

DOI 10.18551/rjoas.2019-07.36

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE AND WORK LIFE BALANCE: THE EFFECT ON EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION THROUGH EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

**Suryanto Erwin, Syah Tantri Yanuar Rahmat*, Negoro Dimas Angga,
Pusaka Semerdanta**

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Esa Unggul, Indonesia

*E-mail: tantri.yanuar@esaunggul.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Leaders of any organization are expected to carry out tasks with limited resource to the maximum level in order to maintain the competitive edge and sustain profitability position of the organization. In other side, employees are looking for ways that will help them balance between work and personal life effectively. Successful organizations know that employee satisfaction, performance and employee engagement are crucial. The objective of this research is to analyze the impact of work life balance and transformational leadership style on employee satisfaction through employee engagement in Telco support Partner Company in Indonesia. The research used 150 field technicians as respondents. Data were analyzed using Lisrel-Structural Equation Model (SEM). The results showed that work live balance and the transformational leadership style influence the employee satisfaction.

KEY WORDS

Transformational leadership style, employee, satisfaction, employee engagement, work life balance.

Leadership in general may be defined as a process whereby leaders interact with their followers and influence the followers to achieve most desired organizational outcomes (Northouse, 2007). Leaders of any organization are expected to carry out tasks with limited resource to the maximum level in order to maintain the competitive edge and sustain profitability position of the organization (Riaz, A., & Haider, 2010). Leadership can thus be viewed as a process of influencing other people to act in ways that are in line with set organizational goals. Different styles of leadership have been identified in previous studies (Hirtz, P. D., Murray, S. L., & Riordan, 2007; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). The results of previous studies from different countries show that different styles of leadership do not have the same impact on job satisfaction (Stodgill, 1970).

One of the most prominent styles of leadership is Bass and Avolio's (1995) transactional and transformational styles of leadership (Bass, B., & Avolio, 1995) view transformational leadership as a kind of leadership that emphasizes on the followers' intrinsic satisfaction and personal growth. Transformational leaders seek to match followers' interests and needs with the most desired organizational outcomes and foster followers' commitment to the organization by inspiring them to go beyond their expected level of performance (B.M. Bass, 1998; Bernard M. & Bernard M., Riggio, 2006). In the context of this contemporary business environment which is highly complex and dynamic, transformational leaders are viewed as individuals who initiate change and inspire their followers during periods of environmental uncertainties. Since the early 1990s, transformational leadership style has been preferred over transactional leadership style (M. Bass & J. Avolio, 1990) because field technician demands leaders who inspire others with the vision of what can be accomplished (Efron, 2016).

Many changes in the workplaces and employee lives have created a challenge in balancing work life and personal life. This also leads to a complicated relationship between organization and its employees. Organizations are looking for better performance and productivity, whereas people are looking for enjoyment, pay, promotion and job satisfaction while maintaining their personal lives. The organization should apply work life balance

policies to achieve good results from their employees to have better performance and productive employees.

Interference between work and non-work responsibilities has a number of negative outcomes. In terms of job attitudes, employees reporting high levels of both work-to-life and life-to-work conflict tend to exhibit lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ernst Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Scandura & Lankau, 1997). Both work-to-life and life-to-work conflict have also been associated with increased stress and burnout (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998), cognitive difficulties such as staying awake, lack of concentration, and low alertness (Macewen & Barling, 1994), as well as reduced levels of general health and energy (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993). Beauregard & Henry (2009b) suggested that work life balance practices depend on attracting better applicants and reducing work-life conflict, hence, it enhances organizational performance. S. Fleetwood (2007) found that work life balance policies and practices reap benefits to the organization that can be measured financially, namely, increased productivity, lower absenteeism, reduced overheads, improved recruitment and retention.

Job satisfaction is how people feel about their job. It depends on the extent to which people are satisfied or dissatisfied with their job. Diaz-Serrano & Vieira (2005) identified that job satisfaction is an important predictor of overall well-being and employee intentions to quit. As a result, there is a relationship between job satisfaction and employee retention (Arthur, 2004). Job satisfaction is a positive outcome of work life balance (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000). Polzer-Debruyne (2007) suggested that when an employee perceives that his/her employer is supportive and is helpful in integrating family and work related issues, it results in a higher level of job satisfaction and organization commitment.

Engaged employee is also a satisfied employee; few people are willing to go the extra mile for their employer unless they are fundamentally happy in their jobs. However, it is certainly possible to have a satisfied employee with a low engagement level - someone who shows up to work and goes through the motions, but does not demonstrate a lot of initiative or put in a lot of extra effort to further the success of the organization. That's why focusing on satisfaction without addressing engagement is unlikely to foster the kind of exceptional workforce performance that drives business results (Swarnalatha & Prasanna, 2014).

The objective of this study is to find the impact of work life balance and transformational leadership style into employee satisfaction through employee engagement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership style is defined as the pattern of behaviors that leaders display during their work with and through others (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). Miller (2005) view leadership style as the pattern of interactions between leaders and subordinates. Leadership styles are not something to be tried on like so many suits, to see which fits. Rather, they should be adapted to the particular demands of the situation, the particular requirements of the people involved and the particular challenges facing the organization.

Bass M. & Avolio J. (1990) defined transformational leadership as the ability to motivate followers to perform beyond what he/she would normally expect. Bachtiar and Amar (2014) defined transformational leadership as a type of leadership that guides or motivates their followers in the direction of enforced goals by clarifying roles and task demands, and other researchers defined transformational leadership as the ability to motivate and to encourage intellectual stimulation through inspiration (Avolio Bruce, Weichun, William, & Puja, 2004).

Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration. It elevates the follower's level of maturity and ideals as well as concerns for achievement, self-actualization, and the well-being of others, the organization, and society (Bernard M. Bass, 1999). Idealized influence is exhibited when followers respect and trust their leaders and want to be like them, also the leader tends to put his/her followers' needs over their own. Inspirational motivation is when a leader acts in a way that causes

people around him/her to be motivated to work better, usually caused by the leader instilling a sense of meaning in the work for the follower. Individualized consideration is shown when a leader gives attention to each employee and is concerned with his/her individual needs. The leader is generally seen as a coach or a mentor. Intellectual stimulation is demonstrated when a leader asks questions to try and increase productivity and innovation.

Felstead et al. (2002) defines work-life balance as the relationship between the institutional and cultural times and spaces of work and non-work in societies where income is predominantly generated and distributed through lab. Aycan et al. (2008) confined the subject only with work and family and put forward the concept of "life balance" with a more whole perspective. Scholars defined life balance as fulfilling the demands satisfactorily in the three basic areas of life; namely, work, family and private. Work demands work hours, work intensity and proportion of working hours spent in work. Additional work hours subtract from home time, while high work intensity or work pressure may result in fatigue, anxiety or other adverse physiological consequences that affect the quality of home and family life (Aycan et al., 2008). She explores the interface between work and family at different types of institutions from the perspective of women faculty who are on the tenure track and who are mothers of young children. Such a perspective provides insight into institutional variation on academic life in general, and for new faculty as mothers, in particular. A macro-view of the findings points to two major concerns, namely, time (and lack thereof) and its impact on the ideal worker norms that shape what it means to be a good mother and good professor at different institutional types, as well as, the idea of 'choice' as an illusion.

Gibbons (2006) defined employee engagement as a heightened emotional and intellectual connection that an employee has for his/her job, organization, manager, or co-workers that in turn influences him/her to apply additional discretionary effort to his/her work. Hewitt and Associates (Associates, 2004) defined engagement as a measure of the energy and passion that employees have for their organizations. Engaged employees are individuals who take action to improve business results for their organizations.

The more highly engaged the employee, the more likely he or she will be to say positive things about the organization, thereby contributing to the development of a positive employer brand; want to remain within the organization, thereby minimizing turnover; and regularly exert a superior level of effort, thereby potentially influencing such variables as service quality, customer satisfaction, productivity, sales, and profitability, performance (Anindita & Emilia Seda, 2018).

The concept of Job Satisfaction was widely discussed by various researchers. The most popular definition was provided by Locke (1976), where Job Satisfaction is simply a positive emotional state of feeling resulted from jobs, thus fulfill individuals' value towards their jobs. This definition further suggests that job satisfaction contains an affective component (emotional state) and cognitive component (appraisal) of Job Satisfaction (Organ, D. W., & Kovovsky, 1989). Affective Job Satisfaction states the individual's immediate feeling state towards job-related factors. It is the extent of pleasurable emotional feelings individuals have about their jobs overall. The positive emotional of feeling may include feeling good about the job individual being delegated, and the particular feeling is experienced from their appraised work performance, recognized professions, and even completion of work task (Megginson, Mosley, & Paul H. Pietri, 1983).

According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2014), job satisfaction is an effectiveness or an emotional response to various aspects of work. Davis (1993) describes job satisfaction as a set of employee feelings about whether or not their work is fun. Job satisfaction can be measured by the employment dimensions: salary, opportunity for promotion, supervision and co-workers (Munadar, Smith, Kendall and Hulin, 2004).

HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

It is very important for an employee to feel engaged. An engaged employee, who feels valued at work, feels that the game is fair, tends to be more productive (more output for less input) than the rest. A happy and engaged employee might be able to deliver more in less

time and successfully achieve a work-life balance. As per experts, sense of achievement is as important as sense of enjoyment. Some days one achieves more, while on other days one enjoys more. Striking a balance between the two helps employees excel professionally as well as personally. But how does one strike this balance? The person most responsible for this is the employee himself; however, the employer can also play a key role in ensuring both are achieved at acceptable levels. Companies must find ways to keep employees happy while they are working and get enough time for family, friends and recreation. Work-life balance is not the allocation of time equally among work, family and personal demands. In literature, it is also emphasized that work-life balance is a subjective phenomenon that changes from person to person. In this regard, work-life balance should be regarded as allocating the available resources like time, thought and labor wisely among the elements of life. While some adopt the philosophy of 'working to live' and see work as the objective, others consider "living to work" and situate work into the centre of life. Employees who perceive a balance between their work and private lives are likely to experience positive emotions and attitudes such as engagement (Beauregard & Henry, 2009a). The results of a study by Richman, Civian, Shannon, Hill, and Brennan (2008) have revealed that supportive work-life policies and perceived flexibility are positively related to employee engagement. In addition, a study by Sonnentag (2003) has suggested that recovery, which can be seen as a part of work-life balance, can contribute to employees' work engagement.

From the above argument, the researcher proposed the hypothesis:

H₁: Good Work Life Balance will increase employee engagement.

Zhang (2010) conducted a study on the relationship between perceived leadership style and employee engagement among 439 sales assistants in Sydney Australia. The results showed that employee engagement is associated with an employees' perception of leadership style in his or her direct supervisor, negatively when classical or transactional leadership styles are perceived and positively in the case of visionary or organic leadership. More over three employee characteristics moderated the relationship between the perceived leadership style and employee engagement in different ways. Chung, et.al (2009) also conducted a study on Taiwanese hotel industry and found that the leaders in this industry exercised transformational leadership with employees believing that their managers emphasized high quality performance.

Bakker and Schaufeli (2008) found that employees who have positive interactions with their managers have increased levels of engagement. Additionally, Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang, and Lawler ((2005) found that using a transformational leadership style leads to increased organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and still Cartwright and Holmes (2006) found that leaders who focus on relationship building and trust development increase engagement levels. Transformational leaders are not viewed as a power figure but as mutual support for a common purpose, the collective good of an organization. From this perspective, transformational leaders have the capacity to directly impact the engagement levels of their employees (Nohria, Groysberg, & Lee, 2008) and are able to meet the human and work needs of their employees, a dividend of a very unique and empowering style.

From the above argument, the researcher proposed the hypothesis:

H₂: Good Transformational Leadership style will increase employee engagement.

Vorina et al. (2017) confirm that the relationship between employee engagement and job satisfaction is positive and statistically significant. Kim-Soon & Manikayasagam (2015) found that through providing employee engagement opportunities, a company will improve employee job satisfaction. Engaged employee leads to higher job satisfaction.

From the above argument, the researcher proposed the hypothesis:

H₃: Good employee engagement will increase employee job satisfaction.

Organizational commitment and job satisfaction are important attitudes in assessing employees' intention to quit and the overall contribution of the employee to the organization (Lok, P., & Crawford, 2004). Job satisfaction is influenced by many organizational contextual factors, ranging from salaries, job autonomy, job security, workplace flexibility, to leadership. In Sectionicular, leaders within organizations can adopt appropriate leadership styles to affect employee job satisfaction, commitment and productivity. Employee job satisfaction

refers to the attitude of employees towards their jobs and the organization which employs them (Voon, M. L., & Ayob, 2011).

Attaining employees' job satisfaction is crucial to retain productive and efficient employees. Therefore, one of the ways that may be effective help managers in increasing the satisfaction among their followers is employing the right leadership style. An effective leader is one that command respect and trust by their followers. Sang Long, et.al (2014) found that only one of the four transformational leadership characteristics have significant relationship with job satisfaction. Characteristic of *individualized consideration* is found to be contributed most in job satisfaction.

From the above argument, the researcher proposed the hypothesis:

H₄: Good Transformational Leadership style will increase employee job satisfaction.

Saif et al.(2011) conducted research in Pakistan to analyze relationship work life balance practices have with job satisfaction. The results reveal that work life balance practices and level of job satisfaction share a Positive relationship. Rani et al. (2011) conducted the study to evaluate the relationship between work life balance and employees satisfaction. Results indicated job satisfaction have positive relationship with work life balance and negative relationship with work recognition, relationship with subordinate & supervisor and task at work.

Varatharaj&Vasanth (2012) conducted the study to examine relationship job satisfaction have with work life balance in women. Result shows strong positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and work life balance.

From the above argument, the researcher proposed the hypothesis:

H₅: Good Work Life Balance will increase employee job satisfaction.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This research was conducted on the field technician of Telco Support partner in Indonesia. The aspects studied were transformational leadership style, work life balance, employee engagement, and job satisfaction. The study was conducted in August 2018 by survey method. This research is descriptive and collected using questionnaire.

Data analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with total 150 respondents and with four variables; transformational leadership style, work life balance, employee engagement, and job satisfaction. The data has been collected and then experienced Likert scale measurement with a scale of one to five (Sugiyono, 2012). The results of the analysis were then interpreted and the final step was to conclude and give a suggestion.

In this research, there were three independent variables, i.e. transformational leadership style, work life balance, employee engagement and one dependent variable, i.e. employee satisfaction. Measurement of transformational leadership style variable used the theory of Avolio and Bass (2004), the measurement of work life balance used *Psychometric Assessment of an Instrument Designed to Measure Work Life Balance by Jeremy Hayman* (2005), measurement of employee engagement variable used Work and Well-Being Survey (UWES-9) reported by Schaufeli, Bakker, and Salanova (2006) and the measurement of job satisfaction variable used *Psychometric Assessment by Corner and others* (2003).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The testing result of first hypothesis (H₁) found that the result of analysis supported H₂ hypothesis that good work life balance will increase employee engagement of 3.87. It's confirm the results of Sonnentag (2003); Richman, Civian, Shannon, Hill, and Brennan (2008) that work live balance contribute to employee engagement.

The result of the second hypothesis testing (H₂) found that the result of analysis supported H₂ hypothesis that good transformational leadership style will increase employee engagement which was equal to 2.65. The results of this study affirmed the results of Bakker and Schaufeli (2008); Lawler ((2005);Cartwright and Holmes (2006); Nohria, et al. (2008) that transformational leadership style impacts the engagement levels.

Table 1 – Hypotheses testing results

<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Hypothesis statement</i>	<i>T-Value</i>	<i>Details</i>
H ₁	Good Work Life Balance will increase employee engagement	3.87	Data support hypothesis
H ₂	Good transformational leadership style will increase employee engagement.	2.65	Data support hypothesis
H ₃	Good employee engagement will increase job satisfaction.	6.4	Data support hypothesis
H ₄	Good transformational leadership style will increase employee job satisfaction.	6.78	Data support hypothesis
H ₅	Good Work Life Balance will increase employee job satisfaction	2.65	Data support hypothesis

The result of the third hypothesis testing (H₃) found that the result of analysis supported H₃ hypothesis that good employee engagement will increase employee job satisfaction of 6.4. The results of this study affirmed the results of Vorina et al. (2017); Kim-Soon & Manikayasagam (2015) that engaged employee leads to higher job satisfaction.

The result of the fourth hypothesis testing (H₄) found that the result of analysis supported H₄ hypothesis that good transformational leadership style will increase employee job satisfaction of 6.78. The results of this study affirmed the results of (Lok, P., & Crawford, 2004); Voon, et al. (2011); Sang Long, et.al (2014) that transformational leadership style have significant relationship with job satisfaction.

The result of the fifth hypothesis testing (H₅) found that the result of analysis supported H₅ hypothesis that more work life balance will increase employee job satisfaction of 2.65. The results of this study affirmed the results of Saif et al.(2011);Rani et al.(2011); Varatharaj & Vasantha (2012) that strong positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and work life balance.

Based on variable analysis, the result of hypothesis testing showed that employee engagement mediated work live balance with employee satisfaction, and mediated transformational leadership style with employee satisfaction in both direct and indirect ways. It can be said that employee engagement act as partial mediation.

CONCLUSION

The results that can be concluded from this research: (1) there is an influence of leadership style on employee engagement, it can be said that good transformational leadership style will increase employee engagement; (2) there is an influence of work life balance on employee engagement, it can be said that good work life balance will increase employee engagement; (3) there is an influence of employee engagement on employee job satisfaction, engaged employee leads to higher job satisfaction; (4) there is an influence of work transformational leadership style on employee job satisfaction, it can be said that good transformational leadership style will increase employee job satisfaction; (5) There is an influence of work life balance on employee job satisfaction, it can be said that good work life balance will increase employee job satisfaction.

In this research there are several limitations: (1) this study was conducted at a company with have several branches around Indonesia and have homogeneous business line; (2) the object of this research came from several big cities with different culture that influencing in fulfilling questionnaire; (3) this study not use all dimensions in each variable.

Variables for model development can be add to find another perspective that affect employee job satisfaction through employee engagement. Research object could be taking from several companies with different business line to make it more universal.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes.

- Journal of Management, 28(6), 787–810.
2. Anindita, R., & Emilia Seda, A. (2018). How employee engagement mediates the influence of individual factors toward organizational commitment. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(1), 276–283.
 3. Arthur, A. R. (2004). Work-related stress, the blind men and the elephant. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 32(2), 157–170.
 4. Associates, H. (2004). "What makes a best employer?," Insights and Findings from Hewitt's Global Best Employer's Study. Hewitt Associates, Pp. 1-28.
 5. Avolio Bruce, Weichun, Z. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951–968.
 6. Aycan, Z. (2008). Cross-cultural approaches to work-family conflict. *Handbook of Work-Family Integration*, 353–370.
 7. Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 827-832.
 8. Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire technical report. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
 9. Bass, B. M. (1998). Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact.
 10. Bass, B. M. (1999). Two Decades of Research and Development in Transformational Leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9–32.
 11. Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009a). Human Resource Management Review Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19, 9–22.
 12. Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009b). Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 19(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.09.001>
 13. Bernard M, B., & Bernard M, Riggio, X. (2006). Transformational leadership (2nd ed.). Transformational Leadership (2nd Ed.).
 14. Cartwright, S., & Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 199-208.
 15. DeVaney, S. A., & Chen, Z. (Sandy). (2003). Job Satisfaction of Recent Graduates in Financial Services. *Compensation & Working Conditions*.
 16. Diaz-Serrano, L., & Vieira, J. A. C. (2005). Low-pay higher pay and job satisfaction within the European Union empirical evidence from fourteen countries. *IZA Discussion Paper No. 1558*, 1–25.
 17. Efron, L. (2016). How Transformational Leadership Saved This Company: Ceridian's Story.
 18. Ernst Kossek, E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139–149.
 19. Felstead, Gallie, & Green. (2002). Work Skills in Britain 1986-2001, 162.
 20. Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1993). Relationship of work-family conflict, gender, and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(6), 545–558.
 21. Gibbons, J. (2006). Employee Engagement: A Review of Current Research and Its Implications. The Conference Board, New York, NY, Pp. 1-21.
 22. Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. E. (1996). Management of Organizational: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood PrenticeHall Inc, 1–627.
 23. Hirtz, P. D., Murray, S. L., & Riordan, C. A. (2007). The effects of leadership on quality. *Engineering Management Journal*, 19(1).
 24. House, R. J. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). Culture, Leadership, and Organizations. The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Beverly Hills, CL: Sage Publications Inc.

25. Jeremy Hayman. (2005). Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work life balance. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 85-91.
26. Kim-Soon, N., & Manikayasagam, G. (2015). Employee engagement and job satisfaction.
27. Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among employed women and men in Finland. *Human Relations*, 51(2), 157–177.
28. Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership on job satisfaction and organizational commitment A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23 (4), 321-338.
29. Bass M., Avolio B. (1990). *Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture*.
30. Macewen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1994). Daily consequences of work interference with family and family interference with work. *Work and Stress*, 8(3), 244–254.
31. Miller, S. (2005). Men working differently: Accessing their inner-feminine. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 18(6), 612–626.
32. Nohria, N., Groysberg, B., & Lee, L.-E. (2008). A Powerful New Model. *Harvard Business Review*, (July-August), 1–7.
33. Northouse, P. (2007). *Leadership, Theory and practice*. Development (Vol. 134). Sage, Thousand Oaks, C.A.
34. Polzer-debruyne, A. (2007). The organizational pay-offs for perceived work–life balance support Stewart Forsyth*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 45(1), 113–123.
35. Rani, S., Kamalanabhan, & Selvarani. (2011). Work / Life Balance Reflections On Employee Satisfaction. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 6(1), 85-96.
36. Riaz, A., & Haider, M. H. (2010). Role of Transformational and Transactional leadership on job satisfaction and Career satisfaction. *Business Economic Horizontal*, 1, 29–38.
37. Richman, A. L., Civian, J. T., Shannon, L. L., Jeffrey Hill, E., & Brennan, R. T. (2008). The relationship of perceived flexibility, supportive work–life policies, and use of formal flexible arrangements and occasional flexibility to employee engagement and expected retention. *Community, work and family*.
38. S. Fleetwood. (2007). Rethinking Work-Life Balance: Editor’s introduction. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(3), 351–359.
39. Saif, D. M., Malik, M. I., Awan, M. Z. (2011). Employee Work Satisfaction and Work - Life Balance: A Pakistani Perspective. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 3(5), 606- 617.
40. Sang Long, C. (2014). The impact of transformational leadership style on job satisfaction. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 29, 117–124.
41. Scandura, T. A., & Lankau, M. (1997). Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(4), 377–391.
42. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakke, A. B. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66, 701–716.
43. Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
44. Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Well-being at work: A cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29(6), 517–538.
45. Stodgill, R. (1970). *Introduction: The student and model-building, The Process of Model Building in the Behavioral Sciences*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company.
46. Swarnalatha, C., & Prasanna, T. S. (2014). Employee Engagement and Job Satisfaction. *Ijsr -International Journal of Scientific Research*, 3(5), 339–340.
47. Tsai, Y., Wu, S. W., & Chung, H. J. (2009). The Exploration of Relationship between Organizational Culture and Style of Leadership. *Proceedings of the 2009 6th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management, ICSSSM '09*, 585–590.
48. V.Varatharaj, &Vasantha, S. (2012). Work Life Balances A Source Of Job Satisfaction - An Exploratory Study On The View Of Women Employees In The Service Sector.

- International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(3), 450- 458.
49. Veithzal, R. et al. (2014). *Pemimpin dan Kepemimpinan dalam Organisasi*. Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.
 50. Voon, M. L., & Ayob, M. C. (2011). The influence of leadership styles on employees' job satisfaction in public sector organization in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Management & Social Sciences*, 2 (1), 24-32.
 51. Vorina, A., Simonič, M., & Vlasova, M. (2017). An Analysis of the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement. *Economic Themes*, 55.
 52. Walumbwa, F. O., Orwa, B., Wang, P., & Lawler, J. J. (2005). Transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: A comparative study of Kenyan and U.S. financial firms. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 16, 235-256.
 53. Zhang, T. (2010). The relationship between perceived leadership styles and employee engagement: The moderating role of employee characteristics. 2010, 1–285.