Strata Social and Humanities Studies, 2026, Vol. 4, No. 2, 79–90
E-ISSN: 2987-2537 | P-ISSN: 2987-3193
doi: 10.59631/sshs.v4i2.572
Advance Access publication October 31, 2026

STRATA
SOCIAL AND HUMANITIES STUDIES
journals.stratapersada.com/index.php/sshs

Employee Well-Being and Work Engagement among Sales Promotion Personnel in the Air Conditioning Industry: A Correlational Study

Abdul Basit Cahyana[1*], Femmy Lekahena[2]

[1*]*Universitas Proklamasi 45 Yogyakarta, Indonesia.* cahyana.abdulbasit@gmail.com
[2]*Universitas Proklamasi 45 Yogyakarta, Indonesia.* femmy@up45.ac.id

Article History	Submitted	Revised	Accepted
	2026-07-24	2026-08-09 & 2026-09-30	2026-10-11

Abstract

Intense competition in Indonesia's air conditioning market places substantial emotional and target-related demands on sales promotion personnel, who act as frontline brand representatives. Although employee well-being is theorized within Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory to sustain work engagement, evidence from frontline retail sales contexts remains limited. This study examined the relationship between employee well-being and work engagement among sales promotion personnel at PT Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia, Yogyakarta Branch. Using a quantitative correlational design, all eligible sales promotion personnel were included through purposive sampling. Data were collected using the Indonesian versions of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) and Employee Well-Being Scale (EWBS) and analyzed with Pearson correlation in SPSS 21 after testing normality, linearity, and outliers. A post hoc G*Power analysis indicated adequate power (0.999). Employee well-being was positively and strongly correlated with work engagement (r = .775). These findings suggest that frontline employees' personal psychological resources support their vigor, dedication, and absorption under demanding sales conditions. Organizations should therefore strengthen psychological resources through targeted debriefing, coaching, and mentoring rather than rely only on general working-condition improvements. The results extend JD-R evidence to an emotionally demanding retail setting, although cross-sectional, single-company data limit causal inferences and generalizability.

Keywords: Employee well-being, frontline employees, job demands-resources, sales promotion personnel, work engagement.

© The Author(s) 2026. Published by CV. Strata Persada Academia.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Common Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian Air Conditioner (AC) market is experiencing increasingly intense competition, driven by the established Japanese and South Korean brands and the growing presence of Chinese manufacturers (Annur, 2023; Muslimawati, 2026). Having entered the Indonesian market in 2015, PT Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia is relatively newer compared to several long-established competitors (Irawan, 2022). Although it has gained market recognition since entering the market in 2015 (Top Brand Award, 2026), building consumer awareness and customer confidence remains a challenge. This burden falls largely on sales promotion personnel, who act as frontline brand representatives. They are expected to meet ambitious sales target while also building long-term customer relationship and brand awareness (Hulu et al., 2025; Novitasari & Guntarayana, 2016; Sulistio & Samuel, 2018). Meeting these expectations requires them to sustain enthusiasm and professionalism under demanding conditions (Schepers & Nijssen, 2018), because the brand image they convey shapes customer loyalty through direct interaction (Kotzé & Mostert, 2025). Yet the same responsibilities can become job stressors that affect employees' emotion, cognition and overall psychological condition (Aprilianingsih & Frianto, 2022; Islamiati et al., 2021), particularly when customer demands combine with substantial physical and emotional strain (Rakhy & Ambily, 2022).

If this strain presist, it raises the risk of turnover (Margaretta & Riana, 2020), which is a common problem in retail, including the Special Region of Yogyakarta (Mudita & Prasetyo, 2023; Nugroho & Darmawati, 2018). Turnover among sales promotion personnel increases recruitment and training costs, erodes organizational knowledge and weakens brand-building efforts (Shavira & Purwanto, 2025; Wulandari et al., 2026). Organization therefore need a stable and engaged frontline workforce (Namira & Pramesti, 2025; Pratama et al., 2023). Work engagement is promising level, as it buffers the effect of heavy workload and lowers intention to leave (Rahmadani et al., 2023).

Work engagement is a positive, fulfilling state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli et al., 2006). It matters most for frontline employees, because their engagement directly affects service quality and the organization's ability to meet customer needs (Asan & Huliselan, 2020). Engaged employees also contribute beyond their formal responsibilities (Jufrizen & Lubis, 2025). Which resources sustain engagement under sustained pressure is best explained by the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) theory. It holds that job resources offset the costs of job demands, supporting employee well-being and, in turn, engagement (Bakker et al., 2014; Mazzetti et al., 2023; Schaufeli, 2017). Employee well-being is therefore a plausable antecedent of work engagement (Triyanta & Jahani, 2025).

Employee well-being goes beyond the workplace and covers life, workplace, and psychological well-being (Page &Vella-Brodick, 2009; Zheng et al., 2015). Prior studies consistently link higher well-being to greater energy, enthusiasm, and effort at work (Gomez & Chaves, 2023; Indriani et al., 2026; Simanjuntak et al., 2024), with moderate association reported among government employees (Sitorus & Primanita, 2025). However, this evidence has two limitations. First, it comes mainly from bank managers, government employees, and executive-level staff, whose work involves relatively little repeated customer contact. Second, these studies

mostly treated well-being as a general resource and do not ask which its dimensions matter most when the job demands are emotional and target-driven. It therefore remains unclear whether the well-being-engagement link found in these setting holds, weakens or strengthens for frontline sales work.

Sales Promotion personnel are an analytically distinct case. Their work involves repeated, brief customer interactions, performance judged against sales targets, and a requirement to display positive emotions as brand representative (Park et al., 2015; Yoo et al., 2025). Under such demands, psychological resources may be used up faster and matter more for staying engaged than the general well-being conditions studies in office-based samples. Examining this group therefore allows a test of whether the JD-R Proposition extends to high emotional-demand frontline work, and of which well-being dimension carries the most weight there. Evidence on sales promotion personnel in the AC industry is still lacking, so this study address both contextual and conceptual gap.

Accordingly, this study examines the relationship between employee well-being and work engagement among sales promotion personnel at PT Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia, Yogyakarta Branch, and explores the contribution of each well-being dimension. We hypothesize that employee well-being is positively associated with work engagement. The findings extend JD-R-based evidence to a frontline retail context and offer practical guidance for organizations seeking to strengthen engagement and reduce turnover risks.

METHOD

This research used a quantitative correlational method to test the correlation hypothesis (Wibowo et al., 2025). The population of this study was all sales promotion personnel at PT. Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia, Yogyakarta Branch (N = 32). The branch employs 63 people in total, but only the 35 sales promotion personnel matched the research focus. Because the study required respondent with sufficient work experience to report on their engagement and well-being, purposive sampling was applied based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) working as sales promotion personnel at an PT. Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia, Yogyakarta Branch, (2) having worked for at least three months, and (3) willingness to participate in the study. All 32 sales promotion personnel met these criteria and were included, so the sample represents the entire eligible population and no additional respondents were available.

Research data were collected using psychological scales: the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9), which measures work engagement, constructed by Schaufeli et al. (2006) and validated in the Indonesian context by Kristiana et al. (2018), and the Employee Well-Being Scale (EWBS), which measures employee well-being, constructed by Zheng et al. (2015) and validated in the Indonesian context by Rahmi et al. (2021). Data were collected using a self-administered online questionnaire distributed via Google Forms. The questionnaire was available for one week, and participation was voluntary. An informed consent statement was provided on the first page of the Google Form, and only participants who agreed to participate proceeded to complete the questionnaire.

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21. Prior to hypothesis testing, the assumptions of Pearson's correlation, including normality, linearity, and the presence of outliers, were evaluated. Normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test, linearity was examined using the ANOVA test for linearity, and potential outliers were assessed through visual inspection of boxplots. Pearson's correlation analysis was then performed to examine the relationship between employee well-being and work engagement. To assess sample adequacy, a post hoc power analysis was conducted using G*Power version 3.1.9.7. Based on the observed correlation coefficient (r = .775), a significance level of .05, and a sample size of 32, the achieved statistical power was 0.999, indicating that the sample size was adequate to detect the observed effect.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Participants

The respondents of this study were 32 who were eligible for inclusion. The demographic profile of the respondents presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Participants

Characteristic	Category	n	Percentage
Gender	Male	21	65.63%
	Female	11	34.38%
Age	< 25 years old	0	0.00%
	≥ 25 years old	32	100.00%
Job Tenure	< 2 years	14	43.75%
	≥ 2 years	18	56.25%

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants. As shown in Table 1, the majority of participants were male (65.63%), while females accounted for 34.38% of the sample. All participants were aged 25 years or older. Regarding job tenure, most participants (56.25%) had worked for at least two years, whereas 43.75% had worked for less than two years. These findings indicate that the sample primarily consisted of experienced sales promotion personnel.

Descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, were calculated to summarize participants' scores. For descriptive purposes, participants' scores were also categorized using the hypothetical mean approach based on the normal distribution model proposed by Azwar (2023). The classification was established using the hypothetical mean (μ) and hypothetical standard deviation (σ).

Work Engagement

Table 2. Distribution of Work Engagement Data

Interval	Category	Frequency	Percentage
X > 33	High	13	40.63%
21 < X ≤ 33	Moderate	18	56.25%

X ≤ 21	Low	1	3.13%
Mean = 31.81; Deviation Standard = 6.23			

As shown in Table 2, most participants had moderate work engagement (n = 18, 56.25%), followed by high engagement (n = 13, 40.63%) and low engagement (n = 1, 3.13%). The mean score (31.81) lies just below the cut-off for high engagement (X > 33). These indicate that most sales promotion personnel are reasonably vigorous, dedicated, and absorbed in their work, although a substantial group has not yet reached high engagement, which may reflect the demands of the job. These findings are consistent with those of Rois and Irta (2025), who reported that employees generally demonstrate a satisfactory level of enthusiasm, dedication, and focus at work, although various job demands may still influence their level of work engagement.

Employee Well-Being

Table 3. Distribution of Employee Well-Being Data

Interval	Category	Frequency	Percentage
X > 66	High	7	21.88%
42 < X ≤ 66	Moderate	23	71.87%
X ≤ 42	Low	2	6.25%
Mean = 58.03; Deviation Standard = 10.17			

As shown in Table 3, the majority of participants were classified as having moderate employee well-being (n = 23, 71.87%). This suggests that employees experience well-being at work; however, their well-being may fluctuate when they face work-related pressures or challenges. These findings are consistent with the study by Nanda and Nio (2025), which reported that employees generally experience a satisfactory level of well-being at work, although they still face various challenges in achieving optimal well-being.

Hypothesis Analysis

Prior to Pearson's correlation analysis, assumption testing was conducted. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test indicated that both work engagement (Z = .648, p = .796) and employee well-being (Z = .695, p = .720) were normally distributed. Furthermore, the ANOVA test confirmed a linear relationship between employee well-being and work engagement (F = 87.947, p < .05). Visual inspection of the boxplots indicated that no influential outliers remained in the final dataset. Therefore, all assumptions for Pearson's correlation analysis were satisfied.

Table 4. Correlation's Result

		EWB	WE
EWB	Pearson Correlation	1	.775**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	32	32
WE	Pearson Correlation	.775**	1
		.000	

	Sig. (2-tailed)	32	32
	N		

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 presents the results of the Pearson correlation analysis between employee well-being and work engagement. As shown in Table 4, employee well-being was positively and significantly correlated with work engagement ($r = .775$, $p < .001$). This finding indicates that employees with higher levels of employee well-being tended to report higher levels of work engagement. Furthermore, employee well-being accounted for 60.06% of the variance in work engagement, indicating that a substantial proportion of the variance in work engagement was associated with employee well-being in the present sample. These findings suggest that employees who experience greater well-being, including feeling comfortable at work and being able to manage work-related demands, tend to report higher levels of work engagement.

Employee well-being was strongly related to work engagement, which is higher than the pooled estimates in the JD-R meta-analysis, where personal resources and job resources correlated with engagement at about .48 and .37, and even the strongest outcome correlates reached only about .60 to .63 (Mazzetti et al., 2023). It's also stronger than the $r = .522$ ($P < .05$) reported among government employees (Sitorus & Primanita, 2025). Because the confidence interval is wide with $N = 32$, the exact size should not be overstated, but the relationship is clearly at the upper end of what the literature reports. The direction of this relationship is consistent with Jufrizen and Lubis (2025), who found that employees with more positive work-related experiences showed higher work engagement.

One possible reason lies in the nature of the work. Sales promotion personnel interact repeatedly with customers, must display positive emotions as brand representatives, and are judged against sales target (Park et al., 2015). According to JD-R theory, such constant emotional demand draws on employees' psychological resources every day. Well-being can be therefore be seen as the reserve from which energy for vigor, dedication, and absorption is drawn. When demands are high and steady, small differences in that reserve may separate engaged from disengaged employees more sharply than in jobs with fewer emotional demands. This is an interpretation, because emotional labor was not measured in this study and should be tested directly in future research.

Several other explanations could inflate the correlation. Both scale were self-reported in questionnaire, so common-method variance and a general positive response tendency may have contributed. Well-being and work engagement are two distinct but closely related positive states (Bosle et al., 2021). Finally, the cross-sectional design cannot show direction, since engaged employees may also report higher well-being.

The strength of the relationship may also reflect the homogeneity of the sample. All participants work for the same employer, branch, targets and incentive system, so individual differences in well-being may stand out more clearly than they would in a more varied sample. The lower correlation reported among government employees (Sitorus & Primanita, 2025)

suggests that the relationship may be weaker in more heterogeneous groups, which should be tested in multi-branch and multi-company samples.

Additional Analysis

Effective Contribution of Employee Well-Being Dimensions to Work Engagement

As an additional analysis, the effective contribution of each employee well-being dimension to work engagement was calculated using the procedure proposed by Widhiarso (2014). The effective contribution of each dimension was estimated using the unstandardized regression coefficient (b), the cross-product value, the regression sum of squares, and the total coefficient of determination (R^2) to estimate the proportion of the explained variance associated with each employee well-being dimension.

Table 5. Effective Contribution of Employee Well-Being Dimensions to Work Engagement

Dimension of Employee Well-Being	b	Cross Product	Effective Contribution
Life Well-Being	.545	490.250	22.22%
Workplace Well-Being	.353	507.375	14.89%
Psychological Well-Being	.536	524.563	23.38%
Regression sum of squares = 727.505;			
Total coefficient of determination (R^2) = 60.50%			

Based on Table 5 above, the three-dimension explained 60.50% of the variance in work engagement (R^2), which is slightly higher than the 60.06% explained by the total well-being score ($r^2 = .775^2$), because the dimensions were entered as separate predictors. According to Table 5, among the three dimensions, psychological well-being demonstrated the largest effective contribution (23.38%), followed by life well-being (22.22%) and workplace well-being (14.89%). Because the first two values are so close and the dimensions are correlated, they should be treated as roughly equal contributors, and the ranking should be interpreted cautiously with N = 32. This finding is consistent with Indriani et al. (2026), who also identified psychological well-being as the dimension with the largest effective contribution to work engagement.

The small contribution of workplace well-being is the more informative result. One might expect workplace conditions to matter most for work engagement, but all participants work for the same employer, branch and incentive system, so their workplace conditions vary little from person to person, and a factor with little variation can explain little of the differences in engagement. Psychological well-being, in contrast, covers personal growth, coping and a sense of meaning, which differ between individuals. For sales promotion personnel who face customer rejection and target pressure, these resources may determine whether an employee keeps investing energy and dedication or withdraws, which would explain why they relate closely to engagement. Life well-being may matter for a similar reason: frontline work is emotionally draining, and a stable life outside work may help employees recover between working days. These explanations are tentative, because the study did not measure the mechanisms directly and the effective contributions are estimated from correlated predictors in a small sample. Larger samples and longitudinal or mediation designs are needed to test them.

Differences in Work Engagement Based on Tenure

Additional analyses were conducted to examine differences in work engagement across demographic characteristics. Age was not included because all participants were older than 25 years. Gender differences were examined but were not statistically significant. Therefore, job tenure was selected for further analysis because it showed variability within the sample and has been identified in previous research as a demographic characteristic associated with work engagement (Sia et al., 2021).

Differences in work engagement based on tenure were examined using the Mann–Whitney U test. Employees who had worked for at least two years showed significantly higher work engagement than those with employees who had worked for less than two years ($U = 252.000$, $p < .001$). Employees who had worked for at least two years had a mean work engagement score that was 10.21 points higher than that of employees who had worked for less than two years. This could suggest that employees with longer tenure are more likely to understand their job demands, master their work tasks, and feel more confident in performing their roles. It was aligned with those of Zang and Feng (2023) who reported that work engagement tends to increase with organizational tenure. This pattern may be attributed to employees' greater adaptability, broader work experience, higher job satisfaction, and stronger willingness to invest effort, dedication, and involvement in their work.

CONCLUSION

The findings indicate that employees who are better off in their lives, at work and psychologically also tend to be more engaged in their work. This supports the view that, for frontline sales staff, engagement depends not only on how demanding the job is but on the personal resources employees have to meet those demands. Theoretically, the study extends the well-being and engagement literature to a frontline retail setting in the Indonesian context and suggests that psychological resources deserve particular attention in such settings. Practically, the results point to programs that build sales promotion staff's psychological resources instead of only improving general working conditions. Companies could, for example, run short debriefing sessions after periods when sales targets are missed, offer coaching on handling customer rejection, and pair new staff with experienced colleagues during their first two years. Sales targets could also be discussed openly with staff so that they are experienced as challenges rather than threats. Such programs should be piloted and evaluated before wider use.

This study has several limitations. First, This research was conducted at only one company, PT Gree Electric Appliances Indonesia, and specifically at one of its branches, the Yogyakarta Branch. Second, although all eligible sales promotion personnel at the branch participated, the population was small ($N = 32$) and limited to one branch of one company, which restricts generalizability and the precision of the estimates. Third, the cross-sectional design does not permit causal conclusions about the relationship between employee well-being and work engagement. Fourth, both variables were measured by self-report at a single point in time, so common-method bias may have contributed to the relationship Future research should therefore use larger, multi-branch samples across different organizations, apply longitudinal or

experimental designs to test whether improving well-being leads to greater engagement, and examine additional workplace and personal factors that may shape engagement.

REFERENCES

Annur, C. M. (2023, March 3). *Mayoritas Buatan Korsel & Jepang, Ini Merek AC Paling Banyak Digunakan Konsumen Indonesia*. https://databoks.katadata.co.id/produk-konsumen/statistik/819e5a114147be5/mayoritas-buatan-korsel-jepang-ini-merek-ac-paling-banyak-digunakan-konsumen-indonesia

Aprilianingsih, A., & Frianto, A. (2022). Pengaruh job demands dan job resources terhadap work engagement pada tenaga kependidikan di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, *10*(1), 173–184. https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v10n1.p173-184

Asan, S., & Huliselan, J. J. (2020). Analisis work engagement karyawan frontline high-contact dan low-contact di industri jasa. *Jurnal Manajemen Maranatha*, *19*(2), 127–140. https://doi.org/10.28932/jmm.v19i2.2425

Azwar, S. (2023). *Penyusunan skala psikologi*. Pustaka Pelajar.

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*(1), 389–411. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091235

Bosle, C., Fischer, J. E., & Herr, R. M. (2021). Creating a measure to operationalize engaged well-being at work. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology, 16*(9), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12995-021-00297-0

Gomez, M. D. C., & Chaves, C. C. (2023). Thriving in the new normal: Exploring the link between employees' well-being and work engagement. *Business and Management Science*, *4*(4), 44–51. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0262

Hulu, N., Lubis, K. S., Khairunnisa, K., Manurung, K., Ovianti, W., Syahreza, D. S., & Aprinawati, A. (2025). The role of sales promotion girls as frontliners in Wardah's product marketing strategy. *Economic: Journal Economic and Business*, *4*(1), 27–31. https://doi.org/10.56495/ejeb.v4i1.855

Indriani, T., Lumbanraja, P., & Absah, Y. (2026). The influence of employees' well-being on work engagement at PTPN IV. *Talenta Conference Series: Local Wisdom, Social, and Arts (LWSA)* , *9*(2), 280–288. https://doi.org/10.32734/lwsa.v9i2.2813

Irawan, W. (2022, February 29). *Gree Indonesia buka pusat pelatihan utama dan pusat layanan teknis di Surabaya - ANTARA News Jawa Timur*. ANTARA JATIM. https://jatim.antaranews.com/berita/614509/gree-indonesia-buka-pusat-pelatihan-utama-dan-pusat-layanan-teknis-di-surabaya

Islamiati, C., Sentosa, E., & Effendi, M. S. (2021). Pengaruh motivasi kerja, stress kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT. Puma Cat Indonesia. *Jurnal IKRA-ITH Ekonomika*, *4*, 164–171. https://doi.org/10.37817/ikraith-ekonomika.v4i2.1030

Jufrizen, J., & Lubis, A. A. (2025). Employee well-being and work-life balance on millennials employee performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Current Issues & Research*

in Social Sciences, Education and Management (CIRSSEM), *3*(2), 86–102. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4837-7451

Kotzé, T., & Mostert, P. (2025). A store-level analysis of frontline employees as enhancers of store loyalty. *Service Business*, *19*(3), 17–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-025-00589-z

Kristiana, I. F., Fajrianthi, F., & Purwono, U. (2018). Analisis rasch dalam utrecht work engagement scale-9 (UWES-9) versi bahasa indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *17*(2), 204. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.17.2.204-217

Margaretta, H., & Riana, I. G. (2020). Pengaruh stres kerja dan kepuasan kerja terhadap turnover intention karyawan PT. Fastrata Buana Denpasar. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, *9*(3), 1149–1169. https://doi.org/10.24843/EJMUNUD.2020.v09.i03.p17

Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta-analysis using the job demands-resources model. *Psychological Reports*, *126*(3), 1069–1107. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988

Mudita, V., & Prasetyo, H. (2023). The influence of work life balance, employee engagement, and career development on turnover intention of the millennial generation in The Special Region of Yogyakarta. *Indonesian Interdisciplinary Journal of Share Economics (IJSE)*, *8*(3), 11885–11898. https://doi.org/10.31538/iijse.v8i3.8032

Muslimawati, N. (2026, April 2). *Produsen AC asal China, Gree, bidik ekspansi produk baru di RI*. https://kumparan.com/kumparanbisnis/produsen-ac-asal-china-gree-bidik-ekspansi-produk-baru-di-ri-27FscB6WvQ8?utm

Namira, A., & Pramesti, M. (2025). What makes them stay? Important role of employee value proposition in retaining frontliner retail. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *10*(1), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.38043/jimb.v10i1.6092

Nanda, S., & Nio, S. R. (2025). Hubungan perceived organizational support dengan employee well-being pada karyawan PT. X. *CAUSALITA: Journal of Psychology*, *3*(1), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.62260/causalita.v3i1.414

Novitasari, D., & Guntarayana, I. (2016). Analisis SWOT penjualan dan pelayanan: Studi kasus pada sales promotion girl (SPG) M245 PT. Mayora Indah Tbk. Area Blitar. *Jurnal Media Akademika (JMA)*, *4*(7), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.62281/rc5x1m98

Nugroho, T. T., & Darmawati, A. (2018). Pengaruh kompensasi dan lingkungan kerja terhadap turnover intention pramuniaga PT Circle K Indonesia Utama cabang Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Manajemen*, *15*(2), 101–108. https://doi.org/10.21831/jim.v15i2.34761

Page, K. M., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2009). The "what", "why" and "how" of employee well-being: A new model. *Social Indicators Research*, *90*(3), 441–458. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-008-9270-3

Park, J., Yoo, W. S., & Rutherford, B. (2015). Sales people as emotional laborers: Psychological and behavioral outcomes. *Asia Marketing Journal, 16*(4), 39–57. http://dx.doi.org/10.15830/amj.2015.16.4.39

Pratama, A. H., Riyanto, D. W. U., & Kadharpa, E. (2023). The effect of personal selling and

advertising on purchasing decisions with brand awareness as an intervening variable. *Business Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship Journal (BIMANTARA)*, *2*(01), 32–43. https://doi.org/10.22219/bimantara.v2i01.27219

Rahmadani, H., Daud, I., Fahruna, Y., Rosnani, T., & Azazi, A. (2023). Work engagement as a mediator of transactional leadership and workload on employee turnover intention. *International Journal on Social Sciences, Economics and Arts*, *13*(3), 163–174. https://doi.org/10.35335/ijosea.v13i3.362

Rahmi, T., Agustiani, H., Harding, D., & Fitriana, E. (2021). Adaptasi Employee Well-Being Scale (EWBS) Versi Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *17*(2), 93–101. https://doi.org/10.24014/jp.v17i2.13112

Rakhy, K. S., & Ambily, A. S. (2022). Burnout risks among salespersons under job demand and the mediating role of abusive supervision. *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *26*(1), 26–28. https://doi.org/10.4103/ijoem.ijoem_249_21

Rois, R. Q., & Irta, A. Z. (2025). Pengaruh gratitude terhadap work engagement pada pegawai Balai Pemasyarakatan (BAPAS) kelas I Padang. *Indonesian Journal of Digital Business*, *5*(4), 1828–1841. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijdb.v5i4.96711

Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics*, *46*(2), 120–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008

Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *66*(4), 701–716. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471

Schepers, J., & Nijssen, E. J. (2018). Brand advocacy in the frontline: How does it affect customer satisfaction? *Journal of Service Management*, *29*(2), 230–252. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-07-2017-0165

Shavira, I. T., & Purwanto, P. (2025). Turnover karyawan. *Pediaqu: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *4*(2), 2798–2803. https://doi.org/10.35931/pediaqu.v4i2

Sia, S. P., Bullare, M. I., & Said, H. S. R. B. H. M. (2021). The role of tenure as a moderator to job satisfaction and work engagement. *GESJ: Education Science and Psychology*, *3*(60), 19–29. https://gesj.internet-academy.org.ge/en/search_en.php

Simanjuntak, F., Rivai, H. A., & Syahrul, L. (2024). The impact of new ways of working on employee well-being through engagement and job satisfaction. *Jurnal Manajemen Stratejik Dan Simulasi Bisnis*, *5*(2), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.25077/mssb.5.2.29-44.2024

Sitorus, H., & Primanita, R. Y. (2025). Hubungan antara employee well-being dengan work engagement pada pegawai pemerintah. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, *4*(1), 9214–9224. https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i1.8978

Sulistio, A., & Samuel, H. (2018). Pengaruh promotion mix terhadap brand awareness PT HM Sampoerna Tbk melalui produk terbaru Sampoerna A Platinum. *Jurnal Strategi Pemasaran*, *5*(1), 1–7. https://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/manajemen-pemasaran/article/view/7308

Top Brand Award. (2026). *Top Brand Index Beserta Kategori Lengkap*. https://topbrand-award.com/top-brand-index/?tbi_year=2026&category=elektronika

Triyanta, Y., & Jahani, J. (2025). Pengaruh employee well-being, family supportive supervisor, behavior dan job satisfaction terhadap work engagement. *Jurnal Ilmiah Muqoddimah: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik, Dan Humaniora*, *9*(4), 1944–1953. https://doi.org/10.31604/jim.v9i4.2025.1944-1953

Wibowo, U. D. A., Anggraini, R., Lekahena, F., Rizqia, A. G., Dewi, R. P., Wulandari, N. Y., Zulaika, G., & Sarie, F. (2025). *Dasar-dasar Psikologi*. Askara Sastra Media.

Widhiarso, W. (2014). *Pengategorian data dengan menggunakan statistik hipotetik dan statistik empirik*. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Gajah Mada.

Wulandari, A. T., Setiawan, T. A., & Azmy, A. (2026). Kepuasan kerja dan turnover tenaga penjualan: Tinjauan literatur. *Journal of Comprehensive Science*, *5*(1), 264–271. https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v5i1.3893

Yoo, W. S., Park, J., & Back, K.-J. (2025). Editorial: Analysing emotional labor in the service industries: Consumer and business perspectives, volume II. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16,* Article 1600934. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1600934

Zang, L., & Feng, Y. (2023). Relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement in Chinese kindergarten teachers: Vocational delay of gratification as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1114519

Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *36*(5), 621–644. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990