THE RELATION BETWEEN WORK-LIFE BALANCE AND EMPLOYEE WELL- BEING AMONG EMPLOYEES

Ramadani Fitria Anggraini[1]*, Umi Anugerah Izzati[2]
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: ramadanifitriaanggraini@gmail.com

Abstract
This study examines the relationship between work–life balance and employee well-being among 93 employees working in a social service institution. This topic is important because employees in social-based organizations often face emotional demands and high workload intensity that can disrupt balance and reduce overall well-being. Based on Hudson's (2005) work–life balance model and Zheng's (2015) employee well-being framework, this study hypothesizes that higher work–life balance is associated with higher well-being. The study employs a quantitative correlational design with purposive sampling. Data were collected through a 42-item Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed using SPSS, including assumption tests (normality) followed by Pearson or Spearman correlation depending on data distribution. The findings show a significant positive relationship between work–life balance and employee well-being, highlighting the importance of organizational policies that support balanced work demands to enhance the psychological, social, and workplace well-being of social service employees.

Keywords: employee well-being, social service employees, work-life balance.

INTRODUCTION

The increasingly dynamic work environment has left many employees facing greater pressure to meet professional demands while simultaneously managing their personal lives. Increasing workloads, uncertain working hours, and ever-increasing performance expectations are factors that often disrupt the balance between work and personal life. Prolonged imbalances can lead to emotional exhaustion, decreased motivation, and even disengagement from work. This situation not only harms individual employees but also impacts organizational effectiveness through decreased productivity, increased absenteeism, and deteriorating employee relationships. This situation has prompted a need to understand how work-life balance (WLB) and employee well-being are interconnected and influence the overall work experience.

The concept of WLB essentially describes the extent to which individuals can maintain harmony between their professional roles and their non-work lives. Hudson (2005) emphasized that this balance is not simply related to time allocation but also to the level of psychological engagement and satisfaction felt in both roles. When balance is difficult to achieve, role conflict and work stress tend to increase, ultimately reducing employee quality of life and performance. Several studies in Indonesia have shown that WLB significantly impacts employee commitment, performance, and job satisfaction. Ardiansyah and Surjanti (2020), for example, found that role balance can improve performance through organizational commitment. Other studies by Arifin and Muharto (2022) and Cahyadi and Prastyani (2020) indicate that WLB contributes to increased job satisfaction and reduced role conflict in the workplace.

On the other hand, employee well-being has emerged as one of the many crucial indicators for assessing the quality of work experience. Zheng et al. (2015) divided employee

well-being into three dimensions: general life well-being , workplace well-being , and psychological well-being . These three dimensions are interconnected and play a crucial role in shaping individuals' perceptions of their quality of life, both inside and outside of work. Employees with good levels of WLB tend to exhibit more stable psychological states, more positive relationships with coworkers, and higher work motivation. This empirical finding aligns with a study by Greenhaus, Collins, and Shaw (2003), which confirmed that engagement, time balance, and satisfaction between family and work directly influence quality of life. Recent research in Indonesia also strengthens this relationship. Fadhila and Satriansyah (2025) found that WLB positively influences employee well-being, and job satisfaction can even strengthen this relationship.

Changing characteristics of the modern workforce, the development of digital technology, and flexible work practices have also influenced the dynamics of WLB. The current generation of workers views work not only as a source of income but also as part of the process of achieving personal well-being. Meanwhile, digital technology, which expands the boundaries of the workspace, allows work to be done anytime, but also increases the risk of *work overload*. Employees with unlimited access to work often struggle to determine when to truly take a break, indicating that WLB policies depend not only on organizational rules but also on work culture and employees' ability to manage themselves. Organizations that respond to these needs, through policies such as flexible working hours, telecommuting opportunities, or psychological support programs, tend to have a more positive work culture, higher retention rates, and more committed employees. When employee well-being improves, they demonstrate stronger loyalty, emotional commitment to the organization, and a greater desire to contribute to their full potential.

However, research on the relationship between WLB and employee well-being in the social services sector in Indonesia is still limited. Most previous studies have focused on job satisfaction or *burnout* as outcome variables, while employee well-being, which encompasses the comprehensive dimensions of life, workplace, and psychology, has not been widely explored. Furthermore, although various organizations have developed policies related to WLB, their implementation is often inconsistent, and many existing policies remain formal and do not translate into a work culture that truly supports role balance. This is where the research gap lies: how WLB can directly impact employee well-being multidimensionally, particularly in the context of social services organizations with unique work characteristics and high emotional demands.

Given the importance of the correlation between work-life balance and employee well-being, this study focuses on understanding the relationship between the two in greater depth. By combining theoretical perspectives and empirical findings from various previous studies, this study aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the relationship between WLB and employees' psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and overall quality of life, particularly in the context of social service institutions. Based on the literature review and identified research gaps, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

a) **H0:** There is no significant relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being in employees.

b) **H1:** There is a significant relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being in employees.

The research findings are expected to provide practical contributions to organizations in designing more humane work policies and supporting sustainable employee productivity, while enriching the literature on WLB and employee welfare in the context of the social services sector in Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance is a framework encompassing the various roles individuals play in society, not just limited to equality between work and family (Khateeb, 2021). Kundi et al. (2021) define work-life balance as a state in which individuals are able to efficiently manage both professional and personal life pressures, with the expectation of avoiding excessive conflict between the two. This concept is increasingly relevant in the modern work context, characterized by high professional demands and difficulties balancing work with other life domains, particularly in the social services sector, which is characterized by work with high emotional burdens and irregular working hours.

This study uses Hudson's (2005) theory as the primary framework for measuring work-life balance due to its comprehensive, multidimensional approach. Hudson (2005) describes work-life balance through three interrelated dimensions: (1) time balance , which relates to the proportional distribution of time between professional and personal life demands; (2) involvement balance , which emphasizes the balanced investment of mental and emotional energy across various life domains; and (3) satisfaction balance , which reflects an individual's subjective evaluation of their experiences across various life roles. These three dimensions provide a holistic understanding of work-life balance that goes beyond time allocation to encompass the psychological and affective aspects of work and life experiences (Brough et al., 2020). Hudson's framework was chosen because of its relevance in comprehensively measuring work-life balance in the context of social service organizations, which require a deep understanding of employee emotional engagement and satisfaction.

To understand the dynamics of work-life balance more deeply, this study also refers to two supporting theories. *Border theory*, proposed by Clark (2000), explains that individuals live in different domains, such as work and home, and they must navigate the boundaries between these domains daily. This theory emphasizes the importance of flexibility and permeability of boundaries between domains to achieve effective balance (Khateeb, 2021). Meanwhile, *spillover theory* states that experiences, feelings, and behaviors from one life domain can influence other domains, both positively and negatively (Khateeb, 2021). These two theories provide a foundation for understanding why imbalances in one domain can impact other domains, which is relevant to the context of social service workers who often experience spillover of work stress into their personal lives.

Empirically, various studies have confirmed a positive relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being. Ardiansyah and Surjanti (2020) found that work-life balance improves employee performance through organizational commitment in the banking

sector. Research by Arifin and Muharto (2022) in manufacturing companies showed that work-life balance significantly contributes to increased job satisfaction. Meanwhile, Cahyadi and Prastyani (2020) identified that work-life balance can reduce role conflict in female workers. Recent findings by Fadhila and Satriansyah (2025) found that work-life balance positively influences employee well-being, with job satisfaction as a variable that strengthens this correlation.

However, the majority of these studies have been conducted in the corporate sector, such as banking and manufacturing, while studies in the social services sector are still limited. This is despite the unique characteristics of the social services sector, which includes high emotional demands, irregular working hours, and direct exposure to complex social issues. Furthermore, previous studies have tended to use job satisfaction or burnout as outcome variables; few have explored employee well-being in a multidimensional manner, as conceptualized by Zheng et al. (2015). This gap forms the basis of this study, which examines the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being in the context of social service institutions in Indonesia.

Employee well-being

Employee well-being is a multidimensional construct encompassing mental health, job satisfaction, and emotional balance within an organizational context. Employee well-being has received increasing attention due to its critical role in driving key organizational outcomes such as productivity, job satisfaction, and retention (Mincarone et al., 2025). Employee well-being can be understood through several key dimensions. According to Kundi et al. (2021), employee psychological well-being encompasses hedonic aspects related to happiness and satisfaction, and eudaimonic aspects related to personal growth and fulfilling potential. These dimensions interact to shape the overall state of well-being experienced by employees.

Employee well-being is a key determinant of human functioning and job performance and is crucial to the development of organizations worldwide (Zheng et al., 2015). Zheng et al. (2015) developed a theoretical model and structural dimensions of employee well-being within an organization. Using qualitative and quantitative methods, their research found that employee well-being encompasses three main, interrelated dimensions. The first dimension is life well-being, which reflects employees' evaluations of their overall life outside of the work context. This dimension encompasses general life satisfaction, well-being in family relationships, and quality of personal life. Life well-being is important because overall life satisfaction can impact job satisfaction (Deng et al., 2021).

The second dimension is workplace well-being, or well-being at work. This is an important dimension of employee well-being, combining job satisfaction and work-related emotional responses (Zheng et al., 2015). This dimension encompasses employees' level of satisfaction with their jobs, including satisfaction with income, job security, work environment, working hours, and promotion opportunities. Workplace well-being also involves feelings of pleasure and fulfillment derived from the current job (Deng et al., 2021).

The third dimension is psychological well-being, which is an evaluation of how well employees function psychologically (Zheng et al., 2015). This dimension typically focuses on factors such as autonomy, environmental mastery, self-acceptance, personal growth, and life vision. Psychological well-being involves employees' learning, growth, and self-actualization within the organizational context. These three dimensions, proposed by Zheng et al. (2015), are interrelated and not mutually exclusive. Satisfaction with life as a whole can impact job satisfaction, and vice versa. This three-dimensional model has been validated across cultures and shown to have measurement invariance in both Chinese and American contexts, indicating that this construct is universally applicable (Zheng et al., 2015).

The relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being is evident in how the balance of time, engagement, and satisfaction across various life roles can impact employees' psychological and emotional well-being. Based on border theory (Clark, 2000) and spillover theory (Khateeb, 2021), a good balance allows for smoother role transitions, reduces conflict, and lowers stress, thus enhancing well-being. Hudson's (2005) work-life balance dimensions align with the employee well-being model, which encompasses aspects of life well-being, workplace well-being, and psychological well-being (Zheng et al., 2015), suggesting that the more effectively an individual balances the demands of their professional and personal lives, the greater their sense of well-being.

This study's conceptual model positions work-life balance as a variable that directly influences employee well-being, where role balance is understood as a factor that supports psychological stability, life satisfaction, and a healthier work experience. Based on previous theory and findings, balance in role management contributes to increased positive evaluations of life and work, so this model depicts a linear relationship that shows that improved work-life balance is in line with improved employee well-being.

METHOD

This study uses a simple quantitative correlational design to examine the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being among employees of Office X, a social worker. The correlational design was chosen because it is suitable for observing the direction and strength of correlations between variables without using treatment manipulation, as has been widely used in studies on work-life balance and employee well-being in Indonesia in recent years (Darmawan, 2023; Prastita et al., 2025). This study involves two main variables: work-life balance as the independent variable and employee well-being as the dependent variable.

The research subjects were 93 employees of Office X who work in the social sector. The sampling technique applied was purposive sampling, a non-probability approach in which researchers consciously determine the sample based on specific considerations and criteria that match the study's objectives (Sugiyono, 2019). The inclusion criteria for this study were employees who were actively working (not on long leave) and willing to be research respondents. This technique was chosen because the researchers needed respondents who truly experienced the demands of work and personal life simultaneously, so they could provide an appropriate picture of work-life balance and employee well-being.

The study data were collected using a self-developed psychological scale developed by the researcher using Hudson's (2005) theory for the WLB variable and Zheng et al.'s (2015) theory for the employee well-being variable. The questionnaire was structured on a 1-5 Likert scale, with response options ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). The five-point Likert scale was chosen because it is widely used in quantitative studies in Indonesia to measure attitudes and perceptions in a structured manner and facilitates further statistical analysis (Prastita et al., 2025).

Data collection was conducted in November 2025 at Office X by distributing questionnaires to employees during working hours agreed upon with management. The questionnaires were distributed in printed form, and respondents completed them independently in approximately 10-15 minutes. Prior to completion, the researcher explained the purpose of the study, guaranteed confidentiality of responses, and stated that participation was voluntary.

Data analysis in this study was conducted using SPSS. First, instrument analysis included a validity test using item-total correlation with an r value of >0.30 and a reliability test using Cronbach's alpha with an acceptance limit of 0.70 to ensure the instrument's internal consistency. Second, primary data analysis began with descriptive statistics to obtain a general overview of the data, such as the mean and standard deviation. Next, assumption tests were conducted, including a normality test using Shapiro-Wilk, outlier checking, and a linearity test. Finally, hypothesis testing was performed using Pearson correlation (if the data were normal) or Spearman correlation (if the data were not normal) with a significance level of 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Validity Test

No.	Item	r count	Sig.	Status
1	WLB.1	0.398	0.018	Valid
2	WLB.2	0.682	0.000	Valid
3	WLB.3	0.235	0.174	**Fall**
4	WLB.4	0.399	0.017	Valid
5	WLB.5	0.511	0.002	Valid
6	WLB.6	0.441	0.008	Valid
7	WLB.7	0.719	0.000	Valid
8	WLB.8	0.235	0.174	**Fall**
9	WLB.9	0.697	0.000	Valid
10	WLB.10	0.489	0.003	Valid
11	WLB.11	0.606	0.000	Valid
12	WLB.12	0.444	0.007	Valid
13	WLB.13	0.857	0.000	Valid
14	WLB.14	0.613	0.000	Valid
15	WLB.15	0.698	0.000	Valid

No.	Item	r count	Sig.	Status
16	WLB.16	−0.080	0.647	**Fall**
17	WLB.17	0.485	0.003	Valid
18	WLB.18	0.766	0.000	Valid
19	EWB.1	0.677	0.000	Valid
20	EWB.2	0.785	0.000	Valid
21	EWB.3	0.378	0.025	Valid
22	EWB.4	0.384	0.023	Valid
23	EWB.5	0.425	0.011	Valid
24	EWB.6	0.216	0.212	**Fall**
25	EWB.7	0.675	0.000	Valid
26	EWB.8	0.616	0.000	Valid
27	EWB.9	0.716	0.000	Valid
28	EWB.10	−0.212	0.221	**Fall**
29	EWB.11	0.518	0.001	Valid
30	EWB.12	0.048	0.785	**Fall**
31	EWB.13	0.687	0.000	Valid
32	EWB.14	−0.018	0.916	**Fall**
33	EWB.15	0.669	0.000	Valid
34	EWB.16	0.446	0.007	Valid
35	EWB.17	0.700	0.000	Valid
36	EWB.18	0.604	0.000	Valid
37	EWB.19	0.480	0.004	Valid
38	EWB.20	0.620	0.000	Valid
39	EWB.21	0.654	0.000	Valid
40	EWB.22	0.417	0.013	Valid
41	EWB.23	0.478	0.004	Valid
42	EWB.24	0.654	0.000	Valid

Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

The validity test for the work-life balance variable was conducted by analyzing the correlation of each item to the total score. An item is categorized as valid if it meets the criteria of a correlation value (r) ≥ 0.30 and a significance value (p-value) < 0.05. Based on the calculation results, most items show a strong and significant correlation, so they can be declared capable of representing the work-life balance construct adequately. Items that meet the validity criteria include WLB.1, WLB.2, WLB.4, WLB.5, WLB.6, WLB.7, WLB.9, WLB.10, WLB.11, WLB.12, WLB.13, WLB.14, WLB.15, WLB.17, and WLB.18. The items that do not meet the criteria because they have a correlation below 0.30 or a significance value exceeding 0.05 are WLB.3, WLB.8, and WLB.16. These results show that the majority of indicators in the work-life balance instrument correlate significantly with

the total score, so that in general it can be considered valid and suitable for use in measurement.

Validity testing of the employee well-being variable was also conducted with the same criteria, namely a minimum item-total correlation of 0.30 and a p-value <0.05. The results of the analysis show that the majority of items have a strong and significant correlation, so that the employee well-being construct can be measured well through the available items. Items that are proven valid include EWB.1, EWB.2, EWB.3, EWB.4, EWB.5, EWB.7, EWB.8, EWB.9, EWB.11, EWB.13, EWB.15, EWB.16, EWB.17, EWB.18, EWB.19, EWB.20, EWB.21, EWB.22, EWB.23, and EWB.24. Meanwhile, several items did not meet validity requirements due to low correlation or high significance values, namely EWB.6, EWB.10, EWB.12, and EWB.14. Thus, most of the items in the *employee well-being instrument* were proven valid and can be used as appropriate indicators in measuring employee well-being levels.

Reliability Test

No	Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Reliability Category
1	Work-Life Balance (WLB)	**0.863**	**15**	Very Reliable
2	*Employee well-being* (EWB)	**0.889**	**20**	Very Reliable

Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

Reliability testing was conducted to ensure the internal consistency of the instruments across the two research variables. The analysis findings showed that the work-life balance variable had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.863, while employee well-being had a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.889. Both values exceeded the minimum reliability limit of 0.70, making them highly reliable. These findings indicate that the remaining items after the validity test, namely 15 items on work-life balance and 20 items on employee well-being, were able to measure the constructs consistently and stably. Thus, both instruments can be declared to have a strong level of consistency and are suitable for use in research data collection procedures.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Work-Life Balance	93	51	72	62.03	4,262
Employee well-being	93	65	94	81.31	5,207
Valid N (listwise)	93				

Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

Descriptive analysis shows that work-life balance has a mean score of 62.03, with a score range of 51–72 and a standard deviation of 4.262. This value indicates that respondents' perceptions of work-life balance tend to follow a relatively uniform pattern. For the employee well-being variable, the mean score of 81.31 with a score range of 65–94 and a standard deviation of 5.207 indicates that respondents' perceptions of employee well-being are also quite consistent. This descriptive analysis provides an initial overview of the distribution and trends of the data before further testing.

Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Work-Life Balance	Employee well-being
N		93	93
Normal Parameters [a,b]	Mean	62.03	81.31
	Standard Deviation	4,262	5,207
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.075	.074
	Positive	.075	.041
	Negative	-.066	-.074
Test Statistics		.075	.074
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 [c,d]	.200 [c,d]

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed a significance value of 0.200 for both variables, which is above the 0.05 threshold. Thus, the data for both variables are normally distributed.

Linearity Test

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Employee well-being * Work-Life Balance	Between Groups	(Combined)	1049,465	19	55,235	2,791	.001
		Linearity	466,695	1	466,695	23,585	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	582,769	18	32,376	1,636	.073
	Within Groups		1444,492	73	19,788		
	Total		2493.957	92			

Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

The results of the linearity test show that the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being is linear, as evidenced by the significance value in the *Linearity*

section of 0.000, which is smaller than 0.05. Meanwhile, *the Deviation from Linearity value* of 0.073 indicates insignificance, so the relationship pattern does not deviate from the linear line. This confirms that the Pearson correlation analysis is appropriate and that an increase in work-life balance tends to be followed by a proportional increase *in employee well-being*
.

Correlation Test

Correlations

		Work-Life Balance	Employee well-being
Work-Life Balance	Pearson Correlation	1	.433 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	93	93
Employee well-being	Pearson Correlation	.433 **	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	93	93

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Source: SPSS 2025 data processing

Correlation analysis shows that work-life balance has a significant positive relationship with employee well-being, indicated by an r value of 0.433, with a significance of p = 0.000. This means that the higher the work-life balance, the higher *the employee well-being* . The correlation value is in the moderate category, indicating that work-life balance is an important factor, but not the sole factor that influences employee well-being. This finding is in line with the work-life balance theory which emphasizes that controlled work pressure and healthy time allocation support employee psychological and emotional well-being.

The results of this study indicate that work-life balance is positively related to employee well-being among social institution employees. In the context of social work, work-life balance is crucial because employees face significant emotional burdens, deep community involvement, and complex administrative obligations. These working conditions make employees more vulnerable to emotional exhaustion, making the ability to maintain boundaries between work and personal life a determining factor for their psychological stability. This is in line with Hudson's (2005) theory, which emphasizes the role of time balance, engagement, and satisfaction in maintaining a healthy psychological state, as well as the findings of Zheng et al. (2015) which show that employee well-being is formed from life well-being, work well-being, and psychological well-being. Therefore, the positive correlation found indicates that when employees are able to manage work demands proportionally, they are better able to maintain a stable emotional and psychological state despite the intense demands of social work.

This research also demonstrates consistency with several previous findings. Studies in Indonesia, such as those by Fadhila and Satriansyah (2025), show that work-life balance contributes to increased employee well-being. Findings by Ardiansyah and Surjanti (2020)

and Arifin and Muharto (2022) also support that role balance has positive implications for important aspects of work such as commitment and performance. Internationally, Deng et al.'s (2021) research in the nonprofit sector shows a similar pattern, namely that employee well-being improves when work demands are well-managed and work resources are adequate. This consistency confirms the convergence of this research's findings with previous literature, both nationally and internationally, particularly in occupations that require high levels of social interaction.

However, this positive relationship does not mean that work-life balance completely determines well-being. The correlation test showed an r value of 0.433, meaning that WLB explains approximately 18% of the variation in well-being. Thus, approximately 82% is influenced by other factors such as field caseload, role conflict, leadership, work culture, and employee personal circumstances. External factors such as shift systems, leadership support, team size, and workload distribution can also influence an employee's ability to maintain a good work-life balance. At the same time, the characteristics of social work, which involve handling complex cases, potential emotional stress, and intense interaction with the community, can be sources of decreased well-being. Furthermore, unexamined moderating factors, such as family support, age, and tenure, have the potential to influence the strength of the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being.

The organizational context also plays a significant role in the relationship between the two variables. As a social institution, Office X has work characteristics that require public service, direct community service, and intensive administrative rotation. The demands of emergency services, the complexity of community situations, and limited human resources can make it difficult for employees to maintain boundaries between work and personal life. This context explains why work-life balance is relevant for them, as the ability to maintain a balanced work rhythm can help reduce emotional exhaustion and increase positive perceptions of work. Thus, the findings of this study not only confirm the theory of role balance but also demonstrate how organizational characteristics and the nature of social work contribute to shaping the dynamics of employee well-being.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that work-life balance has a positive relationship with employee well-being among social service agency employees. These findings indicate that when employees can manage work and personal life demands proportionally, they are better able to maintain a positive psychological, emotional, and work experience. These findings support the role balance theory and the employee well-being framework, which emphasizes the importance of time balance, engagement, and satisfaction as factors shaping well-being in the context of social work in Indonesia.

Practically, these findings provide a basis for organizations to strengthen policies that support role balance, such as more humane shift arrangements, equalizing workloads, and providing psychosocial support for employees facing challenging situations. Implementing flexible work practices and improving the quality of supervision can also contribute to a more supportive work environment. Theoretically, these research findings reinforce the

understanding that work-life balance is a crucial predictor of employee well-being, particularly in jobs with high emotional and social demands.

This study has several limitations. The sample size was limited to a single institution, so generalizations should be approached with caution. The use of a self-report instrument has the potential to introduce social bias into respondents' responses. Furthermore, the study did not examine mediator or moderator variables such as family support, tenure, or workload intensity, which may influence the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being. Future research is recommended to involve a broader sample, employ mixed methods, and incorporate additional variables to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of employee well-being.

REFERENCES

Ardiansyah, CA, & Surjanti, J. (2020). The effect of work-life balance on employee performance through organizational commitment among employees of PT. Bhinneka Life Indonesia, Surabaya branch. Journal of Management Science, 8 (4), 1211–1221. https://doi.org/10.26740/jim.v8n4.p1211-1221

Arifin, M., & Muharto, A. (2022). The effect of work-life balance on employee performance (Study at PT. Livia Mandiri Sejati Pasuruan). Journal of Economic & Business Research, 15 (1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.26623/jreb.v15i1.3507

Brough, P., Timms, C., Chan, X. W., Hawkes, A., & Rasmussen, L. (2020). Work–life balance: Definitions, causes, and consequences. In T. Theorell (Ed.), Handbook of socioeconomic determinants of occupational health: From macro-level to micro-level evidence (pp. 473–483). Springer Nature.

Cahyadi, L., & Prastyani, D. (2020). Measuring work-life balance, job stress, and role conflict on job satisfaction in working women. Journal of Economics and Communication, 11 (2), 123–134. https://doi.org/10.47007/jeko.v11i2.3576

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

Darmawan, A. (2023). The effect of work-life balance on employee performance: A study of companies in Indonesia. Journal of Human Resource Management, 12 (3), 245–260.

Deng, G., Huang, C., Cheung, S. P., & Zhu, S. (2021). Job demands and resources and employee well-being in the Chinese non-profit sector. Frontiers in Psychology, 12 , 780718. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.780718

Fadhila, DA, & Satriansyah, A. (2025). Analysis of the influence of work-life balance and job satisfaction on employee welfare at PT. Candra Broadcast Mediantara. Ebisnis Manajemen, 3 (3), 01–15. https://doi.org/10.59603/ebisman.v3i3.1038

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relationship between work–family balance and quality of life. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63 (3), 510–531. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8

Hudson, H. (2005). The case for work/life balance: Why balance is important to your company and how to get it right . Hudson Australia and New Zealand.

Khateeb, F.R. (2021). Work life balance: A review of theories, definitions and policies. Cross-Cultural Management Journal, 23 (1), 27–55.

Kundi, Y.M., Aboramadan, M., Elhamalawi, EMI, & Shahid, S. (2021). Employee psychological well-being and job performance: Exploring mediating and moderating mechanisms. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 29 (3), 736–754. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2020-2204

Mincarone, P., Leo, C.G., Fusco, N., Garbarino, S., Guarino, A., Rissotto, A., Tumolo, M.R., Ponzini, G., Scoditti, E., Sabina, S., & Bodini, A. (2025). Mental health and social relationships shape the work-from-home experience: Lessons from COVID-19.

Prastita, A., Wijaya, K., & Saputra, H. (2025). Quantitative research methods in the study of work-life balance: An Indonesian perspective . Media Nusa Creative.

Sugiyono. (2019). Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods (2nd Edition). Alfabeta.

Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36 (5), 621–644. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990