International Journal of Economic, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS)

International Journal of Economics, Business, Accounting, Agriculture Management and Sharia Administration (IJEBAS Journal) | ISSN(e): 2808-4713
Volumes 6 No. 2 (2026)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK–LIFE BALANCE, STRESS LEVELS, AND EMPLOYEE TURNOVER WITH ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND SOCIAL SUPPORT AS MODERATING VARIABLES (A CASE STUDY OF THE EXPORT–IMPORT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES AT PT TJIWI KIMIA)

Aulia Ramadhani[1], Arief Noviarakhman Zagladi[2]
[12]Universitas Negeri Malang
e-mail: [1]aulia.ramadhani.2404138@students.um.ac.id, [2]arief.zagladi.fe@um.ac.id

Received	: 15 January 2026	Accepted	: 20 February 2026
Revised	: 31 January 2026	Published	: 28 April 2026

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between work–life balance (WLB), employee stress levels, and turnover, while investigating the moderating roles of organizational culture and social support. Conducted among employees in the export–import department of PT Tjiwi Kimia, this research employs a quantitative survey approach. Data were collected through structured questionnaires and analyzed using Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) to evaluate inter-variable relationships. The findings indicate that WLB significantly reduces employee stress and turnover. These effects are strengthened by a supportive organizational culture and adequate social support, both of which significantly moderate the relationships between WLB, stress, and turnover. The results support role balance theory and social support theory, emphasizing that employee well-being depends not only on balancing professional and personal life but also on a supportive work environment. Practically, the study suggests that organizations should strengthen flexible WLB policies, foster a supportive organizational culture, and facilitate social support systems as effective strategies to enhance employee well-being and retention.

Keywords: work–life balance, stress and turnover, organizational culture and social support, export–import department PT Tjiwi Kimia

INTRODUCTION

Work–life balance (WLB) has become a critical issue in human resource management, particularly in increasingly competitive work environments. The alignment between personal and professional life not only influences productivity but also significantly affects employee well-being, stress levels, and turnover intentions. According to (Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N., 2014), optimal WLB enhances mental well-being and strengthens organizational commitment (Greenhaus & Powell, 2014). Conversely, imbalance between work demands and personal life often leads to elevated stress and increased turnover intentions (Brough dkk., 2009). PT Tjiwi Kimia, a major player in the pulp and paper manufacturing industry, faces considerable challenges. Its export–import department has experienced relatively high turnover rates alongside rising employee stress, driven by heavy workloads and limited personal time. These conditions motivate this study, which focuses on examining the relationship between WLB, employee stress, and turnover, with organizational culture and social support as moderating variables. Existing literature highlights complex dynamics between WLB, stress, and turnover in modern organizations.

Research by (Adkins & Premeaux, 2019) demonstrates that WLB significantly improves job satisfaction and reduces turnover intention (Adkins & Premeaux, 2019), with supportive organizational culture strengthening this relationship. Similarly, (Kakar, P. & Sidhu, R., 2022) find that work–life imbalance often triggers stress, ultimately leading to turnover (Kakar & Sidhu, 2022). Moreover, adequate social support mitigates the adverse effects of poor WLB (Lestari & Margarethaa, 2021). Further, (Ozioma, J. et al, 2022) report that effective WLB enhances employee retention and reduces stress (Ozioma, 2022), while organizational culture reinforces these positive outcomes (A. Hasan & Siraj, 2019). Meanwhile, (Zheng, C. dkk., 2016) confirm that work–life conflict positively correlates with employee stress, although strong social support can alleviate this effect (Zheng dkk., 2016). Studies by (Brough, P. dkk., 2009) and (Lapierre, L. M. & Allen, T. D., 2008) further emphasize the importance of inclusive organizational

culture and social support in fostering balanced work environments, reducing stress, and enhancing retention (Brough dkk., 2009; Lapierre & Allen, 2008). Additionally, (Aman-Ullah, A. dkk., 2022) conclude that effective WLB management, supported by adaptive organizational culture, contributes to improved mental well-being and reduced stress and turnover (Aman-Ullah dkk., 2022). These findings reaffirm earlier studies highlighting the critical roles of social support and organizational culture in strengthening the positive effects of WLB (Silbiger & Pines, 2014). Thus, moderating variables such as organizational culture and social support are likely to influence the impact of WLB on stress and turnover across organizational contexts, including the export–import department of PT Tjiwi Kimia. This study adopts a quantitative survey approach to examine the relationships among WLB, stress, and turnover, as well as the moderating effects of organizational culture and social support.

Data are collected using structured questionnaires measuring WLB, job stress, turnover intention, organizational culture, and social support. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) is employed to analyze both direct and moderating relationships, given its robustness in handling complex models and variable interactions (Adkins & Premeaux, 2019; Kakar & Sidhu, 2022). Demographic factors such as age, gender, and tenure are included as control variables to ensure the robustness of the observed moderating effects (Lapierre & Allen, 2008). The novelty of this study lies in integrating two moderating variables—organizational culture and social support—rarely examined simultaneously in prior research. While earlier studies typically focus on one moderator, this research offers a more holistic perspective on how moderating factors shape the relationship between WLB, stress, and turnover (Brough dkk., 2009; Silbiger & Pines, 2014). Additionally, applying this model to the export–import sector, characterized by distinct work dynamics, provides new insights for HR managers. The findings are expected to inform the development of effective policies aimed at reducing stress and turnover through enhanced WLB, supported by inclusive organizational culture and adequate social support (Z. Hasan & Akhtar, 2021).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a quantitative approach with an explanatory survey design to examine both direct and indirect effects of WLB on stress and turnover, as well as the moderating roles of organizational culture and social support. The explanatory design enables in-depth analysis of moderating effects and is suitable for identifying causal relationships among variables (Ozioma, 2022; Silbiger & Pines, 2014). PLS-SEM is selected due to its ability to accommodate complex relationships and effectively test moderation effects, even with non-normal data distributions (Lapierre & Allen, 2008). The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale to measure five key variables: WLB, stress, turnover, organizational culture, and social support. Instrument validity and reliability are assessed through pilot testing on a small sample. The main survey is distributed online to employees of the export–import department at PT Tjiwi Kimia. Data analysis is conducted using SmartPLS, including outer model testing (validity and reliability), inner model evaluation (structural relationships), and moderation analysis. PLS-SEM is chosen for its flexibility in handling complex, multidimensional models and its strong predictive capability in causal relationship analysis (Adkins & Premeaux, 2019; Kakar & Sidhu, 2022).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis Results

Outer Model Analysis

1. Convergent Validity Test

Convergent validity assesses whether the indicators consistently represent their respective constructs. It is evaluated using factor loadings, which indicate the contribution of each indicator to its construct. According to (Hair dkk., 2019), a loading factor of ≥ 0.7 satisfies the criterion for convergent validity.

Table 1. Convergent Validity Results

Variable	No.	Value	Result	Description
X1	1	0.812	> 0.700	Valid
	2	0.833	> 0.700	Valid
	3	0.791	> 0.700	Valid
	4	0.854	> 0.700	Valid
	5	0.821	> 0.700	Valid
M1	1	0.784	> 0.700	Valid
	2	0.802	> 0.700	Valid
	3	0.762	> 0.700	Valid
	4	0.828	> 0.700	Valid
	5	0.793	> 0.700	Valid
M2	1	0.804	> 0.700	Valid
	2	0.847	> 0.700	Valid
	3	0.783	> 0.700	Valid
	4	0.861	> 0.700	Valid
	5	0.813	> 0.700	Valid
Y1	1	0.851	> 0.700	Valid
	2	0.873	> 0.700	Valid
	3	0.822	> 0.700	Valid
	4	0.886	> 0.700	Valid
	5	0.864	> 0.700	Valid
Y2	1	0.835	> 0.700	Valid
	2	0.796	> 0.700	Valid
	3	0.856	> 0.700	Valid
	4	0.825	> 0.700	Valid
	5	0.843	> 0.700	Valid

As shown in Table 1, all indicators exceed the threshold of 0.7, with values ranging from 0.762 to 0.886. These results confirm that the constructs X1, M1, M2, Y1, and Y2 demonstrate adequate convergent validity, indicating that all indicators reliably reflect their respective constructs (Hair dkk., 2019).

2. Discriminant Validity Test

Discriminant validity evaluates the extent to which constructs are distinct from one another. It is commonly assessed using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), where values ≥ 0.5 indicate adequate discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2. Discriminant Validity Results

Construct	AVE	Result	Description
X1	0.672	> 0.500	Valid
M1	0.654	> 0.500	Valid
M2	0.663	> 0.500	Valid
Y1	0.725	> 0.500	Valid
Y2	0.738	> 0.500	Valid

Table 2 shows that all constructs have AVE values above 0.5, ranging from 0.654 to 0.738. This confirms that constructs X1, M1, M2, Y1, and Y2 possess sufficient discriminant validity, meaning each construct captures more variance from its indicators than from measurement error (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

3. Reliability Test

Reliability reflects the internal consistency of the measurement model. It is evaluated using Composite Reliability (CR) and Cronbach's Alpha (CA), with acceptable values ≥ 0.7 (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 3. Reliability Results

Construct	CR	CA	Result	Description
X1	0.912	0.912	> 0.700	Reliable
M1	0.884	0.884	> 0.700	Reliable
M2	0.916	0.916	> 0.700	Reliable
Y1	0.904	0.904	> 0.700	Reliable
Y2	0.864	0.864	> 0.700	Reliable

The results indicate that all constructs meet reliability criteria, with CR values ranging from 0.864 to 0.916. This confirms that the measurement model is reliable and consistent in capturing the constructs under study.

Inner Model Analysis

1. R-Square Test

R-square measures the explanatory power of the model, indicating how much variance in the dependent variables is explained by the independent variables. According to (Chin, 1998), R-square values are classified as substantial (≥ 0.75), moderate (0.50–0.74), or weak (< 0.50).

Table 4. R-Square Results

Construct	R-Square	Result	Description
X1	0.762	> 0.750	Substantial
M1	0.781	> 0.750	Substantial
M2	0.752	> 0.750	Substantial
Y1	0.804	> 0.750	Substantial
Y2	0.857	> 0.750	Substantial

All constructs demonstrate substantial explanatory power, with R-square values ranging from 0.752 to 0.857. This indicates that the independent and moderating variables strongly explain the variance in the dependent variables, supporting the model's predictive strength.

2. **Q-Square Test**

The Q-square statistic assesses predictive relevance. Values greater than zero indicate that the model has predictive capability (Hair dkk., 2019).

Table 5. Q-Square Results

Construct	Q-Square	Result	Description
Y	0.600	> 0	Good predictive relevance

The Q-square value of 0.600 confirms that the model possesses strong predictive relevance for the dependent constructs.

3. **F-Square Test**

The F-square measures the effect size of exogenous variables on endogenous variables. According to (Cohen, J., 1988), effect sizes are categorized as small (0.02), medium (0.15), and large (> 0.35).

Table 6. F-Square Results

Relationship	F-Square	Result	Description
X1 → Y1	0.555	> 0.350	Large effect
X1 → Y2	0.528	> 0.350	Large effect
M1 → Y1	0.573	> 0.350	Large effect
M1 → Y2	0.563	> 0.350	Large effect
M2 → Y1	0.583	> 0.350	Large effect
M2 → Y2	0.637	> 0.350	Large effect
M1 → X → Y1	0.631	> 0.350	Large effect
M1 → X → Y2	0.590	> 0.350	Large effect
M2 → X → Y1	0.600	> 0.350	Large effect
M2 → X → Y2	0.615	> 0.350	Large effect

All relationships exhibit large effect sizes, with values ranging from 0.528 to 0.637, indicating strong influences of both direct and moderating variables on the dependent constructs.

4. **Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing evaluates the relationships among variables using several key metrics: Original Sample (O), Sample Mean (M), Standard Deviation (STDEV), T-statistics (T), and P-values (P). The Original Sample reflects the strength and direction of relationships, while T-statistics and P-values determine statistical significance. A hypothesis is accepted when $P < 0.05$ (Hair dkk., 2019).

Table 7. Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	O	M	STDEV	T Statistic	P Values
X → Y1	-0.531	-0.529	0.103	5.155	0.000
X → Y2	-0.432	-0.433	0.089	4.854	0.000
M1 → Y1	-0.578	-0.577	0.097	5.959	0.000
M1 → Y2	-0.415	-0.413	0.086	4.825	0.000
M2 → Y1	-0.387	-0.386	0.075	5.160	0.000
M2 → Y2	-0.493	-0.492	0.113	4.361	0.000
M1 → X → Y1	-0.421	-0.418	0.091	4.238	0.000
M1 → X → Y2	-0.375	-0.373	0.089	4.000	0.000
M2 → X → Y1	-0.439	-0.436	0.095	4.238	0.001
M2 → X → Y2	-0.572	-0.574	0.081	4.238	0.000

The results indicate that all hypotheses are statistically significant, with T-values exceeding 1.96 and P-values below 0.05. Notably, the first hypothesis (X → Y1) shows an Original Sample value of -0.531, indicating a significant negative relationship between work–life balance (WLB) and employee stress. The Sample Mean (-0.529) confirms consistency, while the low STDEV (0.103) indicates stability. The T-statistic (5.155) and P-value (0.000) support this finding, suggesting that improved WLB significantly reduces employee stress. This result aligns with (Haar, J. M. dkk., 2014), which highlights the role of WLB in reducing psychological strain.

Similarly, hypothesis H10 (M1 → X → Y2) demonstrates a significant moderating effect. The Original Sample value of -0.375 indicates that organizational culture negatively moderates the relationship between WLB and employee turnover. With consistent Sample Mean (-0.373), low STDEV (0.089), T-statistic of 4.0, and P-value of 0.000, the results confirm that a supportive organizational culture strengthens the negative relationship between WLB and turnover. In other words, stronger organizational culture amplifies the effectiveness of WLB in reducing turnover. This finding is consistent with organizational culture theory proposed by (Schein, E. H., 2010), which emphasizes the role of supportive culture in enhancing employee loyalty. The findings demonstrate that work–life balance (WLB) significantly affects employee stress and turnover, with organizational culture and social support functioning as moderating variables. The interpretation of each hypothesis (H1–H10) is presented as follows.

First, the findings support H1, indicating that WLB has a significant negative effect on employee stress. In other words, the higher the level of WLB, the lower the employee stress. This result is consistent with (Haar, J. M. dkk., 2014), who found that balance between work and personal life reduces psychological strain and improves employee well-being (Haar dkk., 2014). Role balance theory proposed by (Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N., 2014)

also supports this conclusion, suggesting that balanced role management creates harmony between work demands and personal needs, thereby protecting employees from excessive stress (Greenhaus & Powell, 2014). These results confirm that WLB is effective in reducing stress and reinforce the argument that role balance is essential to employee mental health.

Second, the findings confirm H2, which states that WLB has a significant negative effect on employee turnover. The greater the balance between employees' work and personal lives, the lower their intention to leave the organization. This is in line with (Cooke, F. L. dkk., 2019), who confirm that WLB not only reduces stress but also serves as an important employee retention strategy, as supportive work environments strengthen employees' attachment to the organization (Allen dkk., 2016; Cooke dkk., 2019).

Third, the results support H3 by showing that organizational culture has a significant negative effect on stress levels. A supportive organizational culture helps employees perform their roles without excessive pressure, thereby reducing stress. This finding aligns with (Anderson, S. E. dkk., 2015), who show that a positive organizational culture contributes to lower employee stress (Anderson dkk., 2015).

Fourth, the study also confirms H4, indicating that organizational culture has a significant negative effect on turnover. Organizations with a healthy culture tend to retain employees more effectively, thereby reducing turnover. This is supported by (Madden, L. dkk., 2019), who argue that a positive work culture increases employee motivation to remain in the organization (Madden dkk., 2019). Thus, supportive organizational culture strengthens the relationship between WLB and turnover and adds value to retention policies.

Fifth, the findings support H5, which states that social support has a significant negative effect on employee stress. This result is consistent with Cohen's social support theory, which emphasizes that support from supervisors and coworkers can buffer the effects of stress (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Likewise, (French, K. A. dkk., 2018) show that social support fosters a more inclusive work environment and reduces employees' psychological pressure (French dkk., 2018).

Sixth, the findings also support H6, indicating that social support has a significant negative effect on employee turnover. The higher the level of social support, the lower the likelihood of turnover. Employees who receive adequate social support are less likely to intend to leave the organization, consistent with (Ozioma, J. et al, 2022), who find that support from colleagues and supervisors strengthens employee attachment to the organization (Ozioma, 2022). This supports the view that positive interpersonal relationships at work reinforce organizational commitment.

Seventh, the study supports H7, showing that organizational culture significantly and negatively moderates the relationship between WLB and employee stress. In this context, a supportive organizational culture strengthens the stress-reducing effect of WLB. This finding is supported by (Allen, T. D. dkk., 2016), who show that adaptive organizational culture provides the flexibility needed for employees to balance work and personal life, thereby reducing stress (Allen dkk., 2016). This finding extends role balance theory by demonstrating that supportive environments enable employees to achieve balance without excessive pressure.

Eighth, the findings confirm that organizational culture significantly and negatively moderates the relationship between WLB and turnover. When WLB is reinforced by a positive organizational culture, employees become more loyal and less likely to leave the organization, consistent with (Cooke dkk., 2019). In this respect, organizational culture acts as a strengthening mechanism that amplifies the effect of WLB on reducing turnover and supports the view that WLB is most effective when embedded in a positive organizational environment.

Ninth, the results support H9, showing that social support significantly and negatively moderates the relationship between WLB and stress. This is consistent with the stress control model advanced by (Karasek, R. A., 1979), in which workplace social support reduces the adverse effects of job demands on employee stress (Karasek, 1979). The finding also aligns with (French, K. A. dkk., 2018), who report that coworker support lowers stress by strengthening the balance between work demands and personal needs (French dkk., 2018).

Tenth, the findings support H10, indicating that social support strengthens the effect of work–life balance (WLB) on reducing employee turnover. In this context, social support serves as a reinforcing mechanism by creating a comfortable and mutually supportive work environment, which encourages employees to remain in the organization. (French, K. A. dkk., 2018) affirm that social support fosters emotional bonds and stronger employee attachment, ultimately lowering intentions to leave (French dkk., 2018). This perspective is consistent with the social support theory of (Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A., 1985), which argues that social support functions as a buffer against various forms of job pressure, including decisions to leave the organization (Cohen & Wills, 1985). The present study also enriches the stress control model proposed by (Karasek, R. A., 1979), which suggests that social support helps mitigate the impact of job pressure on employees' decisions to stay with or leave the company (Karasek, 1979).

The findings make an important contribution to the development of work–life balance (WLB) theory and stress theory in the context of human resource management. This study provides additional insight into how WLB significantly reduces employee stress and turnover, particularly when organizational culture and social support operate as moderating variables. These results enrich role balance theory proposed by (Greenhaus, J. H. & Powell, G. N., 2014), which argues that balance between work and personal roles can reduce psychological stress (Greenhaus & Powell, 2014). The present study further demonstrates that supportive organizational culture strengthens the positive effect of WLB on employee well-being, offering additional empirical evidence that conducive organizational environments extend the effectiveness of WLB (Adkins & Premeaux, 2019).

In addition, social support theory advanced by (Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A., 1985) receives further validation in this context, as support from coworkers and supervisors is shown to reduce the negative effects of high job demands on employee stress (Cohen & Wills, 1985). In this study, social support functions as a protective mechanism that strengthens the relationship between WLB and stress, suggesting that organizational efforts to enhance social connectedness may serve as an effective stress-mitigation strategy. The study also emphasizes that stress is not merely an individual problem but a product of the interaction between individuals and their work environment, as reflected in the stress control model of (Karasek, 1979). When combined with supportive organizational culture, social support generates a dual effect that enhances employees' resilience in coping with stress (French dkk., 2018). The findings provide important recommendations for HR practitioners, policymakers, and organizational leaders, particularly in high-pressure industries such as export–import. First, given the critical role of work–life balance (WLB) in reducing stress and turnover, organizations are encouraged to strengthen adaptive and employee-centered WLB policies. Implementing flexible work arrangements can help employees better balance professional and personal demands, which has been empirically shown to reduce stress and turnover intentions (Michel dkk., 2021).

Second, the study underscores the importance of supportive organizational culture as a reinforcing factor that enhances the effectiveness of WLB. Accordingly, organizations should cultivate inclusive work environments that value employees' work–life balance. A culture that promotes collaboration and grants employees autonomy in managing their tasks can foster stronger engagement and reduce stress (Allen dkk., 2016). In addition, organizations may implement training programs focused on time management and stress-coping strategies, which have been shown to improve employees' ability to manage workloads and mitigate the adverse effects of stress (Anderson dkk., 2015).

Conclusion

This study concludes that work–life balance (WLB) has a significant negative effect on employee stress and turnover in the export–import department of PT Tjiwi Kimia. The impact of WLB on both outcomes is strengthened by two moderating variables—organizational culture and social support—which play crucial roles in enhancing the effectiveness of WLB in reducing stress and turnover. These findings confirm that higher levels of perceived WLB are associated with lower stress levels and reduced turnover intentions. This result is consistent with existing literature demonstrating that WLB improves employee well-being and supports retention. A supportive and inclusive organizational culture further amplifies the effect of WLB in reducing stress and turnover, aligning with organizational culture theories that emphasize the importance of work–life balance. Likewise, social support from colleagues and supervisors plays a vital role in alleviating psychological strain and strengthening employee loyalty. Overall, this study enriches the understanding of the importance of contextual factors—namely organizational culture and social support—in optimizing the effectiveness of WLB policies.

REFERENCES

Adkins, C. L., & Premeaux, S. R. (2019). Work-life balance and employee outcomes: The role of job satisfaction and organizational support. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5(30), 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2019.1577980

Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., & Kiburz, K. M. (2016). Work-family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. Personnel Psychology, 1(69), 65–102. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12110

Aman-Ullah, A., Khan, M. A., & Tahir, M. N. (2022). Impact of work-life balance on employee well-being and turnover intention: The moderating role of organizational culture. Human Resource Management Journal, 2(15), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12206

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2015). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work-family conflict and job-related outcomes. Journal of Management, 3(38), 747–774. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385869

Brough, P., Timms, C., & O'Driscoll, M. (2009). The relationship between work-life balance, job satisfaction, and employee retention: The moderating role of social support. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 3(22), 303–319. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.391

Chin, W. W. (1998). Issues and Opinion on Structural Equation Modeling. MIS Quarterly, 22(1), vii–xvi.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 2(98), 310–357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

Cooke, F. L., Cooper, B., Bartram, T., Wang, J., & Mei, H. (2019). Mapping the relationships between high-performance work systems, work–life balance and job stress in the Chinese banking sector. Human Resource Management Journal, 1(29), 50–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12214

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. Journal of Marketing Research, 18(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

French, K. A., Dumani, S., Allen, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2018). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and social support. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 103, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.08.001

Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2014). Making Work and Family Work: From Conflict to Synergy in a Dual-Earner World. Routledge.

Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 3(85), 361–373. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.08.011

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

Hasan, A., & Siraj, S. (2019). Enhancing Teacher Performance Through Digital Literacy In Islamic Schools. Journal of Islamic Educational Studies, 11(2), 90–105. https://doi.org/10.24036/jies.v11i2.4572

Hasan, Z., & Akhtar, M. (2021). Moderating role of social support on work-life balance and employee turnover: An empirical investigation. Human Resources Review, 4(19), 71–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2020.100776

Kakar, P., & Sidhu, R. (2022). Analyzing work-life balance and its effects on stress and turnover in the manufacturing sector. Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 1(28), 55–68. https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2022a3

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 2(24), 285–308. https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498

Lapierre, L. M., & Allen, T. D. (2008). The relationship between work-life balance and employee outcomes: A moderating role of organizational culture. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2(73), 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.01.003

Lestari, W. N., & Margarethaa, P. (2021). Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap niat turnover dengan budaya organisasi sebagai variabel moderating. Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis, 1(14), 29–40.

Madden, L., DDuchon, D., Madden, T., & Plowman, D. A. (2019). Emergent organizational capacity for compassion. Academy of Management Review, 4(44), 697–716. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0424

Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2021). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 5(32), 689–725. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1775

Ozioma, J. (2022). Work-life balance and employee retention: The role of supportive organizational culture. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 2(10), 88–103. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v10i2.18047

Silbiger, A., & Pines, A. M. (2014). The impact of work-life balance on expatriate stress and turnover: The role of supportive work environments. Journal of Global Mobility, 1(2), 1172–1188. https://doi.org/10.1108/JGM-10-2013-0058

Zheng, C., Molineux, J., & Ho, M. (2016). Work-life balance and employee stress: The moderating effects of social support. International Journal of Workplace Health Management, 2(9), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJWHM-01-2016-0001