a favorable work-life balance positively influences employee productivity and organizational commitment (Arfandi, 2023; Banu & Tjprc, 2019; Haerani, 2023; Badrianto & Ekhsan, 2021).

Research suggests that work-life balance is not solely an individual matter but a strategic organizational priority that might enhance employee performance. Research by Mpody et al. highlights that an effectively organized work-life balance might diminish employee stress levels, thereby improving their performance (Mpody et al., 2020). Bustamam et al. contend that attaining an equilibrium between professional and familial responsibilities might enhance productivity and job satisfaction, which is advantageous to both individuals and employers (Bustamam et al., 2020). The systematic literature review by Rashmi and Kataria identifies emerging themes in work-life balance research, such as flexible work arrangements and the influence of organizational culture, which are essential for comprehending their effects on employee outcomes (Rashmi & Kataria, 2021).

In Indonesia, the significance of work-life balance is highlighted by the distinct socio-cultural milieu that influences employee expectations and organizational practices. Research indicates that Indonesian employees frequently encounter difficulties in reconciling their professional and personal lives due to cultural norms that prioritize familial obligations (Silaban & Margaretha, 2021). The work environment significantly influences employee experiences and outcomes. Studies demonstrate that a conducive work atmosphere, defined by efficient communication and collaboration, can markedly improve employee performance (Rachmawati et al., 2021), (Menuh et al., 2022). Furthermore, the design and amenities of the physical workspace might affect job satisfaction, as employees tend to perform better in situations that foster comfort and collaboration (Kirana et al., 2022).

The relationship between work-life balance, the physical work environment, and employee performance is intricate and diverse. Recent research has emphasized the intermediary function of job satisfaction in this relationship, indicating that a favorable work-life balance results in increased job satisfaction, thereby improving employee performance (Prasetyo, 2023), (Oktafien, 2021). In the Indonesian context, comprehending these dynamics is essential for organizations seeking to cultivate a productive workforce. As organizations increasingly acknowledge the significance of employee well-being, the necessity for comprehensive policies that foster work-life balance and establish supportive work environments becomes essential. This study seeks to investigate these linkages in greater depth, thereby enhancing the existing literature on work-life balance and its effects on employee performance and job satisfaction in Indonesia.

METHODS

The objective of this research method is to determine the relationship and influence between variables and other variables by employing a quantitative approach to causal or causal research analysis. The study's population was comprised of 148 permanent employees of PT POS Indonesia, located in South Tangerang City Centre, and utilized non-probability saturation sampling methods. Mardiani (2021: 989) defines saturated sampling as the inclusion of all members of the population in the study sample. This study employs path analysis utilizing SPSS 26 software. This research used a Likert scale measurement. This study utilizes both primary

and secondary data for the data collection method. The primary data for this study was collected through the distribution of survey forms, which included items pertinent to the research variables. Subsequently, secondary data were acquired for this investigation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Validity Test

According to the findings of the validity test presented:

Based on the validity test results shown:

- For the variable Work-Life Balance (X1), all statements (X1.1 to X1.12) have an R-Count value more significant than the R-Table (0.361), so all items on this variable are valid.
- For the variable Physical Work Environment (X2), all statements (X2.1 to X2.8) also have an R-Count value more significant than the R-Table, indicating that all items on this variable are valid.
- In the Job Satisfaction (Y) variable, all statements (Y.1 to Y.10) have an R-Count value higher than the R-Table, indicating that all items on this variable are valid.
- In the Employee Performance (Z) variable, all statements (Z.1 to Z.12) also have an R-Count value more significant than the R-Table, so all items on this variable are valid.

The validity test results indicate that the measurement instruments employed to evaluate Work-Life Balance, Physical Work Environment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Performance are deemed valid.

B. Reliability Test

Based on the reliability test findings, all research variables satisfy the criteria; that is, the Cronbach alpha value is higher than 0.70, so indicating that the research instrument has good internal consistency.

- The Work-Life Balance (X1) variable exhibits a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.702 over 12 items, signifying the reliability of the measurement instrument for this variable.
- The Physical Work Environment (X2) has a Cronbach Alpha score of 0.762 for 8 items, signifying that the measurement tool for this variable is reliable.
- The Cronbach Alpha value for Job Satisfaction (Y) is 0.747 based on 10 items, signifying the reliability of the instrument for this variable.
- The Cronbach Alpha value for Employee Performance (Z) is 0.834 based on 12 items, signifying the reliability of the instrument for this variable.

Work-life balance (X1), the physical workspace (X2), job satisfaction (Y), and employee performance (Z) are all highly reliable research variables. This indicates that their use in additional analysis can be trusted.

C. Correlation Coefficient Test

The correlation coefficients and their strength level categories represent the relationships between the research variables, as determined by the correlation test results. The significance of all relationships between variables is 0.000. This suggests that the relationships are substantially affected. The following is a more detailed explanation of the relationships between the variables:

- The correlation coefficient of 0.348 between Work-Life Balance (X1) and Physical Work Environment (X2) is modest, but it still has a significant effect (significance of 0.000).
- The correlation coefficient of 0.522 between work-life balance (X1) and job satisfaction (Y) is medium, and it has a significant effect (significance 0.000).

- The correlation coefficient of 0.365 between the physical work environment (X2) and job satisfaction (Y) is minimal, but it has a significant effect (significance 0.000).
- The correlation coefficient of 0.608 between work-life balance (X1) and employee performance (Z) is classified as strong and has a significant effect (significance at 0.000).
- The correlation coefficient of 0.477 between the physical work environment (X2) and employee performance (Z) is medium and has a significant effect (significance at 0.000).
- The correlation coefficient of 0.514 between employment satisfaction (Y) and employee performance (Z) is medium, and it has a significant effect (significance at 0.000).

The results indicate a substantial correlation among the variables Work-Life Balance (X1), Physical Work Environment (X2), Job Satisfaction (Y), and Employee Performance (Z). The most robust association exists between Work-Life Balance (X1) and Employee Performance (Z), characterised by a significant correlation.

D. Coefficient of Determination Test

According to Ghozali (2018: 97) and Maulina (2019: 69), this test assesses the model's efficacy in elucidating the variation in the dependent variable. If the independent variable is elucidated by the dependent variable within the range of 0 to 1, the coefficient of determination is robust. The coefficient of determination is located in the model summary table of the SPSS output. The SPSS output in structure 1 indicates that R Square is 0.310, equivalent to 31%. The interplay between work-life balance and the physical work environment influences job satisfaction by 31%. The remaining 69% is affected by several factors. Structure 2 indicates that the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.478, equivalent to 47%. The variables account for 47% of the effect on employee performance, with the remaining 53% attributable to external factors.

E. Path Analysis Test

The path analysis testing in this study comprises two structural equations. Equation 1 is designed to evaluate the impact of work-life balance and the physical work environment on job satisfaction, while equation 2 is designed to evaluate the impact of work-life balance, the physical work environment, and job satisfaction on employee performance.

Equation 1:

$$Y = 0.44 (X1) + 0.20 (X2) + 0.69 (\epsilon_1)$$

Equation 2:

$$Z = 0.410 (X1) + 0.25 (X2) + 0.205 (Y) + 0.522 (\epsilon_2)$$

So, based on the calculation, the following results were obtained:

- Direct calculation
 - a. Work-life balance (X1) $\rightarrow$ Job satisfaction (Y) = 0.44
 - b. Physical work environment (X2) $\rightarrow$ Job satisfaction (Y) = 0.20
 - c. Work-life balance (X1) $\rightarrow$ Employee performance (Z) = 0.410
 - d. Physical work environment (X2) $\rightarrow$ Employee performance (Z) = 0.25
 - e. Job satisfaction (Y) $\rightarrow$ Employee performance (Z) = 0.205
- Indirect calculation
 - a. Work-life balance (X1) $\rightarrow$ Job satisfaction (Y) $\rightarrow$ Employee performance (Z) = $0.44 \times 0.205 = 0.09$. Indirect effect (0.09) < direct effect (0.410).
 - b. Work Motivation (X2) $\rightarrow$ Job Satisfaction (Y) $\rightarrow$ Employee Performance (Z) = $0.20 \times 0.205 = 0.041$. Indirect effect (0.041) < Direct effect (0.25).

F. Simultaneous Test (F Test)

- Simultaneous Test Results (F Test) Structure Equation 1

According to the aforementioned table, which presents the results of the F-test for structural equation 1, consult the F-table using the formula $F\text{-table} = F(k; n-k)$, specifically $F = (2; 148-2)$. Consequently, $F = (2; 146) = 3.05$. The estimated F-value is 32.629, which exceeds the F-table value of 3.05, as indicated by the SPSS output above. The sig value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05, indicating the acceptance of H_a and the rejection of H_o . The results indicate a concurrent impact of work-life balance (X1) and physical work environment (X2) on job satisfaction (Y).

- Simultaneous Test Results (F Test) Structure Equation 2

The F-test results for equation 2 are presented in the table above. The formula for obtaining the F-table is as follows: The F-table is defined as $F(k; n-k)$, where k represents the number of variables and $n-k$ represents the number of observations. $k=3$, $n-k=148-3$, and the F-value is 2.66. The value of F is 2.66, which is equivalent to $(3; 145)$. The statistical significance of the calculated F value of 43.983 is established. The null hypothesis (H_0) is refuted and the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted, as the p-value is 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Work-life balance, employment satisfaction, and the physical work environment all have a concurrent impact on employee performance.

G. Partial Test (T Test)

The t-value for the t-table has been determined to be 1.656.

- The Impact of Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction

The variable "work-life balance" (X1) has a significance probability value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05, and a t-count of 6.105, which is greater than the t-table value of 1.656, as indicated by the t-test results for the dependent variable "job satisfaction" (Y). Consequently, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is adopted, and the null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected. This implies that there is a partial correlation between job satisfaction and work-life balance.

- The Impact of the Physical Work Environment on Job Satisfaction

The t-test findings for the variable denoting the physical work environment (X2) on job satisfaction (Y) reveal a probability value of 0.005, which is below 0.05, and a t-count value of 2.833, surpassing the t-table value of 1.656. Consequently, we can accept the alternative hypothesis (H_a) and reject the null hypothesis (H_o). This signifies a favourable but statistically limited effect of the physical work environment on job satisfaction.

- Impact of Work-Life Balance on Employee Performance

The t-test results indicate that the work-life balance variables (X1) significantly affect employee performance (Z), with a significance value of 0.000 as presented in Table 1.656. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis H_a is accepted whereas the null hypothesis H_o is rejected. This indicates that work-life balance partially influences employee performance.

- Impact of the Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance

The impact of the physical work environment variable (X2) on employee performance (Z) was evaluated using the t-test, yielding a significance probability value of 0.000, as illustrated in Table 1.656. Consequently, the hypothesis is: H_a is affirmed and H_o is dismissed. The physical work environment significantly influences employee performance.

- Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

The t-test results between Job Satisfaction (Y) and Employee Performance (Z) indicate a significance value of 0.005, as presented in Table 1.656. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis H_a is accepted, while the null hypothesis H_o is rejected. This indicates that job satisfaction exerts a substantial partial influence on employee performance.

H. Sobel Test

The mediation hypothesis can be evaluated using a method established by Sobel (1982) known as the Sobel test. The Sobel test evaluates the magnitude of the indirect effect of X on Y via M.

- Indirect impact of work-life balance (X1) on employee performance (Z) via job satisfaction (Y)

The results of the Sobel test calculation using the formula are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Sab &= \sqrt{b^2 sa^2 + a^2 sb^2 + sa^2 sb^2} \\ Sab &= \sqrt{(0,262^2 \times 0,072^2) + (0,443^2 \times 0,092^2) + (0,072^2 \times 0,092^2)} \\ &= \sqrt{0,00035 + 0,00166 + 0,00004} = \sqrt{0,00205} \\ &= 0,04527 \end{aligned}$$

To test the significance of the indirect effect, we need to calculate the t value for the ab coefficient using the following formula:

$$t = ab/sab = (0,443 \times 0,262)/0,04527 = 2,56386$$

The outcomes of the foregoing computations yielded a significance level of 0.05 and a t value of 1.656 and 2.56386 respectively. H_a is so approved and H_o is turned down. Work-life balance (X1) so influences employee performance (Z) by means of job satisfaction (Y). One can thus draw the indirect relationship between employee performance (Z) and work-life balance (X1).

- Indirect impact of Physical Work Environment (X1) on Employee Performance (Z) Through Job Satisfaction (Y)

The results of the sobel test calculation using the formula are:

$$\begin{aligned} Sab &= \sqrt{b^2 sa^2 + a^2 sb^2 + sa^2 sb^2} \\ Sab &= \sqrt{(0,262^2 \times 0,093^2) + (0,263^2 \times 0,092^2) + (0,093^2 \times 0,092^2)} \\ &= \sqrt{0,00059 + 0,00058 + 0,00007} = \sqrt{0,00124} \\ &= 0,03521 \end{aligned}$$

To test the significance of the indirect effect, we need to calculate the t-value for the ab coefficient using the following formula:

$$t = ab/sab = (0,263 \times 0,262)/(0,03521) = 1,957$$

The t-value of 1.957 was greater than the t-table value of 1.656 at a significance level of 0.05, as determined by the aforementioned calculations. Consequently, it is possible to deduce that H_a is approved and H_o is rejected. This implies that employee efficacy (Z) is influenced by the physical work environment (X2) through job satisfaction (Y). Consequently, it is possible to infer that the efficacy of employees (Z) is indirectly influenced by the physical work environment (X2).

CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted to determine the effect of Work-life Balance and physical work environment on employee performance with job satisfaction as an intervening variable at PT POS Indonesia Pusat Kota Tangerang Selatan. From the results and data analysis and discussion, it can be concluded as follows:

- 1) Work-life balance directly affects job satisfaction.
- 2) The physical work environment directly affects job satisfaction.

- 3) Work-life balance and physical work environment simultaneously affect job satisfaction.
- 4) Work-life balance directly affects job satisfaction, which in turn directly affects employee performance.
- 5) Work-life balance, physical work environment, and job satisfaction simultaneously affect employee performance.

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion that has been carried out and the conclusions above, the parties in this study have the right to make the following suggestions:

1) For PT POS Indonesia

- Work-life balance Related to variables

The company needs to pay attention to several things related to Work-life Balance. Based on the research results, Work-life Balance problems are found in the dimensions of time balance and job satisfaction, so that companies can pay attention to several things related to Work-life Balance in these dimensions, such as paying attention to the time balance between work and personal life of each employee, especially field employee.

- Related to the variable Physical Work Environment

Companies need to pay more attention to the status of employees in terms of work environment issues, especially the physical work environment such as work support facilities. The findings of the investigation show that there are still some problems identified related to the work equipment provided by the company. In terms of the security of company documents, more attention should be paid to filing cabinets without locks. In addition, many facilities such as toilets and prayer rooms are unclean and in poor condition because their capacity is not proportional to the number of staff employed. Around the year

- Related to the variable Job Satisfaction

The results show that some employees are less able to work together in carrying out their work so that it can hinder the completion of work and will ultimately hinder the achievement of company goals, therefore the company should pay attention to its employees and evaluate the behaviour of its employees. When employees work together, they feel their work is done easily and quickly.

- Regarding the variable Employee Performance

The results show that there are some employees whose performance is still unsatisfactory and needs to be improved, so the company should pay more attention to the achievement of goals and the suitability of each employee's work.

2) For Future Researchers

It is hoped that future researchers can use this study as a reference for similar research on the same or other topics. In addition, we would encourage them to consider the addition of variables that are not part of the current research model, or the use of different analyses, in order to explore in greater depth insights that may not have been revealed in the current study.

REFERENSI

- Arfandi, (2023). The effect of Work-life Balance, leadership style and organizational culture on employee performance. *Ekspektra*, 7(1), 41-51. <https://doi.org/10.25139/ekt.v7i1.5519>
- Badrianto, Y. and Ekhsan, M. (2021). Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kinerja karyawan yang di mediasi komitmen organisasi. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah)*, 4(2), 951-962. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v4i2.460>

- Banu, A. (2019). A relationship between work-life balance and job performance of employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research*, 9(2), 53-58. <https://doi.org/10.24247/ijhrmrpr20196>
- Bustamam, N., Choh, N., Shaari, J., & Muda, R. (2020). Factors affecting the performance of employee in workplace. *International Journal of Modern Trends in Social Sciences*, 3(11), 69-79. <https://doi.org/10.35631/ijmtss.311005>
- Haerani, S. (2023). The role of work-life balance in shaping job satisfaction and performance of female employees: a literature review. *International Journal of Economy and Business*, 2(1), 13-21. <https://doi.org/10.55904/keynesia.v2i1.667>
- Kirana, I., Sriathi, A., & Suwandana, I. (2022). The effect of work environment, work discipline, and work motivation on employee performance in manufacturing company. *European Journal of Business Management and Research*, 7(3), 26-30. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.3.1396>
- Menuh, N., Wahyuni, A., Karwini, N., & Wimpascima, I. (2022). Analysis of the work environment and work stress its implications on employee performance. *International Journal of Social Science*, 1(5), 733-738. <https://doi.org/10.53625/ijss.v1i5.1317>
- Mpody, C., Solikhah, S., Fidhyallah, N., & LESTARI, D. (2020). Effectiveness of e-training, e-leadership, and Work-life Balance on employee performance during covid-19. *Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business*, 7(10), 443-450. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no10.443>
- Oktafien, S. (2021). The effect of Work-life Balance on improving employee performance. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (Turcomat)*, 12(11), 1321-1326. <https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i11.6038>
- Prasetyo, C. (2023). The effect of work-life balance on employee performance through job satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Social Science Studies*, 3(5), 342-358. <https://doi.org/10.47153/sss35.7672023>
- Rachmawati, S., Lumbanraja, P., & Siahaan, E. (2021). The effect of adaptive ability, communication skills, and work environment on performance of medan mayor's office with teamwork as intervening variables. *Journal Research of Social Science Economics and Management*, 1(4), 406-417. <https://doi.org/10.36418/jrssem.v1i4.37>
- Rashmi, K. and Kataria, A. (2021). Work-life balance: a systematic literature review and bibliometric analysis. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 42(11/12), 1028-1065. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijssp-06-2021-0145>
- Riyadi, E., Wulandari, D., & Agustin, G. (2021). Analysis of the effect of work stress and work environment on employee performance arema aremania bersatu berprestasi indonesia ltd.. *Journal Research of Social Science Economics and Management*, 1(5). <https://doi.org/10.59141/jrssem.v1i5.48>
- Silaban, H. and Margaretha, M. (2021). The impact work-life balance toward job satisfaction and employee retention: study of millennial employees in bandung city, indonesia.. *International Journal of Innovation and Economic Development*, 7(3), 18-26. <https://doi.org/10.18775/ijied.1849-7551-7020.2015.73.2002>