Original Research Article

****THE EFFECT OF WORKLOAD AND WORK-LIFE BALANCE ON EMPLOYEE TURNOVER INTENTION AT SWISS-BELHOTEL LAMPUNG WITH ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AS A MODERATING VARIABLE****

.

ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims:** This study aims to analyze the effect of workload and work-life balance on employee turnover intention at Swiss-Belhotel lampung **with organizational support as a moderating variable**. Specifically, this study focuses the positive or negative effect whether workload and work-life balance on employee turnover intention at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung, and the moderating role organizational support in the positive or negative effect whether workload and work-life balance on employee turnover intention.  **Study design:** Utilizing a quantitative approach a structural equation modelling (SEM) approach based on Partial Least Squares (PLS).  **Place and Duration of Study:** All Department in Swiss-Belhotel Lampung around July 2025.  **Methodology:** This study involved a sampel of 120 contract and daily worker employees at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed online via Google Forms via WhatsApp. Analysis was performed using smartPLS version 4.1.1.2 to test the proposed model and hypotheses.  **Results:** The results indicate that workload has no significant effect on turnover intention, where as work-life balance shows a positive and significant effect on turnover intention. This suggests that employees who perceive a better work-life balance may paradoxically show a higher tendency to leave. The moderation test further reveals that organizational support does not significantly moderate the relationship between workload and turnover intention. However, it significantly weakens the effect of work-life balance on turnover intention, indicating that higher organizational support can mitigate the tendency of employees to resign even when they perceive a good work-life balance. These findings emphasize the strategic importance of organizational support in managing employee retention within the hospitality sector  **Conclusion:** The results of this study indicate that workload is not a primary factor influencing employee turnover intentions. Conversely, work-life balance shows a positive relationship with turnover intentions, suggesting potential dissatisfaction or a conflict between personal values and job demands, even when employees perceive their work-life balance as adequate. Organizational support is not effective in reducing the impact of workload, it has been shown to strengthen the influence of work-life balance on turnover intentions, functioning as a compensatory mechanism when work-life balance is not optimal. |

*Keywords: Workload, work-life balance, turnover intention, organizational support, hotelier, partial least squares*

1. INTRODUCTION

The hospitality and tourism industry is characterized by a complex and highly competitive environment, where human resource management (HRM) plays a critical role in organizational success and sustainability. Unlike other large-scale industries, the primary product in the hospitality and tourism sector is the customer experience, which is largely intangible and heavily reliant on direct interactions between employees and guests. Therefore, human capital plays a pivotal role in determining service quality, customer satisfaction and loyalty, as well as other key performance indicators (Bruce Tracey, 2014).

Human resource management (HRM) is a specialized field that focuses on managing relationships and the role of people within organizational structures. In hospitality and tourism literature, strategic human resource management (SHRM) emphasizes how HR systems can generate competitive advantages. SHRM assesses how HR practices and policies—either individually or as integrated systems—can directly or indirectly affect organizational performance (Buller & McEvoy, 2012).

At Swiss-Belhotel Lampung, employee turnover peaked in April 2023 with seven employees resigning. Of these, six cited personal reasons, while the remaining one cited career or compensation-related factors. This pattern suggests that intrinsic factors such as personal motivation, job satisfaction, and work-life balance play a dominant role in employees’ decisions to leave. Nevertheless, external factors like better career opportunities or more competitive compensation continue to contribute consistently, affecting an average of one to two employees per month. These findings indicate the need for holistic retention strategies that incorporate psychological well-being and work-life quality, in addition to financial incentives and career progression (Swiss-Belhotel Lampung Internal Report, 2023).

Im et al. (2021) noted that work pressure in hotel branches operating in developing regions is often poorly managed, despite established corporate HR policies. The high levels of emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions observed at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung reflect not only the failure to adapt global policies to local contexts but also pose broader operational sustainability risks. A recent study by Lee & Ok (2022) emphasizes that in the hospitality sector, every 10% increase in turnover is correlated with a 7% decline in customer satisfaction, primarily due to service inconsistencies. This is supported by Deloitte (2023), which reported that 82% of hotel managers in Southeast Asia acknowledge that high turnover has increased the workload for remaining staff, negatively affecting service quality and customer satisfaction.

Workload refers to the physical, mental, and emotional demands placed on employees in the course of their job responsibilities (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Studies have shown that excessive workload is associated with higher intentions to leave due to job dissatisfaction and burnout (Rasool & Shafique, 2022). The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model suggests that when job demands outweigh the available resources, employees experience psychological and physiological strain, leading to increased turnover intentions (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). Poor workload management can also result in high absenteeism and low morale, which further exacerbate employee retention challenges (Park & Min, 2020).

Work schedules in the hospitality industry are irregular, with shifts that vary significantly throughout the week. Night-to-morning shift rotations are common, indicating poor sustainable workload management and creating negative spillover effects (Allen, 2010). For instance, employees working 12-hour days during peak seasons often sacrifice rest and social interaction, which heightens emotional exhaustion and strengthens the desire to leave (Chen & Lee, 2023). Emotional exhaustion can lead to conflict between work and personal life (Hochschild, 2006), reduce overall well-being (Major & Morganson, 2011), and increase psychological stress (Shankar & Bhatnagar, 2010).

Clark (2000) defines work-life balance as a state in which individuals can fulfill their responsibilities at work, home, and in society with minimal role conflict. A balanced life occurs when individuals are equally engaged and satisfied both in the time spent and psychological involvement in their work and personal roles—such as those involving partners, parents, family, friends, and community members—without significant conflict between the two domains. Individuals who prioritize work-life balance tend to place greater importance on their psychological well-being (Westman, Brough, & Kalliath, 2009).

A Deloitte (2023) survey found that 68% of younger employees in the service sector prioritize schedule flexibility over salary, highlighting the urgency for organizations to align with evolving workforce expectations. This necessitates the implementation of organizational policies rooted in perceived organizational support (POS). According to Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002), POS is the employee’s belief that the organization values their contributions and well-being. POS may serve as a moderating factor that buffers the negative effects of workload and work-life imbalance. For younger workers in service-oriented roles, flexible scheduling not only meets expectations but also reduces the spillover of work-related stress into personal life, thereby lowering turnover intentions (Zhang et al., 2022).

Based on this background, the present study investigates the effect of workload and work-life balance on employee turnover intention at swiss-belhotel lampung with organizational support as a moderating variable. The study aims to analyze how workload and work-life balance influence employee turnover intention and to examine whether perceived organizational support can moderate the effects of these two key factors.

2. methodology

**2.1 Research Design**

This study adopts a quantitative research approach, in which data are expressed numerically and analyzed using statistical methods (Malhotra, 2016). A causal research design is employed to examine the cause-and-effect relationships between workload (WL) and work-life balance (WLB) on turnover intention (TI), with perceived organizational support (POS) considered as a moderating variable.

**2.2 Data Sources**

1. Primary Data

Primary data were collected directly from the first-hand sources. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2016), the Likert scale is an effective instrument for measuring individual attitudes and perceptions, making it highly suitable for this study, which focuses on employee perceptions of their working conditions. All variables were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), assessing respondents' levels of agreement with various statements related to each construct.

2. Secondary Data

Secondary data refer to information collected and published by other parties prior to this study. Malhotra (2019) highlights several advantages of secondary data, including wide availability, cost-efficiency, and ease of access. In the context of this research on employee turnover intention at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung, secondary data were obtained from: Internal documents such as HR department reports on employee turnover rates and work-life balance policies, External publications such as academic journals on human resource management in the hospitality industry, Industry reports from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) and the Ministry of Manpower concerning employment trends in the hospitality sector.

**2.3 Data Collection Methods**

Data collection was carried out through a survey method using a structured questionnaire distributed via Google Forms. The survey method was selected for its ability to gather direct responses from participants—in this case, employees of Swiss-Belhotel Lampung—based on structured, pre-formulated questions (Malhotra, 2016).

**Table 1 Operational Definitions and Variable Measurements**

| Variable | Operational Definition | Indicators | Scale |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Workload (X₁) | The individual’s perception that the quantity, complexity, and time pressure of tasks exceed their available energy, ability, or time. (Smith et al., 2020) | Work quality: 2 items (1 & 3), Task pressure: 2 items (2 & 4) (Smith et al., 2020) | Likert 1–5 |
| Work-Life Balance (X₂) | The dynamic interaction between work and personal life that includes both interference and enhancement. Balance reflects not only the absence of conflict but also synergy. (Fisher et al., 2009) | WIPL: 5 items (1–5), PLIW: 6 items (6–11), PLEOW: 3 items (12–14), WEPL: 3 items (15–17) (Fisher et al., 2009) | Likert 1–5 |
| Organizational Support (M) | Employees’ general belief that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being. (Eisenberger et al., 2020) | Valuing contributions: 4 items (1,2,7,10), Caring about well-being: 6 items (3,4,5,6,8,9) (Eisenberger et al., 2020) | Likert 1–5 |
| Turnover Intention (Y) | Employee thoughts or intentions to leave their current job and seek alternative employment elsewhere. (Jaharuddin & Zainol, 2019) | Thinking of quitting: 1 item (1), Job search: 1 item (3), Intention to quit: 1 item (2) (Jaharuddin & Zainol, 2019) | Likert 1–5 |

**2.4 Sampling**

This study utilized a subset of the population as the sample. Proper sampling is critical to ensuring the validity and reliability of the findings (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). To ensure proportional representation, the number of employee respondents per department is as follows:

**Table 2 Sample Allocation by Department**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Sample Size** |
| Front Office | 16 |
| Housekeeping | 23 |
| Food & Beverage Service | 15 |
| Food & Beverage Kitchen | 20 |
| General Manager | 2 |
| Security | 13 |
| Finance | 8 |
| Human Resources | 2 |
| Sales & Marketing | 10 |
| Enginering | 11 |
| **Total** | **120** |

**2.5 Data Analysis Method**

This study employs a quantitative approach with two main types of analysis: descriptive analysis and causal analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with a Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM) approach. This method is selected to examine both the direct and moderating effects of workload and work-life balance on turnover intention, including the role of perceived organizational support as a moderator.

1. Measurement Model Evaluation (Outer Model)

The outer model assesses: Indicator reliability Convergent validity (Average Variance Extracted or AVE ≥ 0.7), Discriminant validity (Fornell-Larcker criterion) and Internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability ≥ 0.7) (Hair et al., 2019)

2. Structural Model Evaluation (Inner Model)

This includes: Coefficient of Determination (R²): Values greater than 0.25 are considered acceptable (Hair et al., 2019). Path Coefficient (β) and Significance: Bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples is used to test the significance. A p-value < 0.05 indicates a significant effect. Moderation Testing: The indicator product approach is used to test interaction effects. If the interaction term (X\*M) is significant (p < 0.05), then perceived organizational support is confirmed as a moderator.

3. Hypothesis Testing

If t-statistic > 1.96, then H₀ is rejected and H₁ is supported. If t-statistic ≤ 1.96, then H₀ is accepted and H₁ is not supported. Hypotheses Overview:

Direct Effects: H1: Workload (X₁) → Turnover Intention (Y). H2: Work-Life Balance (X₂) → Turnover Intention (Y)

Moderating Effects: H3: Workload × Organizational Support (X₁\*M) → Turnover Intention (Y). H4: Work-Life Balance × Organizational Support (X₂\*M) → Turnover Intention (Y).


3. results and discussion

**3.1 Results**

This study employed both descriptive analysis and Structural Equation Modeling using Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM). The evaluation followed three main phases: assessment of the measurement model (outer model), validation of the structural model (inner model), and hypothesis testing.

1. Convergent Validity Test

Convergent validity refers to the degree to which indicators of a construct correlate with the construct itself, typically measured by the loading factor. A loading value is considered high and acceptable when it exceeds 0.70. In early-stage research, a loading factor between 0.50 and 0.60 can still be accepted. If certain items show low validity, it may be due to poorly constructed statements that cause ambiguity. The researcher decided to remove invalid indicators and recalculate the model. The image below presents the recalculated PLS-SEM model:

**Picture 1 PLS Model**

Based on the recalculated results, all indicator items now have loading factors ≥ 0.7. Additionally, the AVE values in Table 4.9 increased to meet the acceptable threshold of ≥ 0.50 across all variables after removing non-compliant items. Thus, all remaining indicators are deemed valid.

2. Discriminant Validity Test

Discriminant validity was evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker Criterion, which compares the square root of the AVE for each construct with its correlations with other constructs. If the square root of AVE is greater than its correlations with other constructs, the indicators are considered valid in measuring their respective latent variables (Hair et al., 2019).

**Table 3 Fornell-Larcker Criterion**

|  | **Workload** | **Organizational Support** | **Work-Life Balance** | **Turnover Intention** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Workload** | **0.749** |  |  |  |
| **Organizational Support** | 0.628 | **0.744** |  |  |
| **Work-Life Balance** | 0.325 | 0.411 | **0.796** |  |
| **Turnover Intention** | 0.434 | 0.689 | 0.697 | **0.771** |

The table shows that the square root of the AVE for each variable (Workload, Work-Life Balance, Turnover Intention, and Organizational Support) is greater than its correlation with other variables. This indicates that each indicator can effectively predict the intended latent construct (Hair et al., 2019).

3. Reliability Test

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability. Constructs are considered reliable when Cronbach's Alpha ≥ 0.70. A value of 0.60 is also acceptable as a lower threshold for exploratory research. If the values reach or exceed 0.70, the instrument is considered reliable in measuring the intended variable (Hair et al., 2019).

**Table 4 Reliability Test Results**

| **Variable** | **Cronbach's Alpha** | **Composite Reliability** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Workload (X1) | 0.610 | 0.793 |
| Organizational Support (M) | 0.742 | 0.832 |
| Work-Life Balance (X2) | 0.721 | 0.838 |
| Turnover Intention (Y) | 0.658 | 0.814 |

As shown, all variables have composite reliability values exceeding 0.70, indicating that the constructs are reliable. Additionally, Cronbach’s Alpha values for each latent variable are all above 0.60, confirming acceptable internal consistency.

4. Coefficient of Determination (R²)

PLS evaluates the inner model using the R² value, which indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. According to Hair, R² values of 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 represent substantial, moderate, and weak explanatory power, respectively.

**Table 5 R-Square values (R2)**

| **Variable** | **R²** | **Adjusted R²** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Turnover Intention | 0.718 | 0.706 |

The R² value indicates that Workload and Work-Life Balance together explain 71.8% of the variance in Turnover Intention, with the remaining 28.2% influenced by other variables not included in this study. Thus, the model has a moderate to substantial explanatory power.

5. Path Coefficients (β) and Significance Testing

Path coefficient testing aims to determine the significance of relationships between variables. A p-value < 0.05 indicates a statistically significant relationship. Bootstrapping in PLS-SEM produced the following results:

**Table 6 Bootsrapping Test**

| **Relationship** | **Original Sample (O)** | **T-Statistics** | **P-Value** | **Significance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Workload → Turnover Intention | -0.116 | 1.750 | 0.080 | Not Significant |
| Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention | 0.490 | 4.925 | 0.000 | Significant |
| Org. Support x Workload → Turnover Intention | 0.093 | 0.964 | 0.335 | Not Significant |
| Org. Support x Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention | -0.194 | 2.170 | 0.030 | Significant |

Interpretation:

a) Workload has a negative effect (-0.116) on Turnover Intention, but the effect is not significant (p = 0.080 > 0.05).

b) Work-Life Balance has a significant positive effect (0.490) on Turnover Intention (p = 0.000 < 0.05), indicating that higher perceived balance is associated with a higher intent to leave.

6. Moderation Effect Test

a) Organizational Support × Workload → Turnover Intention: β = 0.093 (positive), p = 0.335 > 0.05 → Not significant. → Organizational Support does not significantly moderate the relationship between Workload and Turnover Intention.

b) Organizational Support × Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention: β = -0.194 (negative), p = 0.030 < 0.05 → Significant. → Organizational Support significantly moderates the effect of Work-Life Balance on Turnover Intention in a negative direction. As perceived organizational support increases, the positive effect of work-life balance on turnover intention weakens. Although work-life balance still reduces turnover intention, this effect is less pronounced when support is high.

7. Hypothesis Testing Summary

If the t-statistic ≥ 1.96 and p-value < 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted (Ha); otherwise, it is rejected.

**Table 7 Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing**

| **Hypothesis** | **T-Statistic** | **P-Value** | **Conclusion** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| H1: Workload → Turnover Intention | 1.800 | 0.080 | Not Supported |
| H2: Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention | 4.897 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H3: Org. Support × Workload → Turnover Intention | 0.895 | 0.372 | Not Supported |
| H4: Org. Support × WLB → Turnover Intention | 2.164 | 0.032 | Supported |

H1: Workload has a negative but not statistically significant effect on Turnover Intention.

H2: Work-Life Balance significantly and positively affects Turnover Intention.

H3: Organizational Support does not significantly moderate the relationship between Workload and Turnover Intention.

H4: Organizational Support significantly moderates the relationship between Work-Life Balance and Turnover Intention in a negative direction.

4. Conclusion

This study aims to examine the influence of workload and work-life balance on employee turnover intention at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung, with perceived organizational support as a moderating variable. Based on the research findings and analysis, several conclusions can be drawn.The results indicate that workload does not have a significant effect on employee turnover intention at Swiss-Belhotel Lampung. Although high workload is theoretically associated with an increased desire to leave one’s job, in the context of this hotel, workload is not perceived as a dominant factor influencing employees’ intention to resign. The findings reveal that work-life balance has a positive and significant effect on turnover intention. This suggests that the higher the perceived work-life balance, the greater the likelihood that employees will consider leaving the organization. This may reflect an underlying mismatch between personal values and job expectations, despite the perception of balance.

Organizational support does not significantly moderate the relationship between workload and turnover intention. Although the direction of the interaction suggests a slight reinforcement—meaning that perceived organizational support slightly strengthens the effect of workload on turnover intention—this effect is not statistically significant. This implies that employees may not perceive organizational support as sufficient or relevant when dealing with high levels of job demands. The study shows that organizational support significantly moderates the effect of work-life balance on turnover intention, with a negative interaction effect. This means that the higher the perceived organizational support, the weaker the influence of work-life balance on turnover intention. This finding suggests that organizational support may serve as a substitute for work-life balance in retaining employees and enhancing their loyalty to the organization.

**COMPETING INTERESTS DISCLAIMER:**

Authors have declared that they have no known competing financial interests OR non-financial interests OR personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

Allen, T. D., & French, K. A. (2023). Work‐family research: A review and next steps. Personnel Psychology, 76(2), 437–471. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12573>

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>

Bruce Tracey, J. (2014). A review of human resources management research. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 26(5), 679–705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2014-0056>

Buller, P. F., & McEvoy, G. M. (2012). Strategy, human resource management and performance: Sharpening line of sight. Human Resource Management Review, 22(1), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2011.11.002>

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades Shanock, L., & Wen, X. (2020). Perceived Organizational Support: Why Caring About Employees Counts. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 7(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012119-044917>

Fisher, G. G., Bulger, C. A., & Smith, C. S. (2009). Beyond work and family: A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14(4), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016737>

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.

Im, J., Kim, J., & Choeh, J. Y. (2021). COVID-19, social distancing, and risk-averse actions of hospitality and tourism consumers: A case of South Korea. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 20, 100566. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100566>

Jaharuddin, N. S., & Zainol, L. N. (2019). The Impact of Work-Life Balance on Job Engagement and Turnover Intention. The South East Asian Journal of Management, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.21002/seam.v13i1.10912>

Malhotra, R. (2016). Empirical research in software engineering: concepts, analysis, and applications. CRC press.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2017). Understanding Burnout. In The Handbook of Stress and Health (pp. 36–56). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch3>

Park, J., & Min, H. (Kelly). (2020). Turnover intention in the hospitality industry: A meta-analysis. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 90, 102599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102599>

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). Research Methods for Business (Seventh). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Smith, K. J., Haight, T. D., Emerson, D. J., Mauldin, S., & Wood, B. G. (2020). Resilience as a coping strategy for reducing departure intentions of accounting students. Accounting Education, 29(1), 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2019.1700140>

Wen, T. B., Theresa, C. F. H., Kelana, B. W. Y., Othman, R., & Syed, O. R. (2019). Leadership Styles in Influencing Employees’ Job Performances. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 9(9). <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v9-i9/6269>

APPENDIX

Workload (Smith et al., 2020)

1. I have more work than i can complete during my working hours.
2. I often feel that i don't have enough time to finish all my tasks at the hotel.
3. My work piles up, making it difficult for me to complete it calmly.
4. I feel overwhelmed by the amount of responsibility i have in a single workday.

**WORK-LIFE BALANCE (Fisher et al., 2009)**

1. I come home from work too tired to do things I would like to do.
2. My job makes it difficult to maintain the kind of personal life I would like.
3. I often neglect my personal needs because of the demands of my work.
4. My personal life suffers because of my work.
5. I have to miss out on important personal activities due to the amount of time I spend doing work.
6. My personal life drains me of the energy I need to do my job.
7. My work suffers because of everything going on in my personal life.
8. I would devote more time to work if it weren’t for everything I have going on in my personal life.
9. I am too tired to be effective at work because of things I have going on in my personal life.
10. When I’m at work, I worry about things I need to do outside work.
11. I have difficulty getting my work done because I am preoccupied with personal matters at work.
12. My job gives me energy to pursue activities outside of work that are important to me.
13. Because of my job, I am in a better mood at home.
14. The things I do at work help me deal with personal and practical issues at home.
15. I am in a better mood at work because of everything I have going for me in my personal life.
16. My personal life gives me the energy to do my job.
17. My personal life helps me relax and feel ready for the next day’s work.

**Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 2020)**

1. The organization values my contribution to its well-being.
2. The organization strongly considers my goals and values.
3. Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.
4. The organization really cares about my well-being.
5. The organization wishes to give me the best possible job for which I am qualified.
6. The organization cares about my general satisfaction at work.
7. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments at work.
8. The organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.
9. The organization is willing to extend itself to help me perform my job to the best of my ability.
10. The organization cares about my opinions.

**Turnover Intention (Jaharuddin & Zainol, 2019)**

1. I want to quit my job at this organization.
2. I am actively seeking employment elsewhere.
3. If an opportunity to work at another organization was available, I would leave my current organization.