

The Influence of Work-Life Balance and Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta

Ananda Nur Rafli^{1*}, Andri Priadi²

Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Pamulang University
anandanurrafli23@gmail.com^{1*}, dosen02160@unpam.ac.id²

Received 19 August 2026 | Accepted 28 August 2026 | Published 25 September 2026

* Correspondence Author

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the partial and simultaneous effects of Work-Life Balance and Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta. This study employs a quantitative method with an associative descriptive approach. The research population consists of all 70 employees of PT Indah Surya Sakti, utilizing a saturated sampling technique, whereby the entire population is included as the sample. Data were collected through questionnaires and analyzed using descriptive tests, classic assumption tests, multiple linear regression analysis, and hypothesis testing (t-test and F-test) using SPSS version 26. The results indicate that the Work-Life Balance variable (X1) has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), as demonstrated by a t-value of 15.908 > t-table 1.996 and a significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, thereby rejecting H0 and accepting H1. The Non-Physical Work Environment variable (X2) also exerts a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance (Y), shown by a t-value of 12.672 > t-table 1.996 and a significance value of 0.000 < 0.05, which rejects H0 and accepts H2. Simultaneously, Work-Life Balance and Non-Physical Work Environment have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance, with an F-value of 1760.262 > F-table 3.13. Consequently, the regression model is declared feasible and explains 98.1% of the contribution of Work-Life Balance and Non-Physical Work Environment to Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta.

Keywords: Work-Life Balance; Non-Physical Work Environment; Employee Performance.

INTRODUCTION

Human Resources (HR) constitute the most vital asset for any organization, as a company's success heavily relies on the quality of the individuals managing it. HR management plays a crucial role in managing, developing, and enhancing employee capabilities to ensure effective performance and the achievement of organizational goals, which includes fostering a conducive work environment and harmonious working relationships among employees.

PT Indah Surya Sakti is a manufacturing and distribution company specializing in LED lighting under the Fujisan brand, located in West Jakarta. While the company heavily expects maximum employee performance, Key Performance Indicator (KPI) data for the 2023–2025 period demonstrate significant fluctuations. The average employee performance score was recorded at 202 (57.5%) in 2023, increased to 248 (70%) in 2024, and then decreased drastically to 187 (63%) in 2025. This decline was primarily triggered by an

increase in product returns and complaints, which directly impacted the performance of the Sales, Collector, Warehouse, and Store Staff divisions.

Such employee performance issues are inextricably linked to the aspect of balance between work demands and personal life (Work-Life Balance). Work-Life Balance is a condition in which an individual is capable of balancing professional demands with personal life, allowing both to run in harmony without interfering with one another (Rabani & Budiani, 2021). Pre-survey results conducted among the employees of PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta revealed that in the Involvement Balance dimension, 33.3% of respondents felt unable to focus entirely on their work without being affected by personal matters. Meanwhile, in the Satisfaction Balance dimension, 23.3% of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with how they managed their time between work and personal life. These findings align with the perspective that an imbalance between work

and personal life exerts a direct impact on employee well-being and performance (Adiawaty & Bernhard, 2023; Wulansari, 2023).

In addition to Work-Life Balance, the Non-Physical Work Environment is also a critical factor that influences employee comfort, morale, and performance in executing their duties. The work environment encompasses everything surrounding the workers that can affect them in carrying out their assigned tasks (Sunyoto, 2019). Pre-survey results indicated that 33.3% of respondents felt their supervisors had not provided clear directions and work instructions, while 26.7% of respondents felt that the work atmosphere was less supportive of maintaining focus and enthusiasm. This condition indicates a gap in the aspects of leadership and harmonious relationships among employees, which potentially hinders performance optimization. As emphasized by Setyawan & Masharyono (2022), a conducive non-physical work environment plays a vital role in enhancing employee performance.

Performance is the qualitative and quantitative result achieved by an employee in carrying out their duties in accordance with the responsibilities assigned to them (Mangkunegara, 2021). Based on the aforementioned description, employee performance is a crucial element contributing to the effective and optimal achievement of company goals. Therefore, this study aims to determine: (1) the partial effect of Work-Life Balance on Employee Performance; (2) the partial effect of the Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance; and (3) the simultaneous effect of Work-Life Balance and the Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta. This research is expected to provide a theoretical contribution to the development of human resource management studies in the distribution sector, as well as a practical contribution as a source of consideration for management in their efforts to improve employee performance through the enhancement of Work-Life Balance and the Non-Physical Work Environment (Hasibuan, 2021).

METHOD

The type of research utilized is causal associative research with a quantitative approach, which aims to determine and analyze

the cause-and-effect relationship between independent and dependent variables (Sugiyono, 2019). The study was conducted at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta, located at Blok B Jl. Outer Ring Road No. B25, Duri Kosambi, Cengkareng District, West Jakarta.

The population in this study consists of all employees of PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta, totaling 70 people. The sampling technique utilizes saturated sampling, which is a sampling determination method where all members of the population are used as samples (Sugiyono, 2019), resulting in a research sample of 70 respondents. Data were collected through observation, questionnaire distribution using a Likert scale, documentation, and literature review. The research variables comprise Work-Life Balance (X1) with indicators including Time Balance, Involvement Balance, and Satisfaction Balance; Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) with indicators including Relationships among Coworkers, Relationships between Supervisors and Subordinates, and Work Atmosphere; and Employee Performance (Y) with indicators including Quality, Quantity, Job Knowledge, Task Execution, and Responsibility.

The data analysis techniques utilized include instrument testing (validity and reliability tests), classic assumption testing (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity tests), multiple linear regression analysis, correlation coefficient and determination analysis, as well as partial (t-test) and simultaneous (F-test) hypothesis testing at a 5% significance level, calculated using SPSS version 26 software.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The instrument testing results demonstrate that all statement items for the Work-Life Balance, Non-Physical Work Environment, and Employee Performance variables are declared valid ($r\text{-value} > r\text{-table}$) and reliable (Cronbach's Alpha > 0.60). Furthermore, the classic assumption tests indicate that the data are normally distributed, free from multicollinearity issues among the independent variables, and free from heteroskedasticity symptoms. Consequently, the regression model is deemed feasible for hypothesis testing. The resulting multiple linear regression equation is $Y = -2.925 + 0.583X_1 + 0.496X_2$, which implies that any increase in either Work-Life Balance or Non-Physical

Work Environment will be followed by an increase in Employee Performance.

Respondent Characteristics

The questionnaires were distributed to 70 respondents, representing the entire workforce of PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta. The survey consisted of 30 statements representing the variables of Work-Life Balance (X1), Non-Physical Work Environment (X2), and Employee Performance (Y), measured on a 1–5 Likert scale. The characteristics of the respondents based on gender, age, education, and length of service are presented in Table 1 through Table 4 below.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristic Based on Gender

Gender	Total	Percentage
Male	40 People	57,14%
Female	30 People	42,86%
Total	70 People	100%

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

The research respondents are dominated by males, accounting for 40 individuals (57.14%), while female respondents total 30 individuals (42.86%).

Table 2. Respondent Characteristic Based on Age

Age	Total	Percentage
20 to 25 Years Old	15 People	21,43%
26 to 30 Years Old	20 People	28,57%
Above 31 Years Old	35 People	50%
Total	70 People	100%

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

Based on age, the majority of respondents fall into the age group of over 31 years old (50%), followed by the 26–30 years old age group (28.57%), and the 20–25 years old age group (21.43%).

Table 3. Respondent Characteristic Based on Education

Education	Total	Percentage
High School (SMA)	63 People	90%
Bachelor's Degree (S1)	7 People	10%
Total	70 People	100%

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

Table 4. Respondent Characteristic Based on Length of Service

Length of Service	Total	Percentage
0 – 3 Years	35 People	50%
4 – 7 Years	25 People	35,71%
Above 8 Years	10 People	14,29%
Total	70 People	100%

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

The majority of respondents possess a high school education level (SMA) (90%) and a length of service of 0–3 years (50%). This implies that the human resource composition at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta is dominated by operational employees with a relatively short tenure.

Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

Descriptive analysis was conducted to describe the perceptions of the 70 respondents toward each research variable indicator using the following scale score criteria: 1.00-1.80 (very low), 1.81-2.60 (low), 2.61-3.40 (moderate), 3.41-4.20 (high/good), and 4.21-5.00 (very high/very good).

Table 5. Scale Score Values of Work-Life Balance Variable Indicators (X1)

Indicator	Average Score	Description
Time Balance	4,06	Good
Involvement Balance	4,11	Good
Satisfaction Balance	4,00	Good
Work-Life Balance	4,06	Good
Variable Average		

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

Overall, the Work-Life Balance variable obtained an average score of 4.06, falling into the Good category. The Involvement Balance indicator achieved the highest score (4.11), indicating that employees are capable of maintaining emotional involvement with their families despite having demanding work schedules. Meanwhile, the Satisfaction Balance indicator obtained the lowest score (4.00) because some respondents still feel partially dissatisfied with how they manage their time between professional duties and personal life.

Table 6. Scale Score Values of Non-Physical Work Environment Variable Indicators (X2)

Indicator	Average Score	Description
Relationships Between Coworkers	4,12	Good
Relationships between Supervisors and Subordinates	4,11	Good
Work Atmosphere	4,31	Very Good
Non-Physical Work Environment Variable	4,18	Good
Average		

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

The Non-Physical Work Environment variable obtained an average score of 4.18, falling into the Good category. The Work Atmosphere indicator recorded the highest

score (4.31, Very Good), which demonstrates that employees feel comfortable and free from psychological pressure. On the other hand, the Relationships between Supervisors and Subordinates indicator obtained a slightly lower score (4.11) because there are still respondents who perceive that the work directions from supervisors are not yet fully clear.

Table 7. Scale Score Values of Employee Performance Variable Indicators (Y)

Indicator	Average Score	Description
Quality of Work	4,08	Good
Quantity of Work	4,14	Good
Job Knowledge	4,02	Good
Task Execution	4,17	Good
Responsibility	4,19	Good
Employee Performance Variable Average	4,12	Good

Source: Data processing questionnaire (2026)

The Employee Performance variable obtained a total average score of 4.12, falling

into the Good category. The Responsibility indicator achieved the highest score (4.19), reflecting employees' awareness of completing tasks without strict supervision from supervisors. Conversely, the Job Knowledge indicator obtained the lowest score (4.02), indicating that there is still room for improvement in understanding standard operating procedures (SOP).

Validity and Reliability Tests

The validity test was carried out by comparing the value of r calculated against r of the table at a significance level of 5% with a free degree ($n-2$) = 68, obtained r table of 0.235. The recapitulation of the results of the validity test for the three research variables is presented in Table 11.

Table 8. Recapitulation of Instrument Validity Test Results

Variable	Number of Items	Calculated range r	r Table	Verdict
Work-Life Balance (X1)	10	0,503 – 0,714	0,235	All items are valid
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	10	0,518 – 0,738	0,235	All items are valid
Employee Performance (Y)	10	0,513 – 0,790	0,235	All items are valid

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

All r values calculated on the three variables are greater than the r of the table (0.235), so that all 30 statements are declared valid and suitable for use as research instruments. Furthermore, the reliability test is

carried out by looking at Cronbach's Alpha value, with the criterion that the instrument is declared reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha value is greater than 0.60. The results of the reliability test are presented in Table 12.

Table 9. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Remarks
Work-Life Balance (X1)	0,837	10	Reliable
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	0,828	10	Reliable
Employee Performance (Y)	0,850	10	Reliable

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

The three variables obtained a Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.60, so that all research instruments were declared reliable and consistently used to measure the variables *Work-Life Balance*, *Non-Physical Work Environment*, and *Employee Performance*.

Classic Assumption Test

The normality test was carried out with the *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* to determine whether the residual data was normally distributed, with the criteria that the data was declared normal if the significance value was greater than 0.05.

Table 10. Normality Test Results (One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

N	Mean Residual	Std. Deviation	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Remarks
70	0,0000000	0,46001596	0,200	Normal distribution

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.200 is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the residual data of this study are normally

distributed and this result is reinforced by the normal P-Plot graph showing the data points spread along a diagonal line.

Table 11. Multicollinearity Test Results

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Remarks
Work-Life Balance (X1)	0,219	4,572	Multicollinearity-free
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	0,219	4,572	Multicollinearity-free

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

The two independent variables had a Tolerance value of 0.219 (> 0.1) and a VIF value of 4.572 (< 10), so that the regression model was declared free of the symptoms of multicollinearity between independent variables.

The autocorrelation test with *Durbin-Watson* (DW) produced a DW value of 2.026, being in the range without a definite conclusion ($dL = 1.5542$; $dU = 1.6715$) so additional testing was carried out using the Run Test. The results of the Run Test showed an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.630 (> 0.05), so it can be concluded that there are no autocorrelation symptoms in the regression model. The heteroscedasticity test through the ZPRED-

SPRESID scatterplot graph shows that the data points are scattered randomly without forming a specific pattern, so that the regression model is also declared free of heteroscedasticity symptoms. With the fulfillment of all classical assumption tests, the regression model in this study is declared feasible for use in hypothesis testing.

Simple Linear Regression Analysis

Before multiple regression analysis is carried out, a simple linear regression analysis is first carried out to see the influence of each independent variable individually on Employee Performance.

Table 12. Results of Simple Linear Regression of Work-Life Balance (X1) on Employee Performance (Y)

Models	B	t count	Sig.
Constant	1,112	0,873	0,386
Work-Life Balance	0,994	31,686	0,000

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

The result of a simple regression results in the equation $Y = 1.112 + 0.994X1$. The value of the regression coefficient of 0.994 is positive, meaning that every one unit increase in Work-

Life Balance will increase Employee Performance by 0.994 units, with a t-value of 31.686 and a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05).

Table 13. Results of Simple Linear Regression of Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) Towards Employee Performance (Y)

Models	B	t count	Sig.
Constant	-2,242	-1,351	0,181
Non-Physical Work Environment	1,047	26,347	0,000

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

The result of a simple regression results in the equation $Y = -2.242 + 1.047X2$. The value of the regression coefficient of 1.047 is positive, meaning that every one unit increase

in the Non-Physical Work Environment will increase Employee Performance by 1.047 units, with a calculated t-value of 26.347 and a significance of 0.000 (< 0.05).

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 14. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Models	B	Std. Error	t count	Sig.
Constant	-2,925	0,766	-3,819	0,000
Work-Life Balance (X1)	0,583	0,037	15,908	0,000
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2)	0,496	0,039	12,672	0,000

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

Based on Table 14, the multiple linear regression equation $Y = -2.925 + 0.583X1 + 0.496X2$ is obtained. The constant value of -2.925 indicates that if *Work-Life Balance* and *Non-Physical Work Environment* are valued at 0, then Employee Performance is at -2.925

units. The regression coefficient X1 of 0.583 and X2 of 0.496 is positive, which means that an increase in both independent variables will be followed by an increase in Employee Performance, assuming the other variable is of a fixed value (*ceteris paribus*).

Coefficient Determination Analysis

Table 15. Results of Determination Coefficient Analysis

Models	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
<i>Work-Life Balance</i> (X1) to Y	0,968	0,937	0,936
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) against Y	0,954	0,911	0,909
X1 and X2 simultaneously against Y	0,991	0,981	0,981

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

Partially, *Work-Life Balance* was able to explain the variation in Employee Performance by 93.7% and Non-Physical Work Environment by 91.1%. Simultaneously, the two independent variables were able to explain

the variation in Employee Performance by 98.1% ($R^2 = 0.981$), while the remaining 1.9% was explained by other factors outside the study model, such as compensation, work motivation, and organizational communication.

Table 16. Correlation Coefficients Between Variables

Variable Relationships	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Relationship Level
<i>Work-Life Balance</i> (X1) – Employee Performance (Y)	0,968	Very Powerful
Non-Physical Work Environment (X2) – Employee Performance (Y)	0,954	Very Powerful

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

The value of the correlation coefficient of *Work-Life Balance* to Employee Performance was 0.968 and the Non-Physical Work Environment to Employee Performance was 0.954, both of which were in the interval of 0.800–1,000 so they were classified as very strong. The results of the determination

coefficient analysis showed that *Work-Life Balance* and Non-Physical Work Environment were simultaneously able to explain the variation in Employee Performance by 98.1% ($R^2 = 0.981$), while the remaining 1.9% was explained by other factors outside this study model.

Table 17. Partial Test Results (t-test)

Independent variables	t count	Sig	Ho	H1
<i>Work-Life Balance</i>	15,908	0,000	Rejected	Accepted
Non-Physical Work Environment	12,672	0,000	Rejected	Accepted

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

Table 18. Results of Simultaneous Test (Test F)

F count	F Table	Sig	Ho	Ha
1760,262	3,13	0,000	Rejected	Accepted

Source: SPSS 26 (2026) data processing

Discussion

The results of the t-test showed that the value of t-calculated *Work-Life Balance* of 15.908 was greater than the t of table 1.996 with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, so that H0 was rejected and H1 was accepted. This means that *Work-Life Balance* has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta; the better the management of *the employee's Work-Life Balance*, the better the performance. These findings are consistent with the results of Mardiani & Widiyanto's (2021) research on PT Gunanusa Eramandiri, which also found that *Work-Life Balance* has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

The results of the t-test for the Non-Physical Work Environment variable showed that the calculated t value of 12.672 was greater than the t table of 1.996 with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, so that H0 was rejected and H2 was accepted. This shows that the more conducive the Non-Physical Work Environment felt by employees, the higher the performance produced. This finding is in line with Suhartini's (2021) research on PT Polychem Indonesia Tbk. Machinery Division, which found a positive and significant influence of the Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance, as well as with Subagio et al. (2024) and Gozali & Priadi (2026) who emphasized the importance of non-

physical work environment and communication in supporting employee performance.

The results of the F test showed that the F value of 1760.262 was greater than the F of table 3.13 with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, so that H_0 was rejected and H_a was accepted. Thus, *Work-Life Balance* and Non-Physical Work Environment simultaneously have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta. These results strengthen the findings of Nadapdap & Harahap (2023) on employees of Grand Inna Medan and Dwitama & Ariyanto (2024), who stated that *Work-Life Balance* and Non-Physical Work Environment together are important factors that affect Employee Performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded that *Work-Life Balance* partially has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance at PT Indah Surya Sakti West Jakarta ($t_{\text{count}} 15.908 > t_{\text{table}} 1.996$; Sig. $0.000 < 0.05$). Non-Physical Work Environment also partially has a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($t_{\text{count}} 12.672 > t_{\text{table}} 1.996$; Sig. $0.000 < 0.05$). Simultaneously, *Work-Life Balance* and Non-Physical Work Environment have a positive and significant effect on Employee Performance ($F_{\text{count}} 1760.262 > F_{\text{table}} 3.13$), with a contribution of 98.1% to Employee Performance. Implication, the management of PT Indah Surya Sakti is advised to increase employee satisfaction in balancing work and personal life through more flexible policies, as well as strengthen the clarity of leadership direction and harmonious relationships between employees to encourage continuous performance improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adiawaty, S., & Bernhard, T. (2023). *Work-life balance* and its implications for employee performance. *Journal of Management and Business*, 8(1), 10–21.
2. Badrianto, Y., & Ekhsan, M. (2021). The effect of *work-life balance* on employee performance. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 2(1), 1–10.
3. Chairunisa, C. A., & Priadi, A. (2026). The effect of compensation and physical work environment on employee performance at PT Bumi Berkah Boga West Bekasi. *Scientific Journal of Economics and Management*, 4(5), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.65978/jiem.v4i5.173>
4. Dwitama, F., & Ariyanto, E. (2024). The effect of *work life balance* and non-physical work environment on employee performance in the West Sumatra Provincial Regional Civil Service Agency mediated by satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Management and Finance (Mankeu)*, 6(3), 612–617.
5. Gozali, A. T., & Priadi, A. (2026). The influence of non-physical work environment and communication on the performance of employees of the Tangerang City Regional General Hospital. *Menara Journal: Human Resource Management*, 3(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.65978/jm.v3i1.79>
6. Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2021). *Human Resource Management (Revised Edition)*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
7. Julkipli, A. J., & Priadi, A. (2025). The influence of non-physical work environment and work motivation on employee performance at the Populi Center Foundation, South Jakarta. *Scientific Journal of Economics and Management*, 3(11), 530–541.
8. Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2021). *Corporate human resource management*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
9. Mardiani, I. N., & Widiyanto, A. (2021). The effect of *work-life balance*, work environment and compensation on the performance of employees of PT Gunanusa Eramandiri. *Journal of Sharia Economics & Economics*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v4i2.456>
10. Nadapdap, B. F., & Harahap, K. (2023). The effect of *work-life balance* and work environment on employee performance (Study on Grand Inna Medan Employees). *Transeconomics*, 3(5).
11. Rabani, N., & Budiani, M. S. (2021). *Work-life balance* as an individual's perception of work-life balance. *Journal of Psychology*, 8(1), 1–10.
12. Rahayu, S., & Budiman, A. (2025). The influence of the work environment on employee performance based on the perspective of organizational behavior. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 6(1), 40–52.

13. Setyawan, A., & Masharyono. (2022). Analysis of Non-Physical Work Environment in Improving Employee Performance. *Journal of Office Management Education*, 7(1), 15–25.
14. Subagio, A., Supardi, S., & Dharmanto, A. (2024). The influence of non-physical work environment on employee performance through communication at PT. Suzuki Indomobil Motor Plant Tambun II. *Journal of Management Science and E-Commerce Publications*, 3(1), 199–210.
15. Sugiyono. (2019). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods* (2nd ed.). Bandung: Alfabeta.
16. Suhartini, S. (2021). The Effect of *Work-Life Balance* and Non-Physical Work Environment on Employee Performance at PT Polychem Indonesia Tbk. (Machinery Division). *Eco-Buss*, 3(3), 122–131. <https://doi.org/10.32877/eb.v3i3.207>
17. Sunyoto, D. (2019). *Human Resource Management*. Yogyakarta: CAPS (Center for Academic Publishing Service).
18. Wulansari, O. D. (2023). Narrative Literature Review: Factors Affecting *Work-Life Balance*. *Psychopreneur Journal*, 7(1), 15–28.