International Journal of Finance, Economics and Business
Vol. 4, No. 3, September 2025, pp.142-153
e-ISSN: 2948-3883

DOI: 10.56225/ijfeb.v4i3.519

Original Article

Job Satisfaction as a Key Mechanism Linking Work Engagement and Self-Efficacy to Employee Performance

Rizky Agus Putra Pratama [1,*] and Agus Sukoco [1]

[1] Master of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Narotama, 60117 Sukolilo, Surabaya, Indonesia.
* Correspondence: rizky.pratama@narotama.ac.id (R.A.P.P.)

Citations: Pratama, R.A.P. & Sukoco, A. (2025). Job Satisfaction as a Key Mechanism Linking Work Engagement and Self-Efficacy to Employee Performance. *International Journal of Finance, Economics and Business*, *4*(3), 142-153.

Received: 12 June 2025 Revised: 22 August 2025 Accepted: 6 September 2025 Published: 30 September 2025

Abstract: Employee performance remains a critical concern for organizations, particularly in the logistics sector, where operational efficiency and productivity are essential. However, fluctuations in performance and inconsistent findings across prior studies indicate that the relationships among work engagement, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and employee performance remain poorly understood. Moreover, there is limited empirical evidence that simultaneously examines these variables in the logistics industry context. This study examines the effects of work engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance, with job satisfaction as a mediating variable in the logistics sector. A quantitative approach was employed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) based on data collected from 52 employees through a structured questionnaire. The results indicate that work engagement does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction but has a significant positive effect on employee performance. In contrast, self-efficacy significantly influences job satisfaction but does not directly affect employee performance. Job satisfaction emerges as the strongest predictor of employee performance. Furthermore, mediation analysis reveals that job satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between work engagement and performance, but fully mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. These findings highlight that employee performance is more strongly driven by job satisfaction than by direct psychological factors alone. The study concludes that organizations should prioritize enhancing job satisfaction while simultaneously strengthening employees' self-efficacy and engagement to achieve optimal performance outcomes.

Keywords: Work Engagement; Self-Efficacy; Job Satisfaction; Employee Performance; SEM-PLS

1. Introduction

Company performance during the 2020–2024 period has shown fluctuations in container shipping activities. The recorded achievements were 2,180 TEUs in 2020, 2,477 TEUs in 2021, and peaked at 2,596 TEUs in 2022. However, performance declined to 2,019 TEUs in 2023 and slightly improved to 2,249 TEUs in 2024. These figures represent the operational targets achieved by PT Andalan Pacific Samudra's employees. The drop over the last two years, compared with the 2022 peak, indicates a decline in employee

performance. Employee performance is a critical determinant of organizational success and can be influenced by factors such as work engagement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. This study adopts the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model as its primary theoretical framework, which explains employee well-being and performance by balancing job demands and available resources (Demerouti et al., 2001). Supporting this framework, the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory posits that individuals strive to obtain, maintain, and protect their resources, such as self-efficacy, organizational support, and motivation (Hobfoll, 1989). When sufficient resources are available, employees are more likely to engage in their work and achieve higher performance. Conversely, resource depletion or threat may reduce job satisfaction and negatively affect performance. In addition, Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the role of cognitive processes in shaping behavior and decision-making, particularly in uncertain organizational environments (Bandura, 1986).

Employee performance is defined as the overall value an organization expects from employees' work-related behaviors over a specific period (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). It also reflects employees' ability to accomplish tasks and responsibilities effectively (Saing & Eprianto, 2025). Performance can be assessed through several indicators, including quantity, quality, timeliness, effectiveness, and independence. Previous studies have demonstrated that work engagement and self-efficacy significantly influence employee performance, both directly and indirectly through job satisfaction (Trihudiyatmanto et al., 2025; Ramadhan & Budiono, 2023; Mujiyono et al., 2025; Sayekti & Suhartini, 2022; Yandi & Havidz, 2022; Devi & Dewi, 2025; Sanjaya, 2025; Iskandar & Arif, 2023; Hanan et al., 2024). Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling psychological state characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption in one's work (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Employees with high engagement demonstrate enthusiasm, persistence, and a strong sense of involvement in their tasks (Candana et al., 2022). Empirical evidence suggests that work engagement plays a significant role in enhancing both employee performance and job satisfaction (Trihudiyatmanto et al., 2025; Ramadhan & Budiono, 2023; Imawan et al., 2024; Setyawati et al., 2025; Rustina et al., 2025; Susanto et al., 2024b; Utami et al., 2025).

Self-efficacy, defined as an individual's belief in their ability to perform tasks and achieve goals (Bandura, 1997), is another critical factor influencing employee outcomes. It affects how individuals think, behave, and exert effort in overcoming challenges (Calicchio, 2023). Employees with higher self-efficacy are more likely to demonstrate better performance and experience higher job satisfaction (Devi & Dewi, 2025; Saro & Heryjanto, 2024; Wiyanto et al., 2024). Job satisfaction is described as a positive emotional state resulting from an individual's evaluation of their job or work experience (Locke, 1976; Spector, 2022). It encompasses satisfaction with various aspects of work, including salary, job characteristics, supervision, colleagues, and promotion opportunities. Job satisfaction not only directly influences employee performance but also serves as a mediating variable linking work engagement and self-efficacy to performance outcomes (Jufrizen et al., 2024; Trihudiyatmanto et al., 2025; Imawan et al., 2024; Rustina et al., 2025).

Despite extensive research, inconsistencies remain in previous findings regarding the relationships among these variables. Several studies have reported that work engagement does not significantly affect job satisfaction or employee performance (Noercahyo et al., 2021; Suwarno et al., 2023; Wardiansyah et al., 2024; Bere et al., 2025). Similarly, other studies have found that self-efficacy does not significantly influence job satisfaction or performance (Hanifah et al., 2025; Susanto et al., 2024a; Kusumawati & Husainah, 2024). These inconsistencies highlight the need for further investigation. Moreover, empirical studies examining these relationships simultaneously within the logistics and shipping sector, particularly in Indonesia, remain limited. This study addresses this gap by analyzing the influence of work engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance, with job satisfaction as a mediating variable, in a logistics company in Indonesia.

From a practical perspective, employee productivity is not solely determined by engagement but also by job satisfaction. Employees who experience higher job satisfaction tend to be more productive, which ultimately supports the achievement of organizational goals. Observations in the studied company indicate that there is still room for improvement in task completion and adherence to timelines, suggesting the need to strengthen both emotional engagement and confidence in employees' capabilities. Therefore, strategic efforts to enhance work engagement and self-efficacy are essential, as these factors contribute to job satisfaction and, in turn, improve employee performance. Based on these considerations, this study aims to examine the effects of work engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance, with job satisfaction as a mediating variable, in a logistics company in Indonesia.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research approach using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) as the primary analytical technique. The population comprised all employees of a logistics company in Indonesia, and a census sampling method was used, yielding 52 respondents. Data were collected using a structured, closed-ended questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale. The measurement model was evaluated through tests of convergent validity and composite reliability, while the structural model was assessed using bootstrapping procedures to determine path significance. PLS-SEM was selected for several methodological and practical reasons. First, it is particularly suitable for studies with relatively small sample sizes, as it imposes fewer distributional assumptions than covariance-based SEM. Given that this study involved only 52 respondents, PLS-SEM provides a robust and reliable estimation approach. Second, PLS-SEM is appropriate for prediction-oriented research and for examining complex models involving multiple constructs and mediating relationships, as is the case in this study. Third, it allows simultaneous assessment of both the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model), making it well-suited for analyzing latent variables such as work engagement, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and employee performance. Therefore, PLS-SEM is considered an appropriate and rigorous analytical technique for achieving the objectives of this research.

2.2. Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all employees of a logistics company in Indonesia. Given the relatively small population, this study employed a census sampling technique, in which all members of the population were included as respondents. As a result, the total sample size comprised 52 employees. The use of a census approach ensures comprehensive data collection and minimizes sampling bias, as every individual within the population is represented in the analysis. This approach is particularly appropriate when the population size is manageable, as it allows for more accurate and reliable estimation of relationships among variables. Thus, the sample in this study is identical to the population, enabling the findings to reflect the actual conditions of employees within the organization.

2.3. Research Instruments

This study utilized a structured questionnaire as the primary instrument for data collection. The questionnaire was designed using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*), to measure respondents' perceptions of the studied variables. All measurement items were adapted from established, validated scales used in prior studies to ensure content validity and reliability. The instrument consisted of four main constructs: work engagement, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and employee performance (see Table 1). Work engagement was measured using indicators of vigor, dedication, and absorption, adapted from Bakker et al. (2014). Self-efficacy was assessed using the dimensions of level, generality, and strength, following Devi and Dewi (2025). Job satisfaction was measured using indicators of salary satisfaction, job characteristics, supervisor attitude, coworkers, and promotion opportunities, following Prastyorini et al. (2024). Employee performance was evaluated using indicators such as quantity, quality, timeliness, work effectiveness, and independence, as proposed by Saing and Eprianto (2025). Prior to data collection, the questionnaire was reviewed to ensure clarity, relevance, and appropriateness of the items. The validity and reliability of the instrument were further assessed through statistical testing, including convergent validity, discriminant validity, and internal consistency reliability, as part of the PLS-SEM analysis.

Table 1. Summary of Measurement Instruments

Variable(s)	Definition	Indicator(s)	Source(s)
Work Engagement	A positive psychological state reflecting employees' involvement and commitment to supporting organizational performance.	Vigor, Dedication, Absorption	Bakker et al. (2014)
Self-Efficacy	Employees' beliefs in their ability to perform tasks and overcome work-related challenges.	Level, Generality, Strength	Devi & Dewi (2025)

Job Satisfaction	A positive emotional state resulting from employees' evaluation of their job experiences; acts as a mediating variable in this study.	Salary, Job characteristics, Supervisor attitude, Coworkers, Promotion opportunities	Prastyorini et al. (2024)
Employee Performance	The level of achievement demonstrated by employees in fulfilling their job responsibilities.	Quantity, Quality, Timeliness, Work effectiveness, Independence	Saing & Eprianto (2025)

2.4. Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was performed using SmartPLS version 3, employing Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). The analytical procedure consisted of three main stages: outer model evaluation, inner model evaluation, and hypothesis testing. The outer model evaluation (measurement model) was carried out to assess the validity and reliability of the constructs. Convergent validity was examined through factor loadings, with values greater than 0.70, indicating that the indicators adequately represent their respective constructs. Discriminant validity was evaluated using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where each construct was required to have an AVE value higher than its correlations with other constructs. In addition, reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, rho_A, and composite reliability, with acceptable values exceeding 0.60, indicating the measurement instruments' internal consistency.

The inner model evaluation (structural model) was conducted to examine the relationships among the latent variables. This included a collinearity test using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), with values below 5.00 indicating no multicollinearity issues. The model's explanatory power was assessed using the coefficient of determination (R^2), while the magnitude of the relationships was evaluated through effect size (f^2). Furthermore, both direct and indirect path coefficients were analyzed to understand the structural relationships between variables, including mediating effects. Finally, hypothesis testing was performed using the bootstrapping procedure to assess the statistical significance of the proposed relationships. The significance of the hypotheses was determined based on t-values and p-values, providing robust evidence for accepting or rejecting the proposed hypotheses.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive analysis indicates that female employees constitute the majority of respondents, accounting for 61% of the sample, while male employees represent 39%. This suggests that the workforce in the studied organization is predominantly female. In terms of educational background, the largest proportion of respondents are high school or vocational school graduates, comprising 52% of the sample. Meanwhile, 49% of employees hold a bachelor's degree as their highest level of education. These findings indicate that the employee composition is largely dominated by individuals with secondary-level education, although a substantial proportion also possesses higher education qualifications. The demographic profile highlights a workforce with a higher proportion of female employees and a predominance of high school or vocational education attainment.

3.2. Assessment of Measurement Model

3.2.1. Construct Validity and Reliability

The results of the measurement model evaluation indicate that all constructs meet the required criteria for construct validity, internal consistency reliability, and convergent validity (see Table 2).

Table 2. Result of Construct Validity and Reliability

Variable	Indicators	Loadings	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted
Work Engagement (X1)	WE.1	0.851	0.876	0.779
	WE.2	0.913		
Self Efficacy (X2)	SE.1	0.977	0.977	0.955

Variable	Indicators	Loadings	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average Variance Extracted
Job Satisfaction (Z)	JS.2	0.847	0.801	0.669
	JS.3	0.788		
Employee Performance (Y)	EP.1	0.729	0.875	0.638
	EP.2	0.826		
	EP.3	0.814		
	EP.4	0.822		

Table 2 shows that the indicator reliability (outer loadings) indicates that all items have loadings above the recommended threshold of 0.70. Specifically, work engagement indicators range from 0.851 to 0.913; self-efficacy shows a loading of 0.977; job satisfaction ranges from 0.788 to 0.847; and employee performance ranges from 0.729 to 0.826. These values demonstrate that all indicators have strong correlations with their respective constructs and are therefore valid measures. Second, composite reliability (CR) values for all variables exceed the minimum threshold of 0.70, indicating satisfactory internal consistency. Work engagement has a CR value of 0.876, self-efficacy of 0.977, job satisfaction of 0.801, and employee performance of 0.875. These results confirm that the measurement items consistently represent their underlying constructs.

Third, convergent validity, assessed using Average Variance Extracted (AVE), also meets the recommended criterion of 0.50 or greater. The AVE values are 0.779 for work engagement, 0.955 for self-efficacy, 0.669 for job satisfaction, and 0.638 for employee performance. This indicates that each construct explains more than 50% of the variance of its indicators, confirming adequate convergent validity. It is important to note that self-efficacy is measured by a single indicator, resulting in very high reliability and AVE values. While this is acceptable in PLS-SEM, the interpretation should be made cautiously, as multi-item constructs generally provide more robust measurement. These findings demonstrate that the measurement model satisfies the criteria for validity and reliability, and is therefore appropriate for further structural model analysis.

3.2.2. Discriminant Validity Testing

Discriminant validity was evaluated by comparing the square root of the AVE with inter-construct correlations using the Fornell–Larcker criterion (see Table 3).

Table 3. Result of Discriminant Validity using Fornell-Larcker Criterion

Variable(s)	Work Engagement (X1)	Self-Efficacy (X2)	Job Satisfaction (Z)	Employee Performance (Y)
Work Engagement (X1)	0.723			
Self-Efficacy (X2)	1	1		
Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.716	-0.079	0.881	
Employee Performance (Y)	0.832	-0.315	0.607	0.815

Table 3 presents the results of discriminant validity assessment using the Fornell–Larcker criterion, which compares the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each construct with the correlations between constructs. According to this criterion, a construct is considered to have adequate discriminant validity when the square root of its AVE is greater than its correlations with other constructs. The results indicate that work engagement (X1) has an AVE of 0.723. However, this value is lower than its correlation with employee performance (0.832), suggesting a potential issue with discriminant validity between these two constructs. This indicates that work engagement and employee performance may share a high degree of conceptual similarity or overlapping variance. For self-efficacy (X2), the square root of AVE is 1.000, which exceeds its correlations with other constructs, including job satisfaction (–0.079) and employee performance (–0.315). This confirms that self-efficacy demonstrates adequate discriminant validity.

However, it is important to note that self-efficacy is measured using a single indicator, which may inflate its AVE value and should therefore be interpreted with caution. Similarly, job satisfaction (Z) shows an AVE of 0.881, which is greater than its correlations with work engagement (0.716), self-efficacy (–0.079), and employee performance (0.607). This indicates that job satisfaction is empirically distinct from the other constructs. In the case of employee performance (Y), the square root of AVE is 0.815, which exceeds its correlation with job satisfaction (0.607) and self-efficacy (–0.315), but is slightly lower than its correlation with work engagement (0.832). This again suggests a potential overlap between employee performance and work engagement. While most constructs meet the Fornell–Larcker criterion, the results reveal a potential concern about discriminant validity between work engagement and employee performance, as their inter-construct correlation exceeds the square root of their AVEs.

3.2.3. Common Methods Bias (CMB) Testing

Common method bias was assessed using variance inflation factors (VIFs) to examine potential collinearity among indicators. The result is seen in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Result of the Common Methods Bias test using the VIF value

Variable(s)	Indicators	VIF
Work Engagement (X1)	WE.1	1.471
	WE.2	1.471
Self-Efficacy (X2)	SE.1	1
Job Satisfaction (Z)	Z.2	1.451
	Z.3	1.451
Employee Performance (Y)	EP.1	1.901
	EP.2	1.998
	EP.3	2.169
	EP.4	2.249

Table 4 presents the results of the common method bias (CMB) assessment using the variance inflation factor (VIF) approach. In PLS-SEM, CMB can be evaluated by examining indicator collinearity; VIF values exceeding the recommended threshold may indicate bias due to common measurement methods. Following established guidelines, VIF values below 3.3 (or more conservatively below 5.0) suggest that common method bias is not a serious concern. The results show that all indicators have VIF values ranging from 1.000 to 2.249, which are well below the critical threshold. Specifically, the indicators for work engagement (WE.1 and WE.2) both have VIF values of 1.471, indicating low collinearity. The self-efficacy indicator (SE.1) has a VIF of 1.000, indicating no multicollinearity. For employee performance, the VIF values range from 1.901 to 2.249 across indicators (EP.1–EP.4), while job satisfaction indicators (Z.2 and Z.3) both show VIF values of 1.451. These findings indicate that there is no significant multicollinearity among the indicators and, more importantly, no evidence of common method bias in the data. The relatively low VIF values suggest that the variance explained by each indicator is not inflated due to measurement artifacts, thereby supporting the robustness of the measurement model. The results confirm that common method bias is not a threat in this study, and the data can be considered reliable for further structural model analysis.

3.3. Assessment of Structural Model

3.3.1. Coefficient Determination and Effect Size

Table 5. Result of Coefficient Determination and Effect Size

Variable	R Square	R Square Adjusted	f-square
Employee Performance (Y)	0.447	0.413	0.230
Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.120	0.085	

Table 5 presents the results for the coefficients of determination (R^2), adjusted R^2, and effect sizes (f^2) for the endogenous variables in the structural model, namely employee performance (Y) and job satisfaction (Z). The results indicate that employee performance (Y) has an R^2 value of 0.447 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.413. This implies that approximately 44.7% of the variance in employee performance can be explained by

the exogenous variables included in the model, namely work engagement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. According to commonly accepted guidelines, this value indicates moderate explanatory power. The adjusted R^2, which accounts for model complexity, remains close to the R^2, indicating the model is relatively stable and not overfitted.

Furthermore, the effect size (f^2) for employee performance is 0.230, which falls within the medium effect category based on Cohen's (1988) criteria (0.02 = small, 0.15 = medium, 0.35 = large). This suggests that the combined contribution of the predictor variables has a moderate impact on explaining employee performance. In contrast, job satisfaction (Z) shows an R^2 of 0.120 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.085, indicating that only 12.0% of its variance is explained by the independent variables (work engagement and self-efficacy). This reflects a weak level of explanatory power, suggesting that other factors not included in the model may play a more substantial role in influencing job satisfaction. The lower adjusted R^2 further underscores the model's limited explanatory power for this construct. These findings suggest that while the model demonstrates moderate predictive capability for employee performance, it exhibits limited explanatory power for job satisfaction. Therefore, future research is recommended to incorporate additional relevant variables to better explain variations in job satisfaction.

3.4. Hypothesis Testing

Table 6. Results of Hypothesis Testing (Direct and Mediating Effects)

Hypothesis	Coefficient	Std. Error (SE)	t-stat	Sig
Work Engagement (X1) → Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.290	0.246	1.181	0.238
Self-Efficacy (X2) → Job Satisfaction (Z)	0.225	0.099	2.275	0.023
Work Engagement (X1) → Employee Performance (Y)	0.126	0.046	2.717	0.007
Self-Efficacy (X2) → Employee Performance (Y)	0.103	0.059	1.736	0.083
Job Satisfaction (Z) → Employee Performance (Y)	0.613	0.087	7.012	0.000
Work Engagement (X1) → Job Satisfaction (Z) → Employee Performance (Y)	0.178	0.15	1.189	0.235
Self-Efficacy (X2) → Job Satisfaction (Z) → Employee Performance (Y)	0.138	0.067	2.074	0.039

Table 6 presents the results of hypothesis testing, including direct and indirect (mediating) effects, based on the path coefficients, standard errors, t-statistics, and significance values obtained from the bootstrapping procedure. The results indicate that work engagement (X1) does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction (Z), as evidenced by a coefficient of 0.290, t-statistic of 1.181, and p-value of 0.238 ($p > 0.05$). Although the relationship is positive, it is not statistically supported, suggesting that higher work engagement does not necessarily lead to increased job satisfaction in this context. In contrast, self-efficacy (X2) has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction (Z) ($\beta = 0.225$, $t = 2.275$, $p = 0.023$). This finding indicates that employees with higher confidence in their abilities tend to experience greater job satisfaction. Furthermore, work engagement (X1) has a significant positive effect on employee performance (Y) ($\beta = 0.126$, $t = 2.717$, $p = 0.007$). This suggests that more engaged employees tend to achieve better performance outcomes. However, self-efficacy (X2) does not have a significant effect on employee performance (Y) ($\beta = 0.103$, $t = 1.736$, $p = 0.083$), indicating that confidence alone may not directly translate into improved performance. The results also show that job satisfaction (Z) has a strong and significant positive effect on employee performance (Y) ($\beta = 0.613$, $t = 7.012$, $p = 0.000$). This is the strongest relationship in the model, highlighting the critical role of job satisfaction as a key driver of employee performance.

Regarding indirect effects, the findings reveal that job satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between work engagement (X1) and employee performance (Y) ($\beta = 0.178$, $t = 1.189$, $p = 0.235$). This indicates that the influence of work engagement on performance occurs primarily through direct pathways rather than through job satisfaction. On the other hand, job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between self-efficacy (X2) and employee performance (Y) ($\beta = 0.138$, $t = 2.074$, $p = 0.039$). Although self-efficacy does not directly affect performance, it indirectly contributes to improved performance through increased job satisfaction. This suggests a full mediation effect, in which job satisfaction serves as a key mechanism linking self-efficacy to employee performance.

4. Discussion

The results of this study provide important insights into the relationships between work engagement, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and employee performance within the logistics sector. First, the findings indicate that work engagement does not have a significant effect on job satisfaction. Although the relationship is positive, it is not statistically significant, and the effect size is weak. This suggests that employees' emotional attachment and involvement in their work do not necessarily translate into higher job satisfaction. One possible explanation is that engagement alone may not be sufficient to fulfill employees' expectations regarding rewards, career development, or organizational support. This finding is consistent with previous studies (Suwarno et al., 2023; Pranitasari et al., 2022; Cipta & Hwihanus, 2024; Ain et al., 2025; Wardiansyah et al., 2024), which also reported no significant relationship between work engagement and job satisfaction.

Second, self-efficacy has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, although the effect size is relatively weak. This indicates that employees who have greater confidence in their abilities tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction. From a theoretical perspective, this finding aligns with Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes the role of self-belief in shaping attitudes and outcomes. Employees with high self-efficacy are more likely to perceive their work positively and cope effectively with challenges, thereby increasing satisfaction. This result is consistent with prior studies (Trihudiyatmanto et al., 2025; Devi & Dewi, 2025; Saro & Heryjanto, 2024; Iskandar & Arif, 2023). Third, the results reveal that work engagement has a significant positive effect on employee performance. This suggests that more engaged employees, characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption, tend to perform better. Engaged employees are more motivated, persistent, and committed to achieving organizational goals. This finding supports the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model and is consistent with previous empirical studies (Imawan et al., 2024; Setyawati et al., 2025; Rustina et al., 2025; Hanan et al., 2024).

Fourth, self-efficacy does not have a significant direct effect on employees. Although employees may have confidence in their abilities, this alone does not guarantee improved performance. This finding suggests that self-efficacy may require supporting factors, such as motivation, organizational support, or job satisfaction, to translate into actual performance. Similar findings have been reported in previous studies (Hanifah et al., 2025; Susanto et al., 2024a; Mayyora & Sumartik, 2024). Fifth, job satisfaction has a strong and significant positive effect on employee performance, with a large effect size. This indicates that job satisfaction is the most influential factor in improving employee performance. Employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to exhibit higher productivity, commitment, and work quality. This finding is consistent with numerous prior studies (Ramadhan & Budiono, 2023; Mujiyono et al., 2025; Imawan et al., 2024), highlighting the central role of job satisfaction in organizational performance.

Regarding mediating effects, the results show that job satisfaction does not mediate the relationship between work engagement and employee performance. This indicates that the influence of work engagement on performance occurs primarily through a direct mechanism rather than through job satisfaction. In other words, engaged employees can perform well regardless of their level of satisfaction. This finding is supported by previous studies (Bere et al., 2025; Sadiq et al., 2022; Pradita & Sugiarto, 2025). In contrast, job satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance. This suggests that self-efficacy enhances employee performance indirectly by increasing job satisfaction. In this case, job satisfaction acts as a full mediating variable, indicating that confidence alone is insufficient unless it contributes to positive job-related feelings. This finding is consistent with prior research (Saro & Heryjanto, 2024; Sanjaya, 2025; Iskandar & Arif, 2023).

5. Conclusions

This study examines the effects of work engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance, with job satisfaction as a mediating variable in the logistics sector. The findings provide several important conclusions. First, work engagement does not significantly influence job satisfaction, suggesting that employees' involvement and enthusiasm alone are insufficient to enhance their satisfaction. Second, self-efficacy has a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, suggesting that employees' confidence in their abilities plays an important role in shaping positive work attitudes. Third, work engagement significantly improves employee performance, highlighting its direct role in enhancing productivity and work outcomes. In contrast, self-efficacy does not have a significant direct effect on performance, implying that confidence alone does not automatically translate into higher performance without supportive conditions. Fourth, job satisfaction emerges as the strongest determinant of employee performance, confirming its central role in driving employee effectiveness. Finally, the mediation analysis reveals that job satisfaction does not mediate

the relationship between work engagement and performance, but fully mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. This indicates that self-efficacy contributes to performance indirectly by enhancing job satisfaction. This study underscores the importance of psychological and attitudinal factors, particularly job satisfaction, as key mechanisms in improving employee performance within the logistics industry.

The findings of this study offer several important implications for organizational practice, particularly for managers in the logistics sector. First, organizations should prioritize strategies that enhance job satisfaction, as it is the most influential factor affecting employee performance. This can be achieved by improving compensation systems, providing fair promotion opportunities, fostering supportive leadership, and creating a positive work environment. Second, managers should focus on strengthening employees' self-efficacy, as this indirectly improves performance by boosting job satisfaction. This can be done through training programs, mentoring, skill development initiatives, and providing constructive feedback that enhances employees' confidence in their abilities. Third, although work engagement does not significantly affect job satisfaction, it does have a direct positive impact on performance. Therefore, organizations should continue to promote engagement by encouraging meaningful work, recognizing employee contributions, and fostering a sense of purpose and involvement. Fourth, the findings suggest that self-efficacy alone is insufficient to drive performance without satisfaction. Thus, organizations should adopt a holistic approach that integrates psychological empowerment (self-efficacy) with organizational support mechanisms (job satisfaction). Finally, given the relatively low explanatory power for job satisfaction, managers should also consider additional factors, such as organizational culture, leadership style, and work-life balance, to further enhance employee satisfaction and overall performance.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, R.A.P.P. and A.S.; methodology, R.A.P.P.; software, R.A.P.P.; validation, R.A.P.P. and A.S.; formal analysis, R.A.P.P.; investigation, R.A.P.P.; resources, R.A.P.P.; data curation, A.S.; writing—original draft preparation, R.A.P.P.; writing—review and editing, A.S.; visualization, R.A.P.P.; supervision, A.S.; project administration, R.A.P.P.; funding acquisition, A.S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Author Initials:
R.A.P.P.: Rizky Agus Putra Pratama
A.S.: Agus Sukoco

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study due to its minimal risk nature. However, the study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Universitas Narotama, Indonesia, for its support in facilitating this research and publication. The author also extends appreciation to the reviewers for their valuable and constructive comments, which have significantly improved the quality of this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

Ain, M. F. D. N., Riono, S. B., Indritani, A., Syaifulloh, M., & Khojin, N. (2025). Pengaruh knowledge sharing, self-confidence, dan employee engagement terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan dengan komunikasi organisasi sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan, 5*(1), 177–198. https://doi.org/10.55606/jimak.v5i1.5366

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD-R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 389–411. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Bere, T. A., Subyantoro, A., & Nilmawati. (2025). The job satisfaction mediation dilemma: A case study of work engagement and organizational culture's influence on employee performance. *Strata International Journal of Social Issues, 2*(2), 323–335. https://doi.org/10.59631/sijosi.v2i2.420

Calicchio, S. (2023). *Albert Bandura dan faktor efikasi diri*. Stefano Calicchio Edizioni.

Candana, D. M., Afuan, M., Purwasih, R., & Ikwal, R. (2022). Pengaruh self-efficacy dan perceived organizational support terhadap kepuasan kerja pegawai. *Jurnal Ekobistek, 11*(4), 433–440. https://doi.org/10.35134/ekobistek.v11i4.421

Cipta, H., & Hwihanus. (2024). The Role of Work Facilities, Employee Engagement, and Work Ethic in Enhancing Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Factor at CV. Anugerah Tirta Persada Pangkalan Bun. *International Journal of Science and Society*, *6*(2), 615-629. https://doi.org/10.54783/ijsoc.v6i2.1187

Demerouti, E., Nachreiner, F., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands–resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Devi, A. C., & Dewi, R. S. (2025). The influence of self-efficacy and work environment on employee performance through job satisfaction. *Journal of Management and Business Education, 8*(2), 329–343. https://doi.org/10.35564/jmbe.2025.0018

Gunawan, K., & Verianto, H. (2023). *The impact of self-efficacy and job stress on employee performance*. University of Widya Dharma Pontianak.

Hanan, Z., Dalimunthe, R. F., & Absah, Y. (2024). The influence of employee engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance through innovative work behavior. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3*(8), 3947-3958. https://doi.org/10.55927/eajmr.v3i8.9898

Hanifah, U., Widhiandono, H., Endratno, H., & Haryanto, T. (2025). The influence of transformational leadership style and self-efficacy on performance with job satisfaction as a mediating variable. *Asian Journal of Applied Business and Management, 4*(3), 1421–1438. https://doi.org/10.55927/ajabm.v4i3.409

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist, 44*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Imawan, I., Lesmana, M. T., & Muslih. (2024). Work–life balance, work engagement, and employee performance: Examining the mediating role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business Economics, 5*(2), 166–186. https://doi.org/10.30596/ijbe.v5i2.18210

Iskandar, D., & Arif, M. (2023). Peningkatan Performance Berbasis Self Efficacy Dan Locus Of Control Yang Dimediasi Job Satisfaction. *Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, *6*(1), 63-74. https://doi.org/10.30596/maneggio.v6i1.15204

Jufrizen, J., Harahap, D. S., & Khair, H. (2024). Leader–member exchange and employee performance: Mediating roles of work engagement and job satisfaction. *Journal of Economics, Business, & Accountancy Ventura, 26*(3), 306–322. https://doi.org/10.14414/jebav.v26i3.3591

Kusumawati, Y., & Husainah, N. (2024). Determinants of self-efficacy and its implications for job satisfaction of generation Z. *PENANOMICS: International Journal of Economics, 3*(3), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.56107/penanomics.v3i3.208

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.

Mayyora, E., & Sumartik. (2024). Emotional intelligence drives employee performance in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review, 19*(2). https://doi.org/10.21070/ijler.v19i2.1106

Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(4), 475–480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.4.475

Mujiyono, S., Trihudiyatmanto, M., & Prawoto, E. (2025). Meningkatkan kinerja karyawan melalui employee engagement dan self-efficacy dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel intervening. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen & Perbankan Syariah, 5*(1), 120-139.

Noercahyo, U. S., Maaruf, M. S., & Sumertajaya, I. M. (2021). The role of employee engagement on job satisfaction and its effect on organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Management, 19*(2), 296–309. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jam

Pradita, N. Y., & Sugiarto, A. (2025). The influence of work–life balance and employee engagement on employee performance intervened by job satisfaction. *Jurnal Maksipreneur: Manajemen, Koperasi, dan Entrepreneurship, 14*(2), 788–812. https://doi.org/10.30588/jmp.v14i2.1822

Pranitasari, D., J., Said, M., & Nugroho, S. H. (2022). The mediating effect of work engagement on competence, work environment, and job satisfaction. *Jurnal Manajemen, 13*(3), 365. https://doi.org/10.32832/jm-uika.v13i3.7346

Prastyorini, J., Widyawati, N., Kristiawati, I., EsterKalangi, M. H., Priyohadi, N. D., Priyanto, E., Arisandi, D., & Mudayat. (2024). Pengaruh kepemimpinan terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja karyawan. *Jurnal Baruna Horizon, 7*(1), 9–20.

Ramadhan, N. D., & Budiono. (2023). Pengaruh self-efficacy dan work engagement terhadap employee performance melalui job satisfaction. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 11*(3), 783–796.

Rustina, E., Dermawan, A., Vidyaningrum, B., & Suwandi. (2025). The impact of job satisfaction and employee engagement on employee performance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13*(3), 1859–1870. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i3.3336

Sadiq, M. A., Indra Gunawan, A., Sosianika, A., & Alty Amalia, F. (2022). The link between engagement and service performance: The mediation role of job satisfaction. *International Journal of Applied Business Research*, 50–64. https://doi.org/10.35313/ijabr.v4i1.208

Saing, B., & Eprianto, I. (2025). Strategies to improve employee performance through employee engagement, organizational culture, work motivation, and job satisfaction. *Integrated Journal of Business and Economics, 9*(1), 38-52. https://doi.org/10.33019/ijbe.v9i1.1076

Sanjaya, T., Syahyunan, S., & Saskia, S. (2025). The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Employee Performance With Job Satisfaction As An Intervening Variable At Mawar Bakery & Cake Shop Medan. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen dan Ilmu Ekonomi (JASMIEN)*, *5*(03), 155-164.

Saro, P. I., & Heryjanto, A. (2024). The influence of self-efficacy, work discipline and organizational culture on employee performance mediated by job satisfaction. *Asian Journal of Social and Humanities*, *2*(8), 1784-1800.

Sayekti, L. N., & Suhartini. (2022). Work–life balance dan work engagement: Dampaknya terhadap kepuasan kerja dan kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis*, 132–142.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzales-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 1*(3), 71–92.

Setyawati, A., Pahrudin, C., Agusinta, L., Sitanggang, R., & Susanto, P. C. (2025). Employee performance through employee engagement in cargo companies. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan, 13*(2), 1249–1256. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i2.3400

Spector, P. E. (2022). *Job satisfaction: From assessment to intervention* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003250616

Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N., Ali, H., & Rony, Z. T. (2024a). Determinants of employee engagement and employee performance. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 8*(6), 356–373. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.2080

Susanto, P. C., Sawitri, N. N., Ali, H., & Rony, Z. T. (2024b). Determinants of employee engagement: Servant leadership, training, self-efficacy effects. *Bulletin of Counseling and Psychotherapy, 6*(3), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.51214/002024061144000

Suwarno, S., Kesuma, I. M., Aprianto, R., Anggraini, S., Nuraini, B., Paleni, H., & Surajiyo, S. (2023). Perceived organizational support and work engagement toward employee performance. *Journal of Business Management and Economic Development, 1*(2), 230–239. https://doi.org/10.59653/jbmed.v1i02.136

Trihudiyatmanto, M., Mujiyono, S., & Prawoto, E. (2025). Improving employee performance through employee engagement and self-efficacy with job satisfaction as an intervening variable. *Business, Accounting, and Knowledge Journal*, *2*(1), 31-46. https://doi.org/10.31941/batik.v1i2.355

Utami, T., Darmawan, A., Bagis, F., & Miftahuddin, M. A. (2025). The effect of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance through employee engagement. *Asian Journal of Management Analytics, 4*(1), 129–144. https://doi.org/10.55927/ajma.v4i1.13360

Wardiansyah, D. R., Indrawati, N. K., & Kurniawati, D. T. (2024). The effect of employee motivation and employee engagement on job performance mediated by job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science, 13*(1), 220–231. https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v13i1.3133

Wiyanto, J., Ratnaningsih, D. J., & Suratini, S. (2024). Self-efficacy, career development, and work engagement on employee performance: Evidence from aviation sector organizations. *Journal of Enterprise and Development (JED)*, *6*(1), 223-236.

Yandi, A., & Havidz, H. B. H. (2022). Employee performance model: Work engagement through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Dinasti International Journal of Management Science, 3*(3), 547-565. https://doi.org/10.31933/dijms.v3i3