MEDIATING ROLE OF JOB SATISFACTION IN THE EFFECT OF WORK-LIFE BALANCE AND WORK PASSION ON TURNOVER INTENTION
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Abstract
This study aims to examine the mediating impact of job satisfaction on the effect of work-life balance and work passion on turnover intention. The data collection technique used a census of 67 respondents who were divided into Badan Layanan Umum (BLU) and contract employees at one of the University Faculties in South Sumatra, Indonesia. Data analysis used the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM-PLS) method with SmartPLS 3 software. The novelty of this study combines the four variables of work-life balance, work passion, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in one research variable. The results of this study indicate that the variables work-life balance and work passion have a positive and significant direct effect on job satisfaction. Work-life balance and work passion have a direct and significant positive impact on turnover intention; job satisfaction can significantly mediate the effect between work-life balance and work passion for turnover intention. This research study contributes to the relationship between variables, especially the relationship between work passion and turnover intention, which is still very few research found in the last ten years.
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Introduction
The term of work-life balance was first started at the signing of the Fair Labor Standards (FLSA) Act by the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1938. The FLSA created entitlements and requirements for minimum wages and overtime wages when someone worked more than 40 hours a week. The regulations also prohibited oppressive child labor, set a minimum hourly wage of 25 cents, set requirements for recording overtime work, and set maximum weekly hours of work initially at 44 hours, later revised to 40 hours per week in 1940. This applies to employees involved in interstate trade or employed by companies engaged in trading or production of goods for trade unless the employer can claim exemption from coverage (Sullivan, 2014).

There are various kinds of benefits of work-life balance that can affect employees like increased work commitment, job satisfaction, absences, work engagement, productivity, work autonomy, lowering the level of work accidents, family conflicts, and
the desire to move or leave their current job (McDonald et al., 2005; Malik et al., 2010; Purohit, 2013; Babin Dhas, 2015; Suifan et al., 2016).

A good work passion can have various influences in increasing job satisfaction, employee performance, organizational performance, initiative, employee welfare, organizational commitment and career, reducing levels of work fatigue, conflict, stress, and intention to quit (Birkeland & Buch, 2015; Burke et al., 2015; Spehar et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017; Gulyani & Bhatnagar, 2017; Indriasari & Setyorini, 2018; Purba & Ananta, 2018; Thibault-Landry et al., 2018; Gong et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019; Clohessy et al., 2020; Deepti & Shalini, 2020;)

Job satisfaction and turnover intentions reflect the perspective that employees have of the organization they work for. Employees generally show higher levels of job satisfaction and lower intentions to quit, when their work environment helps them meet their needs (Malik et al., 2010). Job satisfaction also positively affects the company in terms of commitment, attachment, love, performance, self-efficacy, and reduction in employee turnover (Zhao et al., 2016; Suttikun et al., 2018).

Wenno (2018), Amla & Malhotra (2019), Nurhasanah et al. (2019) get the result that there is a significant positive relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Meanwhile, Sobia et al. (2011), Arunika & Kottawatta (2015), Agha et al. (2017) found the is a negative influence between work-life balance and job satisfaction.

Jaharuddin & Zainol (2019) stated in their research that work-life balance has a positive effect on turnover intention. However, different results found that work-life balance has a negative effect on turnover intention (Bintang & Asiti, 2016; Suifan et al., 2016; Laksono & Wardoyo, 2019).

Work passion as the second exogenous variable gives positive results on job satisfaction in 3 different studies (Purba & Ananta, 2018; Spehar et al., 2016; Tarkar et al., 2019). Meanwhile, negative results were not found in studies ranging from 2015 to 2020.

Research by Gong et al. (2018) explains that harmonious passion has a negative effect on turnover intention, while obsessive passion has a positive impact on turnover intention. While Purba & Ananta (2018) found that work passion does not directly affect turnover intention but must go through job satisfaction first.

The effect of job satisfaction on turnover intention was found to have a significant positive result (Azeez et al., 2016; Nurdin & Rohaeni, 2020). Meanwhile, negative results were found on (Fauzia, 2018; Alam & Asim, 2019; Li et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2020).

Job satisfaction as a mediating variable between work-life balance and turnover intention has different results. Fiernaningsih et al. (2019) revealed that job satisfaction has an effect on work-life balance on turnover intention. Oosthuizen et al. (2016) found that job satisfaction does not provide any relationship between work-life balance and turnover intention. Nafiudin (2015) found that work-life balance and job satisfaction positively affect turnover intention.

There are still few studies that discuss mediating role on job satisfaction in the effect of work-life balance and work passion on turnover intention, especially the effect of work passion on turnover intention with job satisfaction as a mediating variable. These results are found from searches using Google Scholar, PubMed, and Crossref with the help of Harzing's Publish or Perish software.
Literature Review

Work-Life Balance

Work-life balance is defined as the rate at which an individual is involved and equally satisfied with his work role and family roles which consists of time balance, involvement balance, and satisfaction balance (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Work-life balance is also seen as a form of fulfilling the role of work and family with people involved in fulfilling the demands of their role (Grzywacz & Carlson, 2007).

Zedeck & Mosier (1990), O’Driscoll & Cooper (1996) argue that there are five main models used to explain WLB: segmentation theory, spillover theory, compensation theory, instrumental theory, and conflict theory.

Greenhaus et al. (2003) reveal three dimensions in work-life balance, i.e. time balance, involvement balance, satisfaction balance. Meanwhile, Fisher et al. (2009) revealed four things that affect a person's work-life balance, such as work interference with personal life (WIPL), personal life interference with work (PLIW), personal life enhancement of work (PLEW), work enhancement of personal life (WEPL).

Work Passion

Work passion is a combination of strong individual welfare states, positive emotions, meaning-based originating from repeated cognitive and affective assessments of various work situations in organizations resulting in consistent and constructive work intentions and behavior (Zigarmi et al., 2009).

Work passion can be linked to the theory of Self-Determination Theory (SDT). This theory discusses motivation and personality related to psychology in developing human personality (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In the 1970s, research on SDT developed from studies comparing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and from a growing understanding of the dominant role that intrinsic motivation plays in individual behavior (Lepper & Greene, 1973).

Vallerand et al. (2003) provide a model with the name dualistic model as two dimensions that affect work passion, namely harmonious passion, and obsessive passion.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional state that results from appraising one's job or work experience as achieving or facilitating the achievement of someone’s job values (Locke, 1976). Annakis et al. (2011) revealed that job satisfaction is a pleasant emotional attitude, and loves his job.

Various theories can be used in discussing job satisfaction, including the hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943), motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966), job characteristics model (JCM) (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), dan dispositional approach (Judge et al., 2001).

Luthans (2011) divide the dimensions of employee job satisfaction into five; the job itself, salary, job promotion opportunities, supervision, and co-workers.

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention theory refers to the idea of organizational equilibrium proposed by Barnard & Andrews (1970). This theory suggests that an employee will continue to work for the organization as long as the encouragement provided by the organization can be met, for example, satisfactory wages, good working conditions,
opportunities to advance equal to or greater than the employee's contribution, time, and effort required by the organization, a sense of security in old age, a workload that is in accordance with the specialization of the job, and a clear career path (Wirawan, 2015).

Mobley et al. (1978) argued there are three dimensions used to measure turnover intention: thinking of quitting, intention to search, and will to quit.

Work-Life Balance and Turnover Intention
Jaharuddin & Zainol (2019) have a significant positive effect between work-life balance and turnover intention, which indicates that the higher the work-life balance experienced by individuals, the less likely they are to move other jobs. While different results were obtained by Bintang & Astiti (2016), Suifan et al. (2016), Laksono & Wardoyo (2019), there is a negative influence between work-life balance on turnover intention.

Work-Life Balance and Turnover Intention Through Job Satisfaction
Fiernaningsih et al. (2019), Nurdin & Rohaeni (2020) revealed in their research that job satisfaction significantly mediates the effect of work-life balance on intention turnover. However, Prayogi et al. (2019) provide job satisfaction is not a mediating variable.

Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction

Work Passion and Turnover Intention
Gong et al. (2018) found that harmonious passion has a negative relationship with turnover intention and obsessive passion has a positive relationship with turnover intention. Additionally, the relationship between harmonious or obsessive passion and turnover intention is mediated by subjective well-being.

Work Passion and Turnover Intention through Job Satisfaction
Research that specifically discusses the effect of work passion on turnover intention through job satisfaction found only one title. Purba & Ananta (2018) found that work passion does not directly affect turnover intention but must go through job satisfaction first so that it proves that job satisfaction has succeeded in becoming a mediating variable.

Work Passion and Job Satisfaction
Very few studies discuss work passion or passion for work on job satisfaction, starting from the 2015-2020 period. Only three research titles were found and addressed the effect of work passion on job satisfaction; this led the author to extend the existing research references from the 2010 to 2020 period. Harmonious and obsessive passion as two dimensions or factors that affect work passion on job satisfaction was found to have a positive influence relationship (Philippe
et al., 2010; Forest et al., 2011; Thorgren et al., 2013; Spehar et al., 2016; Purba & Ananta, 2018; Deepti & Shalini, 2020).

Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Azeez et al. (2016) show the results of their research that there is a significant positive relationship between employee job satisfaction and turnover intention. Whereas Wen-Rou (2016), Youcef et al. (2016), Lu et al. (2017), Fauzia (2018), Kumara & Fasana (2018), Alam & Asim (2019) have a negative effect on job satisfaction on turnover intention.

Methods

Population and Sample

The population taken is BLU (Badan Layanan Umum) and Contract employees at one of the Faculty of Universities in South Sumatra, Indonesia. Employees are divided into four parts; academic, general, finance and staffing, and student affairs. All employees were used as research respondents, but only 67 were obtained from 74 people.

Data Collection Technique

The data were collected using a questionnaire on a Likert scale with 52 statements. The questionnaire was created and designed in Google Form format that allowed it to be distributed online to the respondents due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Data Analysis Method

This research uses descriptive and quantitative analysis. The descriptive analysis serves to describe the frequency distribution of respondents' answers to variables. Quantitative analysis uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) from the SmartPLS 3 software.

Hypotheses

Based on the results of the research and the phenomena described above, the following hypotheses are:

H1: Work-life balance has a direct effect on turnover intention
H2: Work-life balance has an indirect effect on turnover intention through job satisfaction
H3: Work-life balance has an influence on job satisfaction
H4: Work passion has an influence on turnover intention
H5: Work passion has an influence on turnover intention through job satisfaction
H6: Work passion has an influence on job satisfaction
H7: Job satisfaction affects turnover intention

Conceptual Framework

Based on the hypothesis, a research framework was created which was then used as a conceptual understanding as in Figure 1 below:
Figure 1. Research Framework

Results

Descriptive Statistic

In this study, researchers obtained 67 samples from a total of 74 existing. The details can be seen in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34,33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17,91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Tenure</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Middle High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Processed Data (2020)*

Table 1 shows the characteristics of respondents in this study that the majority of respondents were male (70,15%), aged 31-35 years (34,33%), married (82,09%), worked for 1-5 years (35,82%), and had a bachelor degree (43,28%).

Quantitative Analysis
The latent variable which is formed in PLS-SEM, the indicator can be reflexive or formative. Reflexive indicators or often referred to as Mode A are indicators that are manifestations of constructs and follow the classical test theory, which assumes that the variance in the latent variable score measurement is a function of the true score plus the error. Meanwhile, formative indicators or often referred to as Mode B are indicators that define characteristics or explain constructs.

At the quantitative analysis stage, SEM-PLS requires testing before the indicators are declared to have passed the minimum loading factor limit (0.50). The first calculation can be seen in Figure 2 below:

Figure 2 shows that there are several indicators of each research variable work-life balance, work passion, job satisfaction and turnover intention which have a loading factor in the low category which is below 0.50. This causes the indicators that need to be removed from the model.

The number of indicators issued from the model is 12 out of a total of 52. Then the indicators in the figure above are issued so that they provide the following output:
**Convergent Validity**

Convergent validity was used to compare existing constructs.

**Table 2. Convergent Validity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Loading Factor</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>0,825</td>
<td>0,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>0,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>0,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W5</td>
<td>0,693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W7</td>
<td>0,546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W8</td>
<td>0,604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W9</td>
<td>0,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W11</td>
<td>0,572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work Passion</td>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0,675</td>
<td>0,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0,832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0,587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X4</td>
<td>0,788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0,699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X7</td>
<td>0,529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X9</td>
<td>0,558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>0,566</td>
<td>0,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>0,659</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>0,752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>0,612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. shows all loading factors produce values > 0.50. The lowest value is on the Z6 indicator with a value of 0.514 in the turnover intention variable. The highest loading factor value is on the W3 indicator with a value of 0.921 in the work-life balance variable. So it can be concluded that there is no convergent validity problem in the model that has been tested.

Reliability Test

Table 3. Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbachs Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Passion</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Data (2020)

Based on the results in Table 3 above, it shows that all constructs have a composite reliability value of > 0.7 and cronbach alpha value of > 0.6.

R-Square

Table 4. R-Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Data (2020)
Based on the results in the table above, it is known that job satisfaction has an r-square value of 0.569 and turnover intention of 0.531. The categorization of R-Square values is 0.67 (strong), 0.33 (moderate) and 0.19 (weak) (Chin & Marcoulides, 1998). So, based on the data in Table 4, it revealed that the job satisfaction variable could be explained by the work-life balance and work passion of 56.9%. Likewise, the turnover intention variable can be explained by the work-life balance and work passion of 53.1%.

**Path Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Passion → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Passion → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction → Turnover Intention</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Processed Data (2020)*

Hypothesis testing can be done through the bootstrapping process and the T-Statistic test parameter, which is useful for predicting and knowing the relationship between variables. The value limit for testing the hypothesis, namely the T-Statistic Factor Loadings is greater than the critical value (> 1.96), which can be seen in the following figure:

**Figure 4. T-Statistic**

*Source: SmartPLS 3 (2020)*
Table 6. T-Statistic

|                | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| JS -> TI       | -0.273              | -0.281          | 0.115                      | 2.372                    | 0.009    |
| WLB -> JS      | -0.394              | -0.396          | 0.081                      | 4.882                    | 0        |
| WLB -> TI      | 0.44                | 0.438           | 0.089                      | 4.951                    | 0        |
| WP -> JS       | 0.676               | 0.675           | 0.069                      | 9.738                    | 0        |
| WP -> TI       | -0.309              | -0.289          | 0.11                       | 2.804                    | 0.003    |
| WLB → JS → TI  | 0.108               | 0.110           | 0.050                      | 2.150                    | 0.016    |
| WP → JS → TI   | -0.185              | -0.190          | 0.081                      | 2.295                    | 0.011    |

Source: Processed Data (2020)

SEM Analysis Results and Hypothesis Testing

Table 7. SEM Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>4.951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>2.804</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>2.295</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>9.738</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>2.372</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Processed Data (2020)

Hypothesis 1 shows the T-Statistic value is 4.951 > 1.96 and the P-Value is 0 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that in the first hypothesis, there is a significant influence between the work-life balance on turnover intention. This indicates that the higher a person's work-life balance, the lower employee turnover intention. The results of this study also support what has been researched by Jaharuddin & Zainol (2019) which has a significant positive effect.

Hypothesis 2 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 2.150 > 1.96 and the P-Value is 0.016 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that in the second hypothesis, there is a significant influence between the work-life balance on turnover intention through job satisfaction. This indicates that job satisfaction can be a mediating variable between work-life balance and turnover intention so that it can reduce employee turnover intention. The results of this study also support what has been researched by Nafiudin (2015), Fiernaningsih et al. (2019), which show that job satisfaction has a significant positive effect on work-life balance on turnover intention.

Hypothesis 3 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 4.882 > 1.96 and the P-Value is 0 < 0.05, so it can be concluded that in the third hypothesis there is a significant
influence between the work-life balance on job satisfaction. This indicates that the higher the quality of the work-life balance, the higher the job satisfaction of the employees. The results of this study also support the research results of Wenno (2018), Amla & Malhotra (2019), Nurhasanah et al. (2019), who got the results of a significant positive relationship between the work-life balance on job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 2,804 > 1,96 and the P-Value is 0,003 < 0,05, so it can be concluded that in the fourth hypothesis there is a significant influence between work passion and turnover intention. This indicates that the higher the work passion, the lower the turnover intention of employees. This study's results are the first to directly provide a significant negative result between work passion and turnover intention in the last five years. Meanwhile, another study of Gong et al. (2018) gives partial results where one of the dimensions, namely harmonious passion, has a negative effect on turnover intention and obsessive passion has a positive result.

Hypothesis 5 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 2,295 > 1,96 and the P-Value is 0,011 < 0,05, so it can be concluded that in the fifth hypothesis there is a significant influence between work passion on turnover intention through job satisfaction. This indicates that job satisfaction can be a mediating variable between work passion and turnover intention so that it can reduce employee turnover intention. The results of this study also support the results of research from Purba & Ananta (2018), which gave significant positive results, even though in the last five years, there was only one study that discussed the indirect effect of work passion on turnover intention through job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 6 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 9,738 > 1,96 and the P-Value is 0 < 0,05, so it can be concluded that in the sixth hypothesis there is a significant influence between work passion and job satisfaction. This indicates that the higher the work passion, the higher the job satisfaction of employees. These results also support the research results of Spehar et al. (2016), Purba & Ananta (2018), Tarkar et al. (2019) which gave significant positive results.

Hypothesis 7 shows the T-Statistic value obtained is 2,372 > 1,96 and the P-Value is 0,009 < 0,05, so it can be concluded that in the seventh hypothesis there is a significant influence between job satisfaction on turnover intention. This indicates that the higher job satisfaction, the lower employee turnover intention will be. The results of this study also support the research results of Azeez et al. (2016), Nurdin & Rohaeni (2020) who received significant positive results between job satisfaction with turnover intention.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that each variable, namely work-life balance, work passion, job satisfaction, and turnover intention gives positive results on each relationship between variables, either directly or indirectly.

This study has several limitations. First, the number of respondents is small. Second, the places for sampling are limited. Third, this study only focuses on four variables, namely work-life balance, work passion, job satisfaction, and turnover intention.

The recommendations for future researchers include using a more significant number of respondents so that they get various results, using other research variables such as quality of work-life, leadership, workplace flexibility, workplace stress, and workplace aggression.
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