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ABSTRACT

The increase in jobs at software development companies has in-creased much faster than the average for other jobs. Intention to change jobs is one of the bad work-related outcomes for software development companies. Work-life balance has been discovered to reduce the intention in changing jobs. Individuals who have balanced work and life will experience less work overload and depression, and find it easier to carry out work and life roles. This research desires to reveal the influence of work-life balance dimensions on job satisfaction and turnover intention. The research method used was descriptive and quantitative involving 61 respondents (saturated sample), and was conducted from December 2022 to April 2023. The sampling technique used was non-probability sampling with a saturated sample or census. Data processing and analysis techniques use PLS-SEM via SmartPLS 3.0 software. The results of the research produced several conclusions, namely two dimensions representing work-life balance that have a significant effect, namely personal life interference with work (PLIW) which is detrimental to job satisfaction, and work interference with personal life (WIPL) which heightens turnover intention. Job satisfaction has a significant contradicting effect on employee turnover intentions. The step that companies need to take is to pay attention to work interference with personal life, especially related to fatigue after working during peak workload periods. Companies can provide facilities in the form of multivitamins to employees and carry out regular weekly sports activities to increase employee stamina.
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INTRODUCTION

Work-Life Balance (WLB) is “a measure of a person's quality of life” (Greenhaus et al., 2003) and is significant since according to Haar et al. (2018), “most people spend the majority of their lives at work”. People who struggle to preserve a sound work-life balance are significantly more likely to experience deteriorating mental and physical health (McDonald & Bradley, 2005). Work can have three different types of effects on a person: stress-related effects, work-related effects, and non-work-related effects (Allen et al., 2000). One of work pressure effects is depression which results in drug usage. Additionally, Allen et al. (2000) emphasized that non-work-related outcomes include family and life satisfaction as well as family performance. Work-related outcomes include job satisfaction, turnover intention, absenteeism, and performance.

Turnover intention which leads to losing skilled employees is a bad work-related outcome because it can disrupt organizational functions, service delivery, and administration (Bothma & Roodt, 2013). In addition, companies also need to pay for more employee recruitment and training (re-hiring & re-training) (Sulu et al., 2010). Conversely, individuals who have good work-life balance will experience less work overload and depression, and find it easier to carry out all work and life roles (Marks & MacDermid, 1996). Work-life balance was also found to impact employee psychological well-being (Fotiadis et al., 2019). Not putting enough consideration into employee WLB and well-being will put the company in a bad position by having latent problems in its employees which may lead to bad well-being, low satisfaction, to turnover behaviours.

Along with technological developments, the world has moved further towards digitizing the world of work. Coupled with the Covid-19 Pandemic, which spread
rapidly in Indonesia around March 2020, the government began implementing Community Activity Restrictions (i.e., *Pemberlakuan Pembatasan Kegiatan Masyarakat/PPKM*). As a result, companies are required to implement Work from Home (WFH) system for their employees. Even though the Covid-19 Pandemic has now subsided, many companies have felt the positive impact of telecommuting and have started migrating to the Hybrid Working system (a combination of WFH and Work from Office-WFO or telecommuting as needed). Based on the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics predictions, the number of jobs in software developer companies will increase by 22% from 2019 to 2029, a much faster increase than the average jobs (Arambepola & Munasinghe, 2021). As the number of employees in the software development industry increases, naturally there will be an increase in human capital issues associated with professionals in the field. This research was conducted at a software development company founded in 2018 in Bandung. Preliminary interviews with the company’s Human Resources Manager the following conclusions: (1) The company has implemented a Work from Home (WFH) work system since the pandemic started, in March 2020 until now in all divisions. Employees of the Finance & Human Resource-General Affairs division only come to the office when they need access to certain data. Before the pandemic, the company implemented a full Work-from Office (WFO) system for all company employees for approximately 2 years (2018-2020). (2) The results of a survey of employees conducted by HR at the end of 2021 after implementing WFH, showed that 89% of the employees stated that they were engaged and as many as 84% of employees said they were satisfied with their work. (3) Obstacles faced when implementing WFH are effectiveness of communication between employees because they cannot interact directly with co-workers.

The results of this preliminary interview showed different conditions from surveys conducted by other researchers. An example is a survey conducted by Kaspersky (2021) on employees who WFH, showing that 54% of respondents felt the workload had increased, 36% of employees felt more tired, 33% felt more anxious when working from home, and 39% felt more isolated and lonely while working from home. McCain (2022) shows that 77% of employees stated that they had experienced burnout at least once at their current job, 83% of workers stated that their relationships were badly affected due to burnout, as many as 72% of workers believed Work-Life Balance
is crucial in choosing a job, and 57% stated that a deprived Work-Life Balance is a deal-breaker. Survey by Parmelee & Codd (2022), which focused on women during their hybrid working years, showed the following findings: 53% of surveyed women said their level of work pressure was higher than in 2021, and nearly 50% of respondents felt work fatigue, almost 50% of respondents said their mental health was bad or very bad, and a third had taken leave due to this problem, 60% of respondents felt alienated from important meetings.

The fact that employees, especially those who work remotely, never leave their virtual workspace is the biggest barrier to preserving employee well-being (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Because a poor work-life balance is one of the strongest predictors of work stress (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020), it is one of the elements that affects employee well-being. Employees' work and personal lives become intertwined as a result of the WFH work system since they are dealt with directly while at work. Nevertheless, the research target company showed satisfaction in their employees while doing WFH. This circumstance makes it intriguing to investigate whether the work-life balance dimensions significantly impact job satisfaction and turnover intention in the context of software development employees in Bandung.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Work-life Balance

The ability of a person to successfully manage their work, family, and other significant duties is known as work-life balance (WLB) (J. M. Haar, 2013). According to McDonald & Bradley (2005), WLB is generally understood to be a suitable level of involvement in or fit between one's numerous life responsibilities. Work-life balance is typically interrelated with balance or harmony in life as a whole, despite the fact that definitions and explanations differ from researcher to researcher (Clarke et al., 2004). The degree to which a person can balance several demands on their time depends on the quality of their WLB (Hill et al., 2001). Work-Life Balance, according to Mathis et al. (2016), refers to “company-sponsored programs that accommodate employees in stabilizing work and personal responsibilities”. Implementing flexible working hours and providing family-care benefits are some examples.

Work-life balance is important because there are physical and mental aspects that an individual must manage for well-being in life. Some of the benefits that companies
get by increasing the work-life balance of their employees, including reduced employee turnover, increased employee retention, companies are more attractive to talented applicants, a positive image of the company, better mental and physical health in employees, decreased absenteeism, increased job satisfaction, and increased employee performance (McDonald & Bradley, 2005).

According to Fisher et al. (2009), Work-Life Balance has four dimensions: “(1) Work interference with personal life (WIPL), namely the degree to which work interferes with an individual's private life, (2) Personal life interference with work (PLIW), namely the degree to which private life interferes with work, (3) Personal life enhancement of work (PLEW), namely the degree to which private life improves an individual's accomplishment at work, and (4) Work enhancement of personal life (WEPL), namely the degree to which work can improve the quality of an individual's private life”. Work and personal life roles can interfere with each other in terms of a person's allocation of time, energy, and mental well-being. While enhancement of work and personal life roles happened because of improvements in mood, energy, practical skills, and confidence a role may impact on another role.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job Satisfaction is “a positive feeling toward work that is the result of an assessment of job characteristics” (Robbins & Judge, 2017). The characteristics of the job in question are related to reciprocations with colleagues and superiors, company rules and policies, office power structures (hierarchies), and others. Another similar definition states job satisfaction is “a positive outlook and evaluation of the work an individual does” (Mathis et al., 2016). Job satisfaction is one of the important factors that affect life satisfaction because most of human time is spent at work. The study of job satisfaction and organizational commitment is an interesting topic and can be taken into consideration when studying employee turnover models (Zulkarnaen, W., & Sofyan, Y., 2018: 184).

Some things that are closely related to job satisfaction are employee interdependence (mutual need between employees), feedback from superiors or co-workers, social support, interaction with colleagues outside of work, and the characteristics of the work itself (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Humphrey et al., 2007). Employees who believe their leaders accommodate them have increased job satisfaction
Managers who have attention, responsiveness, and provide support for their employees can also increase employee job satisfaction (Ronen & Mikulincer, 2012). People with positive core self-evaluations (CSEs) (belief in quality and self-competence) are more content with their jobs (Zhang et al., 2014). Salary is the most frequently discussed matter related to job satisfaction, but the study hold by Judge et al. (2010) showed the fact that up to a certain level of comfort in life, the increase in salary has a smaller consequence on job satisfaction. Many aspects determine the level of Job Satisfaction, but generally, people are satisfied because of the job as a whole, the type of work, how superiors (supervisors) and co-workers are compared regarding pay or promotion opportunities Robbins & Judge (2017).

Robbins & Judge (2017) explain that there are 4 responses to job dissatisfaction, they are: (1) Exit (active-destructive), namely employees leaving the company. (2) Voice (active-constructive), namely employees voicing criticism and suggestions towards the company. (3) Loyalty (passive-constructive), namely employees optimistically waiting for the company's condition to improve, continue to believe in management and support the company from external. (4) Neglect (passive-destructive), namely employees allowing conditions to worsen and negative behaviour such as being late and absent, reducing work effort, to deliberately increasing work errors.

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover Intention is “a permanent resignation of a worker from the organization or company” (George & Jones, 2012). Based on the diversification proposed by Mathis et al., turnover intention in the context of this research is voluntary-employees quit by their own will, dysfunctional-employees perform well, and controllable-quit due to reasons that can be controlled by the company (Mathis et al., 2016). Companies will be better able to retain employees if they address individual issues that might turn employee turnover into a controllable turnover. A company's inability to control turnover will result in increased costs for recruiting and retraining employees (Sulu et al., 2010).

A process model of how unhappiness leads to job-shifting behaviour was proposed by Mobley (1977). The flow explains the procedure as follows: “dissatisfaction, thoughts of quitting, evaluation of the expected utility-job search and the cost of quitting work, search Intentions, evaluation of alternatives, comparing
alternative and current jobs, intention to quit working, stop working (quits)”. Mobley et al. (1979) then created a model that explains the elements that become the basis for people to leave work. Broadly speaking, there are three factors, namely (1) Individual; covering occupational/work and personal aspects (i.e., age, length of work, education, personality, socio-economic), (2) Organizational (company values and vision, policies, practices, rewards), and (3) Economic-Labor Market, for example, factors related to unemployment and job vacancies.

**Hypothesis Development**

**Work-life Balance and Job Satisfaction**

Based on Mihelić (2014), there is zero connection between family-work enrichment and work satisfaction in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) study, while there is a positive and significant connection between work-family enrichment and job satisfaction. In the conflict dimension, only work-family conflict harms job satisfaction. Work-life balance is a construct that is correlated with heightened levels of career satisfaction (Brough, Timms, et al., 2014; J. Haar & Brougham, 2020; J. M. Haar et al., 2014). Work-life balance has a direct and indirect leverage on job satisfaction, according to the most current study by Irawanto et al. (2021). The enrichment dimension of work-life balance has also been specifically assured to produce a positive job attitude, which includes job satisfaction (Brough, Hassan, et al., 2014). Previous study on work-life interference showed its indirect effect on career satisfaction through emotional exhaustion and cynicism (Boamah et al., 2022). Based on Fisher et al.’s (2009) study, four work-life balance dimensions clear up most of the variance in job satisfaction.

Based on findings, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H1:** WIPL has a detrimental impact on job satisfaction  
**H2:** PLIW has a detrimental impact on job satisfaction  
**H3:** WEPL has a beneficial impact on job satisfaction  
**H4:** PLEW has a beneficial impact on job satisfaction

**Work-life Balance and Turnover Intention**

Work-life balance is adversely influencing psychological stress and intention to leave one's job, according to a large sample longitudinal study conducted in Australia (Brough, Timms, et al., 2014). According to several studies (Chiew et al., 2018; Fayyazi
& Aslani, 2015; Jaharuddin & Zainol, 2019; Kerdpitak & Jermsittiparsert, 2020), work-life balance has a direct negative impact on an employee intention to quit. Conflict at work and at home can cause employees to feel out of control when it comes to juggling the demands of both. As a result, they lose motivation, have less commitment, and less satisfaction at work, which can lead to absenteeism or even leaving the company (Frye & Breaugh, 2004). Work-life interference has specifically been determined to have an indirect effect on turnover intention through emotional exhaustion and cynicism (Boamah et al., 2022). Reduced intention to quit is one of the advantages of having a healthy work-life balance (J. Haar & Brougham, 2020).

Based on findings, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H5:** WIPL has a beneficial impact on turnover intention.

**H6:** PLIW has a beneficial impact on turnover intention.

**H7:** WEPL has a detrimental impact on turnover intention.

**H8:** PLEW has a detrimental impact on turnover intention.

### Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Investigation by Oosthuizen et al. (2016) illuminates job satisfaction significant influences over the likelihood of leaving a job. Job satisfaction is inversely significant related to turnover intention from one's job (Alam & Asim, 2019; Rahman, 2020). Job satisfaction has been proven to be one of the biggest indicators of quitting intention (Griffeth et al., 2000), which is well supported by long-standing meta-analytic investigations (Meyer & Tett, 1993). Other newer meta-analysis studies have also proven a serious negative relationship linking career satisfaction and turnover intention (Kim & Kao, 2014; Madigan & Kim, 2021).

Based on findings, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H9:** Job satisfaction has a detrimental influence over turnover intention.

### RESEARCH METHOD

The type of research used is explanatory research which aspires to answer the formulated research problem, namely how each dimension of work-life balance influences job satisfaction and turnover intention. In this study, the population was all 83 company employees. Considering the small population, according to Arikunto (2005), for collecting data using a questionnaire, it is recommended that all research subjects be taken. This type of sampling is often called research using saturated samples.
Company X is operating in the field of software development located in Bandung. In this study, there were five independent variables, they are Fisher et al.'s (2009) four WLB dimensions mentioned above and job satisfaction (JS). WIPL, PLIW, PLEW, and WEPL were measured by 5, 6, 3, and 3 statement items respectively (17 statement items in total) adapted from Fisher et al. (2009). Job Satisfaction is measured by 5 statement items adopted from Irawanto et al. (2021). The dependent variable in this investigation is turnover intention by measuring 4 item statements adapted from Lu et al. (2017).

The data gathering method was undertaken using a survey method through the Google Form carried out for 4 months, specifically from December 2022 to April 2023. The survey used a questionnaire with a total of 26 questions, delivered to 83 respondents as employees of Company-X. However, of all the questionnaires that had been filled in, only a total of 61 respondents filled in validly, so a total of 61 data were used for further analysis. 6-point Numerical Scales is used to prevent respondents tendency in picking neutral answers (Taherdoost, 2019). Verification testing is carried out using the SmartPLS 3.3.9 application. The main reason for choosing PLS-SEM is because it can determine the effect between constructs without requiring a large number of samples (Ghozali, 2021).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

The questionnaire will be distributed via an online Google Form from late 2022 until mid-2023. 61 of 83 respondents provided usable data for the study. Table 2 show the distribution of respondents by sex, age, marital status and number of raised child(s). Based on sex, the respondents in this study were divided into 70.5% Male and 29.5% Female. There were three generations involved in this research namely 6.5% of Generation As much as 68.9% of the respondents have no children at all while 14.8% have 1 child, 11.5% have 2 children, and the rest 4.9% have more than 2 children.

Instrument Testing

Table 3 shows that all variables fulfilled the validity and reliability standard criteria, as indicated by “AVE scores greater than 0.50 for construct validity and Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability scores greater than 0.70 for reliability” (Ghozali, 2021). The results of all six research variables indicated great construct
validity through AVE scores greater than 0.50, great internal consistency and scale reliability through Cronbach's Alpha greater than 0.50, and great variable composite reliability which all exceeded 0.70 scores.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The hypothesis is tested using SmartPLS 3.0. This study's confidence level was 95%, with a significance level of 0.05. If the p-value is 0.05 or the t-statistic is more than 1.96, the hypothesis is accepted (Ghozali, 2021). Only three of the nine presented hypotheses were approved. They are as follows: (1) a negative significant effect of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) on Job Satisfaction (p=0.003); (2) a positive significant effect of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) on Turnover Intention (p=0.017); and (3) a negative significant effect of Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intention (p=0.012). The conclusions of each hypothesis examined are shown in Table 4.

**Discussion**

This work obtained three significant hypothesis tests, namely: the negative influence of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) over Job Satisfaction (H2), the positive influence of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) over Turnover Intention (H5), and the negative influence of Job satisfaction over Turnover Intention (H9). Among the four dimensions of work-life balance used in this study, only two dimensions were found to have a significant influence, namely PLIW and WIPL. Among the four dimensions of work-life balance used in this project, only two dimensions were found to have a significant influence, namely PLIW and WIPL. The following paragraph will explain other studies related to the three hypothesis findings of this research.

**The Influence of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) over Job Satisfaction**

Mihelič (2014) shows that there is a positive and pronounced connection between work-family enrichment and job satisfaction, but not with family-work enrichment. The same thing is also known in the conflict dimension, where only work-family conflict hurts job satisfaction. However, there is no perceivable impact when personal life is improved or enhanced in relation to work, and vice versa. Different things were
discovered in this study's findings, where it was determined that interference between personal and professional obligations significantly reduced job satisfaction (H2). Result supports the positive effect of WLB on job satisfaction but challenges it regarding the effect of enrichment on job satisfaction found in Chan et al.’s research (Chan et al., 2016). Another more specific research displayed that work-family conflict was a prominent cause of job satisfaction (Siswanto et al., 2022). Vickovic and Morrow in their research explained in more detail that “strain-based conflict is a strong predictor of job stress and job satisfaction, whereas time-based conflict simply predicts job satisfaction” (Vickovic & Morrow, 2020). In this study, only negative effects were found from the interference dimension.

Contrary research found that life-to-work conflict has no direct impact on job satisfaction (Dorenkamp & Ruhle, 2019). Another research focused on women employees in Indonesia also reinforces the contradicting result and shows that work-family conflict does not outstandingly determine job satisfaction (Purwanto et al., 2021). During WFH, poor work-life balance due to personal interests was found not to affect job satisfaction, but affect job satisfaction if it is caused by working conditions (Bellmann & Hübler, 2020). This runs counter to the study's findings, which indicate that personal life interference with work (PLIW) has a considerable detrimental influence over job satisfaction. The findings of this study corroborate those of a preceding work by Boamah et al. (2022), which discovered that interference from work and family negatively affects career satisfaction.

**The Influence of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) over Turnover Intention**

This study demonstrates that WIPL significantly increases the plausibility of turnover (H5). Work-life balance as an independent variable was discovered to have a strong positive influence on employee retention (Aman-Ullah et al., 2022). The research further elaborated that when respondents had difficulty making time for themselves and their families, turnover intention increased. The finding in this study is reinforced by the result of previous research which also explains the important role of work-life interference in controlling burnout which then leads to turnover intention (Boamah & Laschinger, 2015). Conflict and enrichment that initially began in the area of work appear to have a more profound impact on turnover intention (Aboobaker & Edward,
2019). There is a distinction between this result and that from Kaur & Randhawa's (2021) study, in which the work-life balance dimensions, specifically WIPL and WEPL operate as mediators in the leverage of work-life balance over turnover intention. This research is unique in that WIPL and WEPL are the dimensions measured to represent the work-life balance construct, and not as independent variables. The study of Boamah et al. (2022) which shows that burnout intercedes the influence of work-life interference over turnover intention can complement these study findings. Work flexibility was also found to have reduced turnover intention secondarily through lowering work-family disputes and improving work satisfaction (Rhee et al., 2019).

Then again, H5 disclaims the findings of Li et al. (2019), where no significant association was found between work-family conflict and turnover intention. Despite the finding of H5 that discloses a strong positive reciprocity of WIPL over turnover intention, we can see that the influence of WIPL is not too strong on turnover intention which is indicated by a value of 0.275, which when compared with the results of other significant hypothesis testing is a value greater than 0.4 (positive or negative). Employees in collectivist societies are less likely to have turnover intention caused by WIPL because of their standpoint that featuring work will provide virtues for the family (Li et al., 2019).

**The Influence of Job Satisfaction over Turnover Intention**

Job satisfaction has a considerable negating impact over turnover intention, as shown in this study's finding H9. According to Orpina et al., career satisfaction is a reliable indicator of turning intentions (Orpina et al., 2022). The influence of the work ambience on intention to leave is mitigated by work fulfilment, according to additional recent research (Andriani et al., 2023). A work undertaken in the US discovered that job fulfilment is the best indicator of decision-making regarding departure (Chang et al., 2022). Job fulfilment was also found to have a strong interceding role in the influence of work-life balance over quitting intention (Aman-Ullah et al., 2022). A higher quantity of employees at the same level may affect job fulfilment, which in turn also lowers intention to quit.

Alternative career prospects have an impact on the relatedness amongst employee turnover and work satisfaction (Robbins & Judge, 2017). Employees who possess a high level of "human capital" (education and abilities) are more likely to leave their jobs
as a result of job discontent since they have more options (Lee et al., 2008). Employees' embeddedness (the personal connections that employees have to work and the community) on the other hand can weaken the effect of employee dissatisfaction on turnover behaviour, especially in collectivist societies (Jiang et al., 2012) which Indonesia is a part of (Gupta & Sukamto, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The goal of this study is to see if work-life balance and job satisfaction influence employee intentions to leave at company X. The findings of this study show that the personal life interference with work (PLIW) dimension of work-life balance has a negative influence on job satisfaction. The Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) dimension of work-life balance has a positive impact on individuals' intentions to leave their jobs. This study also discovered that job fulfilment lowers the plausibility of turnover. A case study done in the context of a software development company in Bandung makes this research unique compared to previous studies of work-life balance mostly done in healthcare sectors.

From the results of this study, companies especially those that employ a lot of employees in the IT field need to ensure that their employees do not have inter-role intrusion amongst career and private life. In addition, employee satisfaction is also another factor that supports low employee turnover intention. In the end, low turnover intention can help companies save costs, considering that many companies are trying to get up after the economic downturn caused by Covid-19 pandemic. The step that companies need to take is to seriously consider work interference with personal life, especially related to fatigue after working during peak workload periods. Companies can provide facilities in the form of multivitamins to employees and carry out regular weekly sports activities to increase employee stamina.

Some of the limitations in this study include the limited time available to undertake the research, the small number of research samples, involving only one IT company which prevent the possibility of intergenerational analysis of the respondents and the inadequacy of support from previous studies related to the proposed research model.

Further research is advised to measure Work-Life Balance either with the same instrument, or with other instruments in other industries with different characteristics.
and larger research sample. Future research can also refine this research model (increase model fit) by involving other exogenous (independent) variables that influence turnover intention. Follow-up research can also be done when the pandemic has passed and the WFH work system is no longer applied or has been changed.
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**TABLE, PICTURE, AND GRAPHIC**

Table 1. Variables Operational Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIPL</td>
<td>1. Too tired from work&lt;br&gt;2. Difficult to maintain personal life&lt;br&gt;3. Neglect personal needs because of work demands&lt;br&gt;4. Personal life hurting&lt;br&gt;5. Miss out important personal activities.</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>(Fisher et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIW</td>
<td>1. Personal life consume energy&lt;br&gt;2. Work suffers&lt;br&gt;3. Too tired at work&lt;br&gt;4. Worry about things outside work&lt;br&gt;5. Difficulty completing work because of personal matters.</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPL</td>
<td>1. Job gives energy for activities outside work&lt;br&gt;2. Improved mood at home&lt;br&gt;3. Work help deal with home problems.</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLEW</td>
<td>1. Personal life grants energy to do job&lt;br&gt;2. Personal life provide relaxation and ready feeling for work.</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>1. Thought about leaving company&lt;br&gt;2. Thought about changing work industry&lt;br&gt;3. Looking for job vacancy&lt;br&gt;4. Plan to find job next year.</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>(Lu et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age &amp; Gen.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-57 (Gen. X)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-41 (Gen.Y/Millenials)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25 (Gen.Z)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child(s)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*The age of respondents was measured in the year 2022.

### Table 3. Validity and Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLEW</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIW</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEPL</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPL</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Hypothesis Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Path Coefficients</th>
<th>T-Statistics</th>
<th>P-Values</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>WIPL → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>PLIW → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.409</td>
<td>2.986</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>WEPL → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>PLEW → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>WIPL → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>2.395</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>PLIW → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>WEPL → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>PLEW → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.430</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1. Research Framework**