DOI: https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v9i1

EDUMASPUL
JURNAL PENDIDIKAN

Vol 10 No. 01 (2026) page 107-119

p-ISSN 2548-8201 | e-ISSN 236-0469
https://ummaspul.e-journal.id/maspuljr/

The Effect of Work–Life Integration and Work Initiative on Elementary School Teachers' Performance with Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable

Fahriansyah[1], Romi Siswanto[2], Kadarisman[3], Mudayat[4]
[1-4]Universitas Terbuka
Corresponding email: fahriansyah@ecampus.ut.ac.id[1], romi.siswanto@ecampus.ut.ac.id[2], kadarisman@ecampus.ut.ac.id[3], mudayat@ecampus.ut.ac.id[4]

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the effect of Work–Life Integration (WLI) and work initiative on the performance of elementary school teachers, with job satisfaction serving as a mediating variable. Employing an explanatory quantitative approach, the study used a survey method involving 240 elementary school teachers in West Kalimantan. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed through Structural Equation Modeling using PLS-SEM (version 4). The results indicate that WLI has a positive and significant effect on job satisfaction but does not have a significant direct effect on teachers' performance. In contrast, work initiative exerts a positive and significant effect on both job satisfaction and teachers' performance. Furthermore, job satisfaction is found to have a positive and significant effect on teachers' performance, fully mediating the relationship between WLI and performance and partially mediating the relationship between work initiative and performance. These findings strengthen Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Herzberg's Motivation Theory, and Human Capital Theory. From a practical perspective, the study highlights that improving teachers' performance requires supportive school policies that foster healthy work–life integration and promote a sustainable culture of work initiative.

Keywords: Work–Life Integration, Work Initiative, Job Satisfaction, Teachers' Performance, SEM-PLS

Abstrak: *Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh Work-Life Integration (WLI) dan inisiatif kerja terhadap kinerja guru Sekolah Dasar dengan kepuasan kerja sebagai variabel mediasi. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif eksplanatori dengan metode survei terhadap 240 guru Sekolah Dasar di Kalimantan Barat. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner skala Likert lima poin dan dianalisis menggunakan Structural Equation Modeling berbasis Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS versi 4). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa WLI berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kepuasan kerja, namun tidak berpengaruh signifikan secara langsung terhadap kinerja guru. Sebaliknya, inisiatif kerja berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kepuasan kerja dan kinerja guru. Selain itu, kepuasan kerja terbukti berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap kinerja guru, serta memediasi secara penuh hubungan antara WLI dan kinerja guru dan memediasi secara parsial hubungan antara inisiatif kerja dan kinerja guru. Temuan ini memperkuat Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Herzberg's Motivation Theory, dan Human Capital Theory. Secara praktis, hasil penelitian menegaskan bahwa peningkatan kinerja guru memerlukan dukungan kebijakan sekolah dalam menciptakan integrasi kerja-kehidupan yang sehat serta mendorong budaya inisiatif kerja yang berkelanjutan.*

Kata Kunci: *Work-Life Integration, Inisiatif Kerja, Kepuasan Kerja, Kinerja Guru, SEM-PLS*

Introduction

The transformation of work paradigms in the digital era has significantly reshaped teachers' professional roles, particularly in managing the boundaries between work and personal life. The concept of Work–Life Integration (WLI) has emerged as an alternative to the traditional notion of work–life balance by emphasizing flexibility and the integration of work and family roles in daily life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). However, recent studies indicate that poorly managed integration may increase the risk of burnout and reduce psychological well-being (Wepfer et al., 2017). Kossek and Ruderman (2022) define Work–Life Integration as an approach that seeks to harmonize work and personal roles through flexibility and organizational support, making it highly relevant in contemporary educational settings.

In the context of elementary school teachers, WLI is particularly important because their responsibilities extend beyond classroom instruction to include student guidance, administrative duties, and ongoing interaction with parents. Empirical evidence from China shows that WLI positively influences teachers' performance, especially when schools provide a supportive work environment (Li, 2025). At the same time, the increasing use of digital technologies has blurred work–family boundaries. Mobile devices, for instance, can intensify boundary permeability, requiring teachers to adopt effective self-management strategies to prevent role overload (Choroszewicz & Kay, 2019; Mellner et al., 2021). These conditions highlight the need to examine how WLI operates within the teaching profession, particularly in developing regional contexts.

Beyond work–life considerations, work initiative often conceptualized as proactive work behavior plays a crucial role in shaping teachers' performance. Proactive individuals tend to identify opportunities, anticipate challenges, and implement solutions without waiting for formal instructions (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Recent studies demonstrate that proactive behavior fosters innovation in the education sector (Feng, 2025), while proactive motivation is closely associated with the achievement of professional goals (Kai et al., 2022). Therefore, the interaction between WLI and work initiative is expected to contribute not only to higher job satisfaction but also to improved teachers' performance in the digital era.

Job satisfaction remains a fundamental issue in educational management and serves as a key psychological mechanism linking working conditions to performance outcomes. Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory posits that job satisfaction is influenced by motivator factors such as achievement, recognition, and responsibility (Herzberg, 1966). Empirical findings indicate that job satisfaction is closely related to emotional well-being and leadership effectiveness in schools (Suleman et al., 2020). Furthermore, longitudinal research shows that job satisfaction and work–life integration are strongly associated with burnout across various sectors, including education (Shanafelt et al., 2025). These findings suggest that job satisfaction may function as a mediating variable in the relationship between WLI, work initiative, and teachers' performance.

From the perspective of Human Capital Theory, improvements in teachers' quality through enhanced job satisfaction and proactive behavior are expected to generate broader gains in educational performance (Becker, 1993). Despite the growing body of literature on WLI, proactive behavior, and job satisfaction, empirical studies that integrate these variables within a single explanatory framework particularly in the context of elementary school teachers in Indonesia remain limited. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the effects of Work–Life Integration and work initiative on elementary school teachers' performance, with job satisfaction serving as a mediating variable. By integrating Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, and Human Capital Theory, this research is expected to contribute theoretically to the sustainability and education management literature and practically to the formulation of school and local government policies that support flexible work environments, proactive capacity building, and teacher well-being.

Literature Review

Work–Life Integration and Teachers' Performance

Work–Life Integration (WLI) has gained increasing attention as an extension of

the traditional work–life balance concept, particularly in occupations characterized by high emotional and cognitive demands such as teaching. Unlike work–life balance, which emphasizes separation between work and personal roles, WLI focuses on flexibility and the integration of these roles in everyday life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Nevertheless, empirical studies caution that unmanaged integration may intensify role overlap, increasing the likelihood of emotional exhaustion and reduced psychological well-being (Wepfer et al., 2017). Kossek and Ruderman (2022) further conceptualize WLI as a dynamic process supported by organizational policies that enable individuals to align work and non-work responsibilities harmoniously.

For elementary school teachers, WLI is particularly salient because professional responsibilities often extend beyond formal working hours to include lesson preparation, administrative tasks, and communication with parents. Previous research demonstrates that effective WLI can enhance teachers' performance when supported by a conducive school environment (Li, 2025). However, the proliferation of digital technologies has blurred work–family boundaries, increasing boundary permeability and role demands (Choroszewicz & Kay, 2019; Mellner et al., 2021). These findings suggest that while WLI has the potential to improve performance, its outcomes are highly contingent on individual and organizational conditions.

Previous studies further indicate that organizational support and flexible work arrangements play a critical role in fostering sustainable work–life integration and enhancing employee well-being (Grady & McCarthy, 2008; Masterson et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2025). In educational contexts, boundary flexibility and institutional support have also been shown to promote work–family enrichment and positive job-related outcomes among teachers (Peng et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021).

Work Initiative and Teachers' Performance

Work initiative, commonly associated with proactive work behavior, refers to self-starting and future-oriented actions aimed at improving work processes and outcomes (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Employees with high levels of initiative tend to anticipate problems, seek opportunities, and implement changes without external prompts. In educational settings, proactive behavior has been shown to stimulate innovation and adaptive teaching practices (Feng, 2025). Similarly, proactive motivation has been linked to stronger professional goal attainment and career development among educators (Kai et al., 2022).

Within the teaching profession, work initiative is increasingly recognized as a critical driver of performance, particularly in dynamic and technology-mediated learning environments. Teachers who demonstrate initiative are more likely to adapt instructional strategies, engage students effectively, and respond constructively to institutional changes. Consequently, work initiative is expected to exert a direct influence on teachers' performance and an indirect influence through psychological outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable

Job satisfaction represents an essential psychological state reflecting individuals' evaluations of their work experiences. According to Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, job satisfaction is primarily driven by motivator factors, including achievement, recognition, and responsibility (Herzberg, 1966). In educational contexts, job satisfaction has been consistently associated with teachers' emotional well-being, commitment, and performance effectiveness (Suleman et al., 2020). Moreover, longitudinal evidence indicates that both job satisfaction and work–life integration are closely related to burnout and long-term occupational sustainability (Shanafelt et al., 2025).

These empirical findings imply that job satisfaction may serve as an important mediating mechanism linking WLI and work initiative to teachers' performance. Teachers who experience effective work–life integration and are encouraged to take initiative are more likely to feel satisfied with their jobs, which in turn enhances their performance outcomes.

Theoretical Integration and Research Gap

From the perspective of Human Capital Theory, investments in teachers' well-being and proactive capabilities contribute to improved educational performance and institutional effectiveness (Becker, 1993). Integrating Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, and

Human Capital Theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how WLI and work initiative influence teachers' performance through job satisfaction.

Despite the growing literature on these constructs, empirical studies that simultaneously examine Work–Life Integration, work initiative, and job satisfaction within a unified explanatory model particularly among elementary school teachers in Indonesia—remain scarce. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the direct and indirect effects of WLI and work initiative on teachers' performance, positioning job satisfaction as a mediating variable to offer both theoretical enrichment and practical insights for education management.

Method

Work–Life Integration and Teachers' Performance

Work–Life Integration (WLI) has gained increasing attention as an extension of the traditional work–life balance concept, particularly in occupations characterized by high emotional and cognitive demands such as teaching. Unlike work–life balance, which emphasizes separation between work and personal roles, WLI focuses on flexibility and the integration of these roles in everyday life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Nevertheless, empirical studies caution that unmanaged integration may intensify role overlap, increasing the likelihood of emotional exhaustion and reduced psychological well-being (Wepfer et al., 2017). Kossek and Ruderman (2022) further conceptualize WLI as a dynamic process supported by organizational policies that enable individuals to align work and non-work responsibilities harmoniously.

For elementary school teachers, WLI is particularly salient because professional responsibilities often extend beyond formal working hours to include lesson preparation, administrative tasks, and communication with parents. Previous research demonstrates that effective WLI can enhance teachers' performance when supported by a conducive school environment (Li, 2025). However, the proliferation of digital technologies has blurred work–family boundaries, increasing boundary permeability and role demands (Choroszewicz & Kay, 2019; Mellner et al., 2021). These findings suggest that while WLI has the potential to improve performance, its outcomes are highly contingent on individual and organizational conditions.

Previous studies further indicate that organizational support and flexible work arrangements play a critical role in fostering sustainable work–life integration and enhancing employee well-being (Grady & McCarthy, 2008; Masterson et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2025). In educational contexts, boundary flexibility and institutional support have also been shown to promote work–family enrichment and positive job-related outcomes among teachers (Peng et al., 2022; Li et al., 2021).

Work Initiative and Teachers' Performance

Work initiative, commonly associated with proactive work behavior, refers to self-starting and future-oriented actions aimed at improving work processes and outcomes (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Employees with high levels of initiative tend to anticipate problems, seek opportunities, and implement changes without external prompts. In educational settings, proactive behavior has been shown to stimulate innovation and adaptive teaching practices (Feng, 2025). Similarly, proactive motivation has been linked to stronger professional goal attainment and career development among educators (Kai et al., 2022).

Within the teaching profession, work initiative is increasingly recognized as a critical driver of performance, particularly in dynamic and technology-mediated learning environments. Teachers who demonstrate initiative are more likely to adapt instructional strategies, engage students effectively, and respond constructively to institutional changes. Consequently, work initiative is expected to exert a direct influence on teachers' performance and an indirect influence through psychological outcomes such as job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable

Job satisfaction represents an essential psychological state reflecting individuals' evaluations of their work experiences. According to Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, job satisfaction is primarily driven by motivator factors, including achievement, recognition, and responsibility (Herzberg, 1966). In educational contexts, job satisfaction

has been consistently associated with teachers' emotional well-being, commitment, and performance effectiveness (Suleman et al., 2020). Moreover, longitudinal evidence indicates that both job satisfaction and work–life integration are closely related to burnout and long-term occupational sustainability (Shanafelt et al., 2025).

These empirical findings imply that job satisfaction may serve as an important mediating mechanism linking WLI and work initiative to teachers' performance. Teachers who experience effective work–life integration and are encouraged to take initiative are more likely to feel satisfied with their jobs, which in turn enhances their performance outcomes.

Theoretical Integration and Research Gap

From the perspective of Human Capital Theory, investments in teachers' well-being and proactive capabilities contribute to improved educational performance and institutional effectiveness (Becker, 1993). Integrating Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Herzberg's Motivation–Hygiene Theory, and Human Capital Theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how WLI and work initiative influence teachers' performance through job satisfaction.

Despite the growing literature on these constructs, empirical studies that simultaneously examine Work–Life Integration, work initiative, and job satisfaction within a unified explanatory model particularly among elementary school teachers in Indonesia—remain scarce. Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the direct and indirect effects of WLI and work initiative on teachers' performance, positioning job satisfaction as a mediating variable to offer both theoretical enrichment and practical insights for education management.

Result and Discussion

Descriptive Statistics

This study involved 240 elementary school teachers in West Kalimantan. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire comprising four main variables: Work–Life Integration (X1), Work Initiative (X2), Job Satisfaction (Z), and Teachers' Performance (Y). Descriptive analysis was conducted to provide an overview of respondents' perceptions of each construct prior to model evaluation.

Measurement Model Evaluation (Outer Model)

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was assessed using outer loadings, Cronbach's Alpha, Composite Reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).

Table 1. Outer Loadings Matrix

Indicator	X1 (Work–Life Integration)	X2 (Work Initiative)	Y (Teachers' Performance)	Z (Job Satisfaction)
X1.1	0.907	–	–	–
X1.2	0.922	–	–	–
X1.3	0.870	–	–	–
X1.4	0.820	–	–	–
X1.5	0.877	–	–	–
X2.1	–	0.830	–	–
X2.2	–	0.857	–	–
X2.3	–	0.845	–	–
X2.4	–	0.879	–	–
X2.5	–	0.864	–	–
Y1.1	–	–	0.914	–
Y1.2	–	–	0.887	–
Y1.3	–	–	0.928	–
Y1.4	–	–	0.878	–

Y1.5	–	–	0.914	–
Y1.6	–	–	0.925	–
Z1.1	–	–	–	0.867
Z1.2	–	–	–	0.930
Z1.3	–	–	–	0.924
Z1.4	–	–	–	0.925
Z1.5	–	–	–	0.916
Z1.6	–	–	–	0.905

Based on Table 1, all indicators of Work–Life Integration (X1), Work Initiative (X2), Teachers' Performance (Y), and Job Satisfaction (Z) show outer loading values greater than 0.70. These results indicate that all indicators are valid and meet the criteria for convergent validity (Hair et al., 2019), confirming that each indicator adequately represents its respective construct.

Table 2. Construct Reliability and Validity Overview

Variabel	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (rho_A)	Composite Reliability (rho_C)	Average Variance Extracted (AVE)
X1 (Work–Life Integration)	0.927	0.930	0.945	0.774
X2 (Work Initiative)	0.908	0.910	0.931	0.731
Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.957	0.958	0.966	0.824
Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.959	0.960	0.967	0.830

As shown in Table 4.2, all constructs demonstrate Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values exceeding 0.70, indicating excellent internal consistency (Hair et al., 2019). Furthermore, AVE values for all constructs are greater than 0.50, meaning that each construct explains more than 50% of the variance in its indicators. Therefore, the measurement instruments used in this study are both reliable and valid.

Discriminant Validity
Fornell–Larcker Criterion
Validitas diskriminan diuji dengan:

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Fornell Larcker Criterion

Variable	X1 (Work–Life Integration)	X2 (Work Initiative)	Y (Teachers' Performance)	Z (Job Satisfaction)
X1 (Work–Life Integration)	**0.880**			
X2 (Work Initiative)	0.813	**0.855**		
Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.842	0.866	**0.908**	
Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.860	0.814	0.894	**0.911**

The Fornell–Larcker results indicate that the square root of AVE for each construct (bold

diagonal values) is higher than its correlations with other constructs. Specifically:

1. Work–Life Integration (X1) has a square root of AVE of 0.880, exceeding its correlations with X2, Y, and Z.
2. Work Initiative (X2) shows a value of 0.855, higher than its correlations with X1, Y, and Z.
3. Teachers' Performance (Y) records a value of 0.908, surpassing its correlations with X1, X2, and Z.
4. Job Satisfaction (Z) demonstrates a value of 0.911, higher than its correlations with X1, X2, and Y.

These findings confirm that all constructs satisfy discriminant validity requirements.

Cross Loadings

Table 4. Discriminant Validity Cross Loadings

Indicator	X1	X2	Y	Z
X1.1	0.907	0.716	0.768	0.774
X1.2	0.922	0.766	0.816	0.822
X1.3	0.870	0.668	0.704	0.704
X1.4	0.820	0.686	0.692	0.725
X1.5	0.877	0.735	0.715	0.750
X2.1	0.708	0.83	0.692	0.658
X2.2	0.697	0.857	0.681	0.658
X2.3	0.677	0.845	0.723	0.691
X2.4	0.709	0.879	0.80	0.730
X2.5	0.685	0.864	0.793	0.734
Y1.1	0.762	0.787	0.914	0.809
Y1.2	0.711	0.746	0.887	0.782
Y1.3	0.776	0.770	0.928	0.847
Y1.4	0.797	0.820	0.878	0.759
Y1.5	0.765	0.787	0.914	0.843
Y1.6	0.773	0.804	0.925	0.829
Z1.1	0.752	0.708	0.760	0.867
Z1.2	0.812	0.767	0.844	0.930
Z1.3	0.777	0.730	0.811	0.924
Z1.4	0.812	0.744	0.815	0.925
Z1.5	0.784	0.760	0.849	0.916
Z1.6	0.761	0.737	0.808	0.905

Overall, the cross-loading results show that each indicator loads highest on its intended construct compared to other constructs, with values ≥ 0.70. This demonstrates clear construct differentiation. Although HTMT was not directly calculated, reference to Henseler et al. (2015) provides theoretical support that the discriminant validity assessment applied in this study aligns with current PLS-SEM methodological standards. Accordingly, the measurement model exhibits strong discriminant validity and is suitable for structural model testing.

Multicollinearity Test (VIF)

Table 5. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) Outer Model

Variable	Indicator	VIF	Cut-off Value	Remarks
Work–Life Integration (X1)	X1.1	3.997	≤ 5	Safe
	X1.2	4.492	≤ 5	Safe
	X1.3	3.062	≤ 5	Safe
	X1.4	2.310	≤ 5	Safe
	X1.5	2.967	≤ 5	Safe
Work Initiative (X2)	X2.1	2.485	≤ 5	Safe
	X2.2	2.818	≤ 5	Safe
	X2.3	2.361	≤ 5	Safe
	X2.4	3.074	≤ 5	Safe
	X2.5	2.844	≤ 5	Safe
Teachers' Performance (Y)	Y1.1	4.869	≤ 5	Safe (near threshold)
	Y1.2	3.894	≤ 5	Safe
	Y1.3	5.009	≤ 5	Requires attention*
	Y1.4	3.247	≤ 5	Safe
	Y1.5	4.574	≤ 5	Safe
	Y1.6	5.132	≤ 5	Requires attention*
Job Satisfaction (Z)	Z1.1	3.453	≤ 5	Safe
	Z1.2	5.604	≤ 5	Requires attention*
	Z1.3	5.507	≤ 5	Requires attention*
	Z1.4	5.508	≤ 5	Requires attention*
	Z1.5	4.569	≤ 5	Safe
	Z1.6	4.150	≤ 5	Safe

Most indicators show VIF values ≤ 5, indicating no serious multicollinearity issues. A few indicators slightly exceed the threshold; however, these values remain within acceptable limits and do not compromise model validity. This is consistent with Hair et al. (2019), who suggest that VIF values below 5 indicate the absence of severe multicollinearity, while values between 5 and 10 may still be tolerated in complex social science models. These findings are also supported by Kock and Lynn (2012) and Petter et al. (2007), emphasizing that moderate collinearity does not necessarily undermine construct reliability.

Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)
Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Table 6. R-Square Results

Endogenous Variable	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Criteria (Hair et al., 2019)	Remarks
Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.860	0.858	0.75 = strong 0.50 = moderate 0.25 = weak	The model explains 86% of the variance in teachers' performance (strong)

Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.778	0.776	0.75 = strong 0.50 = moderate 0.25 = weak	The model explains 77.8% of the variance in job satisfaction (strong)

The R^2 results indicate that the research model has strong explanatory power. Work–Life Integration and Work Initiative jointly explain 77.8% of the variance in Job Satisfaction, while the overall model explains 86% of the variance in Teachers' Performance. These values suggest that the proposed model reliably captures the relationships among the study variables.

Effect Size (f^2)

Table 7. Effect Size (f^2) Results

Variable → Target	Y (Teachers' Performance)	Z (Job Satisfaction)	Criteria (Cohen, 1988)	Remarks
X1 (Work–Life Integration)	0.023	0.522	0.02 = small 0.15 = medium 0.35 = large	Small effect on Y, large effect on Z
X2 (Work Initiative)	0.278	0.176	0.02 = small 0.15 = medium 0.35 = large	Medium effect on Y and Z
Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.382	–	0.02 = small 0.15 = medium 0.35 = large	Large effect on Y

The results show that Work–Life Integration has a large effect on Job Satisfaction but only a small effect on Teachers' Performance. Work Initiative exerts a moderate effect on both Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Performance. Job Satisfaction, in turn, demonstrates a large effect on Teachers' Performance. These findings highlight the central role of Job Satisfaction as a mediating variable in the model.

Model Fit

Table 8. Model Fit Indices

Index	Saturated Model	Estimated Model	Cut-off Value	Remarks
SRMR	0.040	0.040	< 0.08	Good fit
d_ULS	0.414	0.414	Tidak ada batas	Model is stable
d_G	0.566	0.566	Tidak ada batas	Model is acceptable
Chi-square	758.353	758.353	-	Influenced by sample size
NFI	0.884	0.884	≥ 0.90	Acceptable fit

The model exhibits satisfactory fit. The SRMR value of 0.040 indicates a good fit, while the NFI value of 0.884 falls within the acceptable range. The d_ULS and d_G indices suggest model stability, and the large chi-square value is likely influenced by the sample size. Overall, the model is considered suitable for hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis Testing
Direct Effects

Table 9. Path Coefficients (Direct Effects)

Path Relationship	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	STDEV	T Statistics	P Values	Remarks
X1 (Work–Life Integration) → Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.121	0.132	0.083	1.468	0.142	Not significant
X1 (Work–Life Integration) → Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.584	0.585	0.095	6.147	0.000	Significant
X2 (Work Initiative) → Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.367	0.371	0.065	5.684	0.000	Significant
X2 (Work Initiative) → Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.339	0.338	0.078	4.364	0.000	Significant
Z (Job Satisfaction) → Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.491	0.476	0.092	5.363	0.000	Significant

The results indicate that Work–Life Integration does not have a significant direct effect on Teachers' Performance but has a significant positive effect on Job Satisfaction. In contrast, Work Initiative significantly influences both Teachers' Performance and Job Satisfaction. Job Satisfaction also has a significant positive effect on Teachers' Performance.

Hypothesis decisions are as follows:

- H1: WLI → Teachers' Performance → Rejected
- H2: WLI → Job Satisfaction → Accepted
- H3: Work Initiative → Teachers' Performance → Accepted
- H4: Work Initiative → Job Satisfaction → Accepted
- H5: Job Satisfaction → Teachers' Performance → Accepted

Indirect Effects (Mediation Test)

Table 10. Indirect Effects Results

Mediation Relationship	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	STDEV	T Statistics	P Values	Remarks
X1 (Work–Life Integration) → Z (Job Satisfaction)	0.287	0.273	0.046	6.217	0.000	Significant mediation

→ Y (Teachers' Performance)						
X2 (Work Initiative) → Z (Job Satisfaction) → Y (Teachers' Performance)	0.166	0.165	0.062	2.679	0.007	Significant mediation

The mediation analysis reveals significant indirect effects. Job Satisfaction fully mediates the relationship between Work–Life Integration and Teachers' Performance, while partially mediating the relationship between Work Initiative and Teachers' Performance.

Thus:

- H6: WLI → Job Satisfaction → Teachers' Performance → Accepted (full mediation)
- H7: Work Initiative → Job Satisfaction → Teachers' Performance → Accepted (partial mediation)

Discussion

The findings indicate that Work–Life Integration does not directly enhance teachers' performance unless it first improves job satisfaction, confirming a full mediation effect. This suggests that WLI functions primarily as a contextual condition that supports psychological well-being rather than as a direct performance driver. In contrast, Work Initiative exerts both direct and indirect effects on performance, demonstrating that proactive teachers are more satisfied with their jobs and simultaneously able to translate initiative into higher performance outcomes. Finally, Job Satisfaction emerges as a central predictor of teachers' performance, reinforcing its role as a key mechanism linking organizational conditions and individual behavior to educational effectiveness. Teachers who experience higher job satisfaction tend to be more productive, innovative, and effective in their professional role.

Conclusion

Based on SEM-PLS analysis using SmartPLS 4 on data from 240 elementary school teachers in West Kalimantan, this study concludes that Work–Life Integration (WLI) has a positive and significant effect on teachers' job satisfaction but does not directly influence teachers' performance, indicating that performance improvement through WLI occurs only when teachers first experience higher job satisfaction. In contrast, work initiative has a significant positive effect on both job satisfaction and teachers' performance, demonstrating that proactive and innovative teachers tend to be more satisfied and perform better in their professional roles. Job satisfaction emerges as a key determinant of teachers' performance and functions as a full mediator in the relationship between WLI and performance and as a partial mediator in the relationship between work initiative and performance. These findings theoretically reinforce Boundary Theory, Proactive Behavior Theory, Motivation–Hygiene Theory, Self-Determination Theory, and Human Capital Theory by confirming the central role of psychological factors—particularly job satisfaction—in translating work context and individual behavior into performance outcomes within the education sector. Practically, the results suggest that schools and education authorities should develop policies that support healthy work–life integration, foster a culture of work initiative through continuous professional development, and enhance teachers' job satisfaction through recognition, adequate facilities, and career development opportunities, including digitally supported welfare programs. Despite its contributions, this study is limited by its focus on elementary school teachers in a single province, reliance on self-reported data, and examination of job satisfaction as the sole mediating variable. Future research is therefore encouraged to expand the population to other educational levels, apply mixed-method approaches, incorporate additional mediating or moderating variables such as burnout, work engagement, organizational commitment, technostress, digital transformation, or AI adoption, and compare urban–rural contexts to provide a more comprehensive understanding of teachers'

performance in the evolving digital education landscape.

References

Arroyabe, J. C. F., Arranz, N., & Fernandez de Arroyabe, J. C. (2024). The integration of circular economy and digital transformation as a catalyst for SME innovation. *Journal of Business Research, 168*, 114087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114087

Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(3), 472–491. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.3363315

Bai, Q., Lin, W., Wang, L., & Yang, H. (2022). The impact of authentic leadership on innovative work behavior: The role of proactive personality and work engagement as mediators. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 879176. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.879176

Barbieri, B., Balia, S., Sulis, I., Cois, E., Cabras, C., Atzara, S., … & Simone, S. (2021). Don't call it smart: Working from home during the pandemic crisis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.741585

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(2), 103–118. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140202

Becker, G. S. (1993). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bölingen, F., Carrillo, A., & Weller, I. (2023). Opening the doors for spillovers: A contingency view of the effects of work from home on the work–home interface. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1191657

Carvalho, V., Imam, H., Chambel, M., & Santos, M. (2022). Family supportive supervisor behavior and work-family boundary control in teleworkers during a lockdown: Portugal and Pakistan comparison. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1008992

Choroszewicz, M., & Kay, F. (2019). The use of mobile technologies for work-to-family boundary permeability: The case of Finnish and Canadian male lawyers. *Human Relations, 73*(10), 1388–1414. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719865762

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*(6), 747–770. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700536001

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Feng, J. (2025). Decision-makings of individual innovative behaviors in different educational settings: A case study of university student innovation competitions in China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1573799

Gao, J., Zhang, Y., Xu, S., & Ma, E. (2025). Rethinking work–life integration: Empowering talent in emerging hospitality and tourism work

paradigms. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.* https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2024-0736

Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: The rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *Academy of Management Annals, 3*(1), 317–375. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520903047327

Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. *Journal of Management, 37*(1), 17–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310382453

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review, 31*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Härtel, T., Hüttemann, D., & Müller, J. (2023). Associations between the implementation of telework strategies and job performance: Moderating influences of boundary management preferences and telework experience. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1099138

Harunavamwe, M., & Ward, C. (2022). The influence of technostress, work–family conflict, and perceived organisational support on workplace flourishing amidst COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.921211

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man.* Cleveland, OH: World Publishing.

Hoque, K. E., Razak, A. Z. A., & Zainal, N. (2023). The factors associated with teachers' job satisfaction and their impacts on students' achievement: A review (2010–2021). *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10*, 560. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01645-7

Howard, M., Follmer, K., Smith, M., Tucker, R., & Zandt, E. (2021). Work and suicide: An interdisciplinary systematic literature review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 43*(2), 260–285. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2519

Kai, T., Yi, T., Mamun, A., Hayat, N., Salamah, A., & Yang, Q. (2022). Predicting the intention to pursue certified professional accountancy qualification among the accounting students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.860204

Kock, N., & Lynn, G. S. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: An illustration and recommendations. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 13*(7), 546–580. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00302

Kossek, E. E., & Ruderman, M. (2022). Conceptualizing work-life integration: A review and research agenda. *Asia Pacific Management Review, 27*(2), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2021.07.003

Li, L., Zhang, M., Zhou, X., & Huang, Y. (2025). Unveiling the factors shaping teacher job performance: Exploring the interplay of personality traits, perceived organizational support, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. *BMC Psychology, 13*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02324-1

Li, M. (2025). The influence of work-life balance on teacher performance in Zhengzhou, China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1586128

Likert, R. (1932). *A technique for the measurement of attitudes*. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1–55.

Li, X., Lin, X., Zhang, F., & Tian, Y. (2021). Playing roles in work and family: Effects of work/family conflicts on job and life satisfaction among junior high school teachers. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.772025

Masterson, C., Sugiyama, K., & Ladge, J. (2020). The value of 21st century work–family supports: Review and cross-level path forward. *Journal of*

Organizational Behavior, *42*(2), 118–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2442

Meharunisa, S., Farooq, S., & Hussain, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence and work–life integration: Evidence from educational institutions. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *9*, 100275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2024.100275

Mellner, C., Aronsson, G., & Kecklund, G. (2021). *Boundary management and psychological detachment in digital work: Implications for work–life balance and recovery*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 734. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.671734

Parker, S. K., Bindl, U. K., & Strauss, K. (2010). *Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation*. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 827–856. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310363732

Peng, L., Lian, L., & Zhang, J. (2022). Influence of border-keepers' support on work–family enrichment of preschool teachers in China: The mediating role of work–family boundary flexibility. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 832273. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.832273

Prasad, R., Thomas, A., & Kumar, P. (2025). *Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and psychological well-being in digital work environments*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 151, 103786. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2025.103786

Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J. M. (2015). *SmartPLS 3*. SmartPLS GmbH. http://www.smartpls.com

Shanafelt, T. D., West, C. P., Sinsky, C., Trockel, M., Tutty, M., Wang, H., Carlasare, L. E., & Dyrbye, L. N. (2025). Changes in burnout and satisfaction with work–life integration in physicians and the general U.S. working population between 2011 and 2023. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, *100*(7), 1142–1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2024.11.031

Suleman, Q., Syed, M., Mahmood, Z., & Hussain, I. (2020). Correlating emotional intelligence with job satisfaction: Evidence from a cross-sectional study among secondary school heads in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00240

Tsang, K. (2019). The interactional–institutional construction of teachers' emotions in Hong Kong: The inhabited institutionalism perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02619

Wepfer, A. G., Allen, T. D., Brauchli, R., Jenny, G. J., & Bauer, G. F. (2017). Work–life boundaries and well-being: Does work-to-life integration impair well-being through lack of recovery? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *32*(6), 727–739. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-017-9520-y

Xie, Y. (2023). The impact of online office on social anxiety among primary and secondary school teachers—considering online social support and work intensity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1154460

Zürcher, A., Galliker, S., Jacobshagen, N., Mathieu, P., Eller, A., & Elfering, A. (2021). Increased working from home in vocational counseling psychologists during COVID-19: Associated change in productivity and job satisfaction. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.750127