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This paper investigates the factors influencing work engagement among local Vietnamese staff in multinational corporations by focusing on the impacts of work motivation and work-life balance on work engagement. It explores the role of salary, bonuses, financial rewards, and career promotion in shaping employees’ motivation. A structured questionnaire was administered to 279 respondents working at Samsung Electronics Vietnam Co., Ltd. The collected data were analyzed using the partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques and SmartPLS software. The findings reveal that career promotion opportunities significantly influence work motivation, surpassing salary, bonuses, and financial rewards. Work motivation and work-life balance positively affect work engagement, with work motivation exhibiting a more substantial impact. The study emphasizes the importance of clear career paths and growth opportunities in enhancing employee work motivation and engagement. It also underscores the need for organizations to create a supportive work environment, offer competitive compensation packages, and implement recognition programs. These findings have practical implications for multinational corporations operating in Vietnam, highlighting the significance of prioritizing employee career progression, promoting work-life balance, and fostering a motivating work environment.
Knight (2015) posits that to retain customers and penetrate new markets, international businesses must increasingly focus on internal factors such as employee engagement and corporate culture rather than solely relying on marketing practices. This viewpoint is also supported by McGill and Slocum (1998), who advocate that to survive and succeed, companies and organizations need to cultivate and enhance a human resource pool that is quantitatively robust, qualitatively adequate, and notably, is characterized by high levels of satisfaction, engagement, and loyalty toward their work and organization. While there is ongoing debate regarding the approach and evaluation of employee engagement with their organization, all scholars concur that engagement is the most crucial prerequisite for driving workforce productivity and organizational efficiency (Hakanen et al., 2011). Osborne and Hammoud (2017) indicate that US businesses lose $350 billion annually due to employee attrition and a lack of engagement between them and the businesses.

In recent decades, researchers have shown significant interest in the health and happiness of workers, and hence, work-life balance has been garnering increasing attention as a factor impacting employee happiness (Jones, 2013; Kinnunen et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2014). In businesses, sales, trade, and marketing departments hold essential roles. Primarily, sales and trade staffs of multinational corporations in Vietnam are the direct implementers, contributors, and creators of the impressive import and export value of the foreign-invested business sector. However, research on creating motivation, job engagement of staff, attracting and retaining employees in general, and specifically the sales staff in Vietnam at multinational corporations, still needs to be completed. From the analysis, studying the factors influencing the job engagement of Vietnamese sales and trade staff in multinational corporations is urgent in theory and practice.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite a wealth of research on work engagement, there is a significant discrepancy in the concepts, theories, scales, influencing factors, and outcomes. There has yet to be a recognized standardized definition for this issue. Besides, the methods to enhance work engagement differ across national business cultures due to different cultural backgrounds. The concept of work engagement was first formally presented by Kahn (1990) as the personal engagement state with their roles, autonomous performance, and self-expression at work in terms of physical, cognitive, and emotional aspects. May et al. (2004) argue that work engagement is cognitive and includes the flexible application of different emotions and behaviors. Shuck and Wollard (2008) suggest that work engagement combines commitment, loyalty, productivity, and ownership. Saks (2006) defines engagement as encompassing cognition, emotion, and behavior.

Macey and Schneider (2008) suggest considering work engagement as a broad term that includes different types of engagements (characteristic engagement, psychological state engagement, and behavioral engagement). Each type needs a separate definition, for instance, proactive personality (characteristic engagement), involvement (psychological state engagement), and organizational citizenship behavior (behavioral engagement). Moreover, work engagement is defined by three main characteristics: voluntary dedication, positive psychological state, and opposition to burnout.

Hewitt (2012) links work engagement to three specific aspects:

1. Speech: Employees use positive language to describe their company, colleagues, and work.
2. Staying: Employees strongly aspire to be a member of the company, wanting to stay for a long time rather than considering their current job as a temporary steppingstone.
3. Striving: Employees are willing to contribute even more effort to the company’s success.

Schaufeli et al. (2002) consider work engagement as a positive, satisfying psychological state connected to work and characterized by vitality, dedication, and absorption; this psychological state can be sustained over time and can spread to oth-
ers. Maslach et al. (2001) suggest that work engagement is represented by energy, involvement, and efficacy, which correspond to the three features of burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy. Thus, work engagement is the opposite state of burnout.

According to Nguyen et al. (2023), engaged employees will be more proactive in their work, have better health, and perform better. Compared to employees without engagement, engaged employees feel more satisfied with their work, have higher organizational commitment, and are less likely to leave the organization (Yang & Matz-Costa, 2018).

Engaged employees exhibit more positive behaviors (Bakker et al., 2006). Sonnentag et al. (2012) found that engaged employees tend to work overtime more than those without engagement. Salanova et al. (2005), who surveyed 342 employees across 114 hotels, concluded that organizational resources can positively impact employee engagement, and employee engagement positively affects their work effectiveness within the company.

Saks (2006) concluded that employee engagement positively impacts organizational citizenship behaviors. Bakker and Demerouti (2008) and Nguyen (2021) support this view, suggesting that engagement positively influences, beyond expectations, the work effectiveness of employees. They found that engaged employees are also willing to undertake tasks outside their primary responsibilities besides efficiently performing their assigned tasks.

Harter et al. (2002) demonstrated that employee engagement is a “soft metric” that positively impacts performance, influencing five primary performance measures: productivity, profit, customer loyalty, employee retention, and operational safety. Xanthopoulou et al. (2009) affirm that employee engagement positively impacts the organization’s financial performance.

Research on factors influencing employee engagement can be classified into three groups: organizational factors (leadership, superior support, job resources, fairness), job-related factors (work environment, involvement in the job, job enrichment) and individual factors (extraversion or introversion, resilience, self-awareness). Herzberg (1966) further proposed two factors influencing employee engagement: motivating factors and hygiene factors. Motivating factors help increase satisfaction, while hygiene factors lead to dissatisfaction and impact the level of engagement. Motivating factors are seen as the cause of engagement, while hygiene factors have been seen as impediments to engagement. Both types of factors are interdependent; the absence of one affects the other. For example, good rewards without career development opportunities cannot enhance employees’ feelings of being valued and challenged.

According to Rounok and Parvin (2011), a good work environment and attachment can be built on financial rewards (salary, bonuses, and other financial rewards). Employees view it as a challenge when job performance is linked to rewards. Fu and Deshpande (2014) suggest that salary, as a financial factor, has the most decisive impact on motivation and work performance. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1996) confirm that the opportunity for career promotion increases organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Moreover, Montgomery et al. (2003) found that the demands of work and family create job stress and reduce commitment, while the availability of work and family resources leads to higher attachment and reduces burnout. According to Swank et al. (2022), while employee engagement is the foundation for excellent work, work motivation is the fuel necessary to achieve it. Fatmasari et al. (2018), Miao et al. (2020), Singh and Sharma (2016) show that work motivation impacts job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2. AIMS AND HYPOTHESES

This study focused on 3 vital objectives. The first is understanding work engagement in multinational corporations by comprehensively exploring the concept of work engagement among Vietnamese employees in multinational corporations, understanding its significance and impact on organizational outcomes, and how it aligns with global trends in positive psychology and human resource management. The second is assessing the role of work-life balance by critically investigating the influence of work-life balance on the motivation and
engagement levels of Vietnamese employees in multinational corporations, determining its correlation with their overall well-being, job satisfaction, and performance, especially in the context of the unique cultural and economic landscape of Vietnam. The third is examining the dynamics of the role of motivation in enhancing the working engagement of sales and trade staff by delving deep into the motivational factors, given their pivotal role in the country’s foreign-invested business sector. Finally, the study assesses how these factors interplay with work engagement and organizational loyalty (Figure 1).

Hence, to examine the impact of work motivation and work-life balance on the work engagement of Vietnamese staff at multinational corporations, the following hypotheses are analyzed:

H1: Salary, bonuses, and financial rewards positively impact work motivation.

H2: Career promotion positively impacts work motivation.

H3a: Work-life balance positively impacts work motivation.

H3b: Work-life balance positively impacts work engagement.

H4: Work motivation positively impacts work engagement.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study investigates the perceptions of Vietnamese business staff working at multinational corporations regarding their work engagement and the influence of work motivation and work-life balance on work engagement. A structured questionnaire was employed to execute the social investigation. The research chose Samsung Electronic Vietnam Ltd. – one of the biggest MNCs in Vietnam, as the object of study. The initially measured scales used in the survey were developed by adopting, translating, and developing scales of Altindis (2011), Hayman (2005), Lawler et al. (1973), Kothari (2004), Chen and Wallace (2011), Oldham and Hackman (1981), and Morgeson et al. (2005).

The surveying process took around five months, from January 2023 to May 2023, with the participation of local Vietnamese business staff working at Samsung Electronics Vietnam Co., Ltd. This study uses a convenience sampling method, with the sampling frame being the list of Vietnamese business employees at Samsung Electronics Vietnam Co., Ltd in Bac Ninh. For studies utilizing the PLS-SEM model in analysis and hypothesis testing, Hair et al. (2014) proposed that the
minimum number of sample elements in the survey sample should be more significant than ten times the number of paths in the model. Therefore, with seven paths, the minimum sample size for this study should be 70.

Through Google Forms, the study sent the survey questionnaire to the contact addresses (personal email, phone message, Facebook message, Viber message, Zalo message) of 400 officers working in the commercial and business department of Samsung Vietnam Company. After more than a month of conducting the survey, the study collected 312 responses. However, after reviewing and eliminating erroneous responses, the paper obtained 279 sufficiently reliable responses for further analysis.

Upon performing the procedure of descriptive statistical analysis with the selected sample, the following results for the sample structure distribution were obtained:

- **Gender**: Male officers comprise a significant proportion among 279 officers participating in the survey, with 186 individuals accounting for 66.7%, while female officers constitute 33.3%, with 93 individuals.

- **Age**: The survey participants are mainly concentrated in the age group of 23-35 years (57%); other age groups participating in the survey are 36-45 years (24.3%), above 45 years (15.1%); the under-23 age group has the least number of participants with only 3.9%.

- **Tenure**: Most respondents have two to five years of experience, accounting for 62%, over five years accounting for 28.3%; those with work experience less than two years make up 9.7%.

- **Job position**: The number of managerial staff accounts for 16.8%, while those working in staff positions constitute 83.2%.

The structural equation model (SEM) was used to analyze and test the hypotheses, obtaining the model’s and constructs’ reliability and validity. The paper employed the PLS-SEM approach using Smart PLS 4.0.9 software to validate the measurement and structural model.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1. Validation of the measurement model

Factor analysis is a multivariate tool used to test complex and polymorphic associations among measured variables in the research model (Hair et al., 2014); this method also helps synthesize or reduce them to a set of factors or components. Factor analysis also proves the reliability and convergent validity of the measurement model (Litwin & Fink, 1995). After conducting the analysis, the study removed some observable variables from the scales because they had factor loadings less than 0.7 (including SBR3, Promo3, and JM2).

To test the reliability and validity of scales, Ringle et al. (2015) used three indices, including Cronbach’s alpha (CA), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE). As Cronbach’s Alpha was evaluated as an inconsistent estimator by Hair et al. (2014), Composite Reliability was proposed to assess internal consistency reliability. However, this also has limitations, so Hair et al. (2014) proposed additionally using the average variance extracted (AVE) to assess the error rate related to the scales. Here, both CA and CR must reach a value greater than 0.7 and AVE simultaneously greater than or equal to 0.5 to ensure the reliability and validity of the scales. The analysis results of Table 1 show that all scales have CA and CR values greater than 0.7 and AVE values greater than 0.5, ensuring reliability and validity.

The second step in measurement model analysis is testing the discriminant validity of the proposed scales. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the analysis compares the square root of the extracted variance of each factor to the correlation coefficient between that factor and each of the others in the model to test the discriminant validity of the scales. The square root value must be greater than the values of the correlation coefficients. Table 2 shows that the square root of the extracted variance of each factor is greater than the values of the correlation coefficients. Therefore, the factors in the model ensure discriminant validity.
4.2. Validation of the structural model

Once the measurement model has been evaluated as meeting the requirements, the next step in the PLS-SEM result analysis process is the structural model test. Standard measurement indicators considered include the model’s fit (Goodness of fit), multicollinearity coefficient (VIF), coefficient of determination ($R^2$), the model’s efficiency ($f^2$), and the predictive relevance coefficient ($Q^2$).

To measure the level of fit of the model to the research subject, the SRMR (standardized root mean square residual) index proposed by Hu and Bentler (1999) must reach a value less than 0.08 or 0.1. The SRMR of the model is 0.064 < 0.008. Thus, the research model is concluded to fit with the research subjects.

The multicollinearity test (VIF) is an analysis procedure to check for multicollinearity to ensure that the regression results are not distorted before proceeding with the structural model analysis. VIF values more significant than five are determined by Becker et al. (2015) as showing signs of multicollinearity among the predictive factors. VIF values from 3 to 5 may still encounter multicollinearity. Ideally, the VIF values should not exceed 3. Table 3 shows that all relationships between factors in the model have VIF values less than 3, ensuring no violation of the multicollinearity phenomenon.

$R^2$ is the coefficient used to measure the variance explained in each factor, and it is also a measure of the model’s explanatory ability (Shmueli & Koppius, 2011). Typically, $R^2$ values range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater explanatory power. The work engagement, with an $R^2$ of 0.646, suggests that the two observed variables, namely work motivation and work-life bal-

### Table 1. Outer loadings, construct reliability, and validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary, Bonuses, and Financial Rewards</td>
<td>SBR 1</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBR 2</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBR 4</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBR 5</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Promotion</td>
<td>Promo 1</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo 2</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo 4</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promo 5</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>WM 1</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WM 3</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WM 4</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>WLB 1</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLB 2</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLB 3</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLB 4</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLB 5</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>WE 1</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE 2</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE 3</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WE 4</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Fornell-Larcker criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>constructs</th>
<th>JM</th>
<th>Promo</th>
<th>SBR</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>WLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SBR = Salary, Bonuses, and Financial Rewards; Promo = Career Promotion; WM = Work Motivation; WLB = Work-Life Balance; WE = Work Engagement.*
Three independent variables affect work motivation: salary, bonuses and financial rewards, career promotion, and work-life balance. These three variables explain 60% of the variation in the job satisfaction factor due to an $R^2$ of 0.600. All three variables have a positive impact, with career promotion having the most significant impact ($\beta = 0.377$), followed by work-life balance ($\beta = 0.36$), and lastly, salary, bonuses, and financial rewards ($\beta = 0.283$).

According to Geisser (1974), the accuracy of estimation in the partial least squares (PLS) path model is evaluated using the $Q^2$ value. This value’s determination is based on eliminating single points in the data matrix, replacing them with mean values, and estimating the model parameters (Sarstedt et al., 2014). Therefore, $Q^2$ is not only a measure of the out-of-sample hypothesis evaluation, but it also combines this aspect with the explanatory power of the in-sample hypothesis (Shmueli et al., 2016). For a specific hypothesis, the $Q^2$ value needs to exceed 0 to indicate the estimation’s accuracy in the structural model for that hypothesis. $Q^2$ values ranging from 0 to 0.25 and 0.50 represent the PLS path model’s small, medium, and large estimation degrees. The analysis results only show that the $Q^2$ values of work motivation and work engagement factors, respectively, reach 0.418 and 0.394, corresponding to a medium level of estimation as they fall within the range of 0.25 to 0.5.

In order to extend the research results beyond the scope of the original data collection, the study employed a bootstrap technique with a repeat sample size of up to 5000 sub-samples ($n = 5000$). The estimation results from these 5000 sub-samples indicate that all relationships in the model have p-values below 0.05, achieving significance according to statistical standards. Thus, the study can affirm that the relationships and impacts within the proposed research model are significant, and all hypotheses are accepted (Table 4).

The study may also use the $f^2$ value to explain the partial or complete presence of mediating variables (Nitzl et al., 2016). As a rule, values higher than 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, describe small, medium, and large $f^2$ impact levels (Cohen, 1988). The impact assessment results of the hypotheses show that 1 out of the total five hypotheses (H4) has a significant impact level as the $f^2$ value = 0.512 > 0.35. The remaining hypotheses have an impact level ranging from medium to large, as the $f^2$ value varies from 0.15 to 0.35 (Figure 2).

### Table 3. VIF, $R^2$, $Q^2$, and SMRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$Q^2$</th>
<th>SMRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary, Bonuses, and Financial Rewards</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Promotion</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Motivation</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. $f^2$ values and hypotheses testing results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$f^2$</th>
<th>p-values</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WM $\rightarrow$ WE</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo $\rightarrow$ WM</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR $\rightarrow$ WM</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB $\rightarrow$ MM</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB $\rightarrow$ WE</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SBR = Salary, Bonuses and Financial Rewards; Promo = Career Promotion; WM = Work Motivation; WLB = Work-Life Balance; WE = Work Engagement.
5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The research findings illuminate essential aspects of employee commitment within the context of Samsung Display Vietnam Co., Ltd., with potential applications for multinational corporations operating in Vietnam. The results showed a notable level of engagement among Vietnamese business staff, underscored by the perception that their work has clear objectives and meaning.

The study significantly expands the understanding of work engagement and motivation factors. Contrary to common belief, salary, rewards, and recognition were only some impactful factors for the surveyed workers. Instead, career promotion opportunities emerged as the primary influence on job satisfaction, underlining the importance of personal development and growth within the work environment. This finding demonstrates the need for corporations to prioritize employee career progression to foster greater job satisfaction and, by extension, commitment. Employees will be more loyal and work more effectively when they are satisfied, and employee satisfaction also affects customer satisfaction and the organization’s overall effectiveness (Hunter & Tietyen, 1997).

The direct influence of work motivation and work-life balance on employee engagement further suggests that these factors are interdependent and crucial for fostering a dedicated workforce. With work motivation showing a higher impact, corporations should focus more on promoting employee satisfaction to improve commitment.

These findings have significant practical implications for the strategies employed by multinational corporations in Vietnam. The strong impact of career advancement on work motivation emphasizes the need for organizations to prioritize clear career paths and progression opportunities. This strategy’s practical implementation may help increase employee work motivation and engagement, potentially enhancing business operation efficiency.

Corporations need to promote activities that enhance employees’ work motivation. First, these activities must balance material and spiritual values...
to suit the current situation of different employee groups. Especially for local sales, commercial, retail, and marketing employees, it is necessary to motivate employees by creating opportunities and career paths commensurate with their work capacity and contributions. It is worth caring about employees’ work-life balance and paying reasonable salaries, having reward programs commensurate with labor efforts, work capabilities, and employee contributions while having measures to recognize and encourage employees, making them understand that all their achievements are known and acknowledged by the company. Second, management should ensure the work-life balance of employees by building an open work environment where employees can speak up if they are experiencing difficulties or are under too much pressure, build welfare policies not only for employees but also for family members of employees, encourage conditions for employees to work remotely and flexibly to reduce work pressure.

Furthermore, the results underscore the importance of ensuring a balanced work-life dynamic for employees. Companies should establish supportive environments that allow employees to voice their concerns, facilitate remote or flexible working conditions, and construct welfare policies catering to employees and their families. Additionally, while salary, bonuses, and financial rewards did not influence work motivation, they remain crucial considerations. It has been recommended that companies ensure their compensation packages are commensurate with the efforts and contributions of their workers and implement recognition programs to ensure employees’ efforts and achievements are acknowledged.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the nature of work engagement and motivation of sales and trade staff in a multinational corporation in Vietnam (Samsung Vietnam). The findings suggested that a work-life balance determined employee motivation and engagement. Moreover, salary, bonuses, and financial rewards and career promotion are two antecedents of work motivation. Companies must continuously assess their practices and consider tailored, culturally sensitive approaches that promote job satisfaction, work-life balance, and employee recognition.

Enriching the literature on work engagement has remained a gap because of the complexity of measured constructs. This has been influenced by various factors depending on research objects, context, and even characteristics of industry and company. Moreover, though having practical skills to cope with challenges from diverse working environments, managers of multinational enterprises must find a solution to balance work and life and draft strategies to boost motivation for their staff.

These brought limitations for this paper. Future research may explore other factors that may impact employee engagement and further investigate the interplays among work motivation, work-life balance, and job engagement in different business cultural contexts of other industries. Future studies may also survey a larger sample size.
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## APPENDIX A

### Table A1. Questionnaire constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measuring items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Salary, Bonuses, and Financial Rewards | 1. Overall, we are receiving a good salary.  
2. The salary is commensurate with the work results.  
3. Bonuses and benefits meet the expectations of the employees.  
4. Rewards are timely when employees perform their jobs well.  
5. The company has a policy of honoring outstanding employees. |
| Career Promotion                  | 1. The company has a clear and transparent career path.  
2. The promotion objectives within the company are achievable.  
3. I get to participate in training courses to enhance my knowledge.  
4. Appointment standards are based on work capabilities.  
5. Individuals are given equal opportunities for career advancement. |
| Work-Life Balance                 | 1. My personal life puts me in a good mood for work.  
2. My job makes my personal life better.  
3. My personal life gives me added motivation to work.  
4. My job gives me added motivation to handle personal issues.  
5. Overall, I feel a balance between work and personal life. |
| Work Motivation                   | 1. I feel enthusiastic about the work I am doing.  
2. The challenges in my job push me to improve myself.  
3. I always give my best effort to complete my tasks.  
4. I always strive to complete my tasks for the company’s common goal. |
| Work Engagement                   | 1. I am always passionate about my work.  
2. I feel that my job has purpose and meaning.  
3. I am proud of my work.  
4. I wish to have a long-term association with the company. |