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Abstract

The current study was a quantitative nonexperimental correlational study utilizing an online survey to examine the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adult U.S. workers. The present study asked two questions: (a) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers? and (b) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers? The target population for the current study was adults working in the U.S. employed in a U.S. business organization for the past full year. A representative sample of 165 individuals was provided by an online data collection company, Qualtrics. The power analysis was a two-tailed test providing an equal opportunity for both positive and negative statistically significant correlational results at the 95% confidence interval and the associated $p < 0.05$ threshold. The Pearson correlation coefficient measured the strength of the linear association between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, denoted by $r$. The current study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, attempting to discover if a correlational relationship was identified and determining the strength of these relationships utilizing Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient. Findings determined job satisfaction was significantly correlated with work-life balance, $r = .33, p < .0001$, and the relationship was positive in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance (RQ1). Additionally, findings determined job satisfaction was significantly correlated with turnover intention job satisfaction, $r = -.65, p < .0001$, and the relationship was negative in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intention (RQ2).
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

How employee feel about their jobs, the impact of work-life balance on employees, and employee turnover intention are important topics affecting employees and organizations. The current study is a nonexperimental, quantitative correlational study applying the Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory related job satisfaction to work-life balance and job satisfaction to turnover intention. Chapter 1 discusses the background of the problem, theoretical framework, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, definition of terms, research design, assumptions and limitations, and the organization of the remainder of the study.

Background of the Problem

Employees are an important part of organizations, and without effective employees, no productivity can be accomplished (Mulla, Vyas, & Hanji, 2014). Organizational effectiveness can be measured through productivity, and measuring productivity involves measuring employee contribution to attaining organizational goals. According to Amah and Ahiauzu (2013), employees demonstrate more effectiveness when they have a united vision, values, and purpose for their work. In this context, organizations have faced the challenge of determining how employees are influenced by variables such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention.

Job Satisfaction

Aziri (2011) discussed job satisfaction as one of the most important areas of study impacting managers and their ability to manage their employees. Herzberg, Mausner, and
Synderman (1959) concluded individuals experienced two different dimensions: job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction (as cited in House & Wigdor, 1967). Job satisfaction is viewed as a complex and often multifaceted concept with different meaning for different individuals (Aziri, 2011). According to Abelha, Carneiro, and Cavazotte (2018), job satisfaction is one of the most important topics in employee attitudes directly impacting employees.

Job satisfaction research can be traced back to the early 20th century with researchers such as Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) conducting a study on job satisfaction focused on satisfaction as related to worker productivity. Seminal research by Herzberg et al. (1957) concluded research on the topic of job satisfaction, as it relates to employee productivity, was warranted to determine satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job. Hofaidhillaoui and Chhinzer (2014) conducted research on job satisfaction, concluding job satisfaction is one of the most researched topics in the areas of organizational psychology and management, due to employee perception of working conditions, level of turnover, and absenteeism.

Work-Life Balance

With the increase of women in the workplace and men’s increased participation in child rearing, work-life balance is an important topic impacting employees. Women identified as the main caregivers for the family’s children, and men had the role of provider (Goldscheider, Bernhardt, & Lappegård, 2015). According to the U.S. Department of Labor (2019), participation rates for women in the workplace increased from 46.3% in 1975 to 57.0% in 2017. As more women entered the workplace, conflicts between work and family obligations became apparent. Clark (2000) determined employees have been faced with a complex relationship between work and family obligations identified as their work-life balance. Christiana and Rajan (2014) conducted research on work-life balance determining employee’s work-life balance can
have a significant impact on the ability of organizations to be effective. Yadav and Dabhade (2014) determined work-life balance is strategically important to organizations as it relates to job satisfaction experienced by employees.

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover intention was identified as a determinant of turnover (Flint, Haley, & McNally, 2013). Turnover intention is an important topic identified as the precursor to an employee making the decision to quit their present job (Haque, Fernando, & Caputi, 2019). Because turnover can be costly for organizations, and turnover intention was identified as the step before quitting, a great deal of research was conducted to understand which variables affect the decision-making process of employees who quit their jobs. Flint et al. (2013) conducted such research on variables impacting the employee decision-making process.

In this context, Huffman, Casper, and Payne (2014) determined as employees experience negative job satisfaction and the employee becomes more dissatisfied with their job, they may find avenues to resolve their dissatisfaction. One avenue could be through their intention to find a new job. According to the seminal work of Mobley (1977), the process of deciding to quit one’s job suggested employees experienced dissatisfaction and based on this dissatisfaction employees may leave their job.

Knowledge gained from analyzing the relationship between job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention helped individuals, as well as organizations, understand the importance of these relationships (Oosthuizen, Coetzee, & Munro, 2016). In this context, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention have impacted individuals, as well as organizations, and it is important to understand the correlation between these variables. It is important for organizations to identify which mechanisms can be put in place to strengthen
employee job satisfaction and work-life balance, and reduce employee turnover (Deery & Jago, 2015). The current research study identified the correlation between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, in adults working fulltime in a U.S. organization filling an important gap in the literature.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical foundations applied to the current study are Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. Herzberg’s theory presented a two-dimensional chart depicting factors that can have an effect on employees’ attitudes regarding their work, such as job satisfaction. According to Kotni and Karumuri (2018), job satisfaction can be related to salary and relationships with others, which are two of the hygiene factors identified by Herzberg. Maslow’s theory addressed how employees can achieve satisfaction with their personal needs while meeting the requirements of their work. Agarwal and Sajid (2017) identified job satisfaction as the extent to which an individual’s desires and expectations are met through their job.

Additionally, Maslow (1970) theorized individuals follow a general pattern of needs and recognition, satisfying one need before pursuing the next higher need (Maslow, 1970). According to Hays and Lou (2015), Maslow believed there is an order to how individuals satisfy their needs and if needs are satisfied, employees will participate in creating and building success for themselves. Huffman et al. (2014) determined as employees experience negative job satisfaction and the employee becomes more dissatisfied with their job, they may find avenues to resolve their negative feeling which impacts turnover intention and work life balance. Herzberg et al.’s. (1959) theory and Maslow’s (1970) theory (as cited in Uzoechi & Babatunde, 2012)
address the needs of individuals while motivating employees to demonstrate their best effort for efficient work

**Statement of the Problem**

Work-life balance has been influential for employees intending to be a part of the workforce (Jabeen, Friesen, & Ghoudi, 2018). Several studies have been conducted to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention (Gächter, Savage, & Torgler, 2013; Harhara, Singh, & Hussain, 2015). Basol and Demirkaya (2017), examined the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention, but did not include the relationship to work-life balance. The results of Basol and Demirkaya’s study concluded employees with high levels of job satisfaction were less likely to leave their jobs.

In related research, Morris, Heames, and McMillan (2011), conducted a quantitative study on work-life balance and determined work-life balance initiatives had a positive impact on employees as well as organizational metrics but did not examine the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Saeed, Waseem, Sikander, and Rizwan (2014) conducted a quantitative study examining the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. The results indicating a negative relationship. Saeed et al.’s study did not include females and did not include samples from more than one city.

The relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention was studied by Huang, Chen, Liu, and Zhou (2017) and all participants were located in China. Huang et al. identified significant differences between China and the United States; political, economic, and social, suggesting future research of these variables should include other countries. A study of job satisfaction and turnover intention in participants from the United States can fill an important gap identified by Huang et al. (2017). Haar, Russo, Suñe, and Ollier-Malaterre (2014) conducted a
Mas-Machuca, Berbegal-Mirabent, and Alegre (2016) conducted a study analyzing the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Mas-Machuca et al. suggested future research should include employees from various organizations to avoid common variance problems that can emerge from conducting studies in limited organizations. The current study utilized a nonexperimental, correlational design to identify the relationship, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working in U.S. companies filling an important gap within the literature (Haar et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2017; Mas-Machuca et al., 2016).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the current quantitative correlational study was to apply the Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory related job satisfaction to work-life balance and job satisfaction to turnover intention. The current study included three measures: the Job Satisfaction scale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983); the Work-Life Balance Scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014); and the Turnover Intention Scale of Brough and Frame, as modified by Brough et al. (2014).

Pandu and Sankar (2018) conducted a study to determine the impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction but did not including turnover intention. Pandu and Sankar’s research determined there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance. Additionally, Pandu and Sankar concluded if employees experience a better work-life balance their level of job satisfaction rises and subsequently turnover rates reduce. Organizations seeking
to implement or modify work-life balance policies towards promoting job satisfaction and reducing employee turnover intention, could benefit from the data collected from the current study. Although job satisfaction is extensively researched, the current study focused on increasing the understanding of the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working in U.S. organizations, filling an important gap within the literature (Haar et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2017; Mas-Machuca et al., 2016).

According to Islam and Ali (2013) studies on the topic of job satisfaction generated evidence of employee behavior and motivation by applying Maslow’s (1970) theory and Herzberg’s (1959) theories of motivation. Islam suggested future research should include a larger population from different types of businesses, different cultures, and different races. Conclusions from the current study, which included adults working in U. S. business for the past year, fill a gap within the literature.

Maslow’s (1970) theory is illustrated as a pyramid making Maslow’s theoretical framework useful as a means of measuring satisfaction, and in particular, job satisfaction (Udechukwu, 2009). According to Udechekwu individual needs explain behavior and behavior reflects attitude, and the study of satisfaction should be measured by a scale. Herzberg’s (1959) theory identifies satisfaction horizontally and distinguishes the different types of satisfaction. The contribution of the current study adds to the existing literature on the relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working in the U.S.
Significance of the Study

Findings from the current study could have practical implications for organizations for reducing turnover and increase understanding of the role of job satisfaction and its relationship to work-life balance and to turnover intention. Findings may assist organizations in general and human resource departments in particular to better understand the relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, and then enact policies towards obtaining and retaining the human capital assets of an organization (Batt & Colvin, 2011). With the objective of exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, the current study provides the strength of these relationships. In fact, job satisfaction is associated with the mental and physical health of employees (O’Brien et al., 2019) identifying job satisfaction as an important topic of study.

The present study advances Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory by examining the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction. Outcomes from the current study can inform the human resource management (HRM) community towards implementing policies reflect understanding of job satisfaction, reduce employee turnover, and increase understanding of work-life balance. According to Mercado (2019), Morris et al. (2011), and Saeed et al. (2014), gaining understanding of job satisfaction, turnover intention and work-life balance, organizations can implement processes to aid in the retention of the human capital of organizations.
Research Questions

The current study is a quantitative nonexperimental study utilizing a survey to determine the relationship if any between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adult U.S. workers. Two research questions were included.

RQ1. To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

RQ2. To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

Definition of Terms

Gender. A cultural term used when referring to both women and men (American Psychological Association, 2013).

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined by many researchers and is one of the most crucial topics of organizations (Kohli & Sharma, 2018). Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as how the integration of psychological, physiological and environmental conditions affects employees’ level of satisfaction. In contrast, Arasli and Baradarani (2014) defined job satisfaction as the feeling employees have when they view their job positively. Gruneberg (1979) defined job satisfaction as the emotional reaction’s employees have toward a particular job which involves fulfilling the employee’s needs. Herzberg et al.’s (1959) definition of job satisfaction can be found within the job satisfaction literature to include job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured on a 1 – 5 Likert scale, which is ordinal data. Responses ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree.

Population. The target population for the current study were adults working full time for the past year in a United States organization. Anyone under 18 years of age, self-employed,
employed for less than one year at their present job, or from outside the United States were not part of the target population and lacked eligibility to participate in the current study.

**Turnover intention.** Turnover intention was identified as the precursor to an employee making the decision to quit their present job (Haque et al., 2019). Demirtas and Akdogan (2015) defined turnover intention as the reason an employee decides to leave an organization. Turnover intention was measured on a 1 – 5 Likert scale, which is ordinal data. Responses ranged from 1 never to 5 a great deal.

**Work-life balance.** Work-life balance is defined as an individual’s perception of how well their two life roles, work life and personal life, are balanced (Braun & Peus, 2018; Haar et al., 2014). Balven, Fenters, Siegel, and Waldman (2018) defined work-life balance as the support organizations give to their employees for different aspects of their personal life. Definitions of work-life balance vary within the work-life balance literature. Some employees may view work-life balance experience as the challenge of successfully maneuvering their work and home responsibilities and others may view work-life balance as the support they receive from the organizations that employ them. Although the individual experience of work-life balance varies from individual to individual, the current studies measures asks participants questions from their experiences and not from the view of support from the organization that employees them. Work-life balance was measured on a 1 – 5 Likert scale, which is ordinal data. Responses ranged from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree.

**Research Design**

The current study is a quantitative nonexperimental correlational design to determine the relationship, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention. Nonexperimental research focuses on finding associations or linkages
between variables (Reio, 2016). Additionally, a nonexperimental correlational design is appropriate because the goal of the study was to measure the strength of the relationships between measures of job satisfaction and work-life balance, and between measures of job satisfaction and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers (Curtis, Comiskey, & Dempsey, 2016).

Quantitative research identifies trends, relationships, and behaviors in participants, not addressing the feelings of participants (Goertzen, 2017). Additionally, quantitative research quantifies and analyzes variables to determine results of statistical data (Apuke, 2017). Surveys are utilized in quantitative research by gathering information from groups or populations yielding the participants for the study. An online survey, provided by Qualtrics data collection company, was utilized in the current study. According to Sauermann and Roach (2013), online surveys can offer speed and cost advantages compared to conventional paper-based surveys. To measure the relationship between the variables job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention, the current study used three measures.

The correlational approach to the current study examined the degree of the relationships, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention. Positive and negative correlations can be determined between the variables in the study. Correlational design is utilized when examining the extent, of the relationship between two or more variables, as changes in one variable reflect a change in the other (Creswell, 2008, p. 358).

Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction scale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983); work-life balance was measured using the Work-Life Balance scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014); and turnover intention was measured using the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame, as modified by Brough et al. The measures used
in the current study concentrated on the participants own experiences in the three areas of study, job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention. Additionally, the current study provided statistical data without examining environmental, regional, or cultural factors that may have affected the studies population.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

It was assumed the U.S. population of adults working full time, for the past year in a U.S. organization was relevant to the current study. Additionally, it was assumed selecting an online data collection company for collecting the relevant data was an efficient way of contacting potential participants throughout the U.S. And, it is assumed the participants could be easily contacted via email for survey participation.

General methodological assumptions. The ontology of the current study design assumes reality can be observed and the positivist empiricist epistemology of the current study design assumes the data can be observed independent of (without influence from) the researcher. The applied axiological assumption is the data can be analyzed in a manner is free from (not influenced by) values. The methodological assumption is the constructs studied can be operationalized in a meaningful way and accurately measured (Creswell, 2013).

Theoretical assumptions. It was assumed that the theoretical foundation of Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory were appropriate as these theories have been used by other researchers conducting studies on job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention. Herzberg et al. examined job satisfaction and dissatisfaction using motivation and hygiene factors (Agarwal & Sajid, 2017; Kotni & Karumuri, 2018). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory
is often depicted as a pyramid representing five levels identified as needs; self-actualization, esteem, social needs, safety and security, and physiological needs. The pyramid represents the needs based on fulfillment, physiological needs (bottom of the pyramid) and fulfilled before safety (second level from the bottom). Once safety needs are met individuals fulfill belonging (third level from the bottom), next is esteem (second from the top), and finally self-actualization (top of the pyramid). Maslow contended that individuals are most often partially satisfied and unsatisfied with all of their wants and as individuals satisfy their needs from the bottom of the pyramid to the top, less satisfaction is achieved (Maslow, 1970).

**Topic-specific assumptions.** The review of the literature revealed the limitations and recommendations for future research. Research from 1950 - 2020 was included in the literature review of job satisfaction. Studies included in the literature review had no assumptions identified by the researchers. Research from 1970 - 2020 was included in the literature review of work-life balance. No assumptions were included within the studies reviewed for the literature review. Finally, research from 1970 - 2020 was included in the literature review of turnover intention with no assumptions identified by the researchers.

**Assumptions about measures.** Several assumptions have been identified about the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS) of Cammann et al. (1983), Work-Life Balance scale of Brough et al. (2014), and the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. utilized in the current study. First, it was assumed that the wording of the measures allowed participants to express their true perceptions, attitudes, and intentions when reading, interpreting, and answering the questions. Second, it was assumed the structure and access to the measures will have no effect on the participants attitude toward the study. Third, it is assumed the participants answers were not impacted by the wording of the
measures. Finally, it was assumed the study presented the measures accurately to the participants, void of any spelling errors.

Limitations

Design limitations. There were several limitations for the current study. First, the inclusion criteria: adults working for the past year in a U.S. company which excludes part time employees, employees under the age of 18, and employees working for global organizations with locations other than the U.S. Second, significant differences could be identified between Western countries, such as the United States and Asian countries. Third, cultural differences were not part of the current study. Culture has been analyzed by scholars through the lens of differences in cultures and the impact on organizations (Popli, Akbar, Kumar, & Gaur, 2016). Because the research sample population was limited to the U.S. and no other counties, the current study is limited by the values, culture, and work ethic of the participants of the United States.

Delimitations. The current study was limited by age and did not distinguish generational differences in the study participants. The inclusion criteria included age, 18 years or older and not by generational years. The theoretical foundation limited the current study to individual perceptions and not by culture, religion, or nationality. Part time, temporary, or self-employee individuals were not included in the participants limiting the study to full-time employees. Employees working outside of the United States were excluded from the current. The current study limited participants to working in an organization within the United States.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter 1 was an introduction to the current study that included background, problem statement, purpose, significance, research questions, research design and assumptions and limitations. Chapter 2 presents the literature review which includes methods, theoretical
orientation, review of the literature, synthesis of the findings, critique of previous research methods and summary. Chapter 3 includes the methodology, purpose, research questions and hypotheses, design, population and sample, procedures, instruments, ethical considerations, and a summary. Chapter 4 discusses the study background, description of the sample, hypothesis testing, and a summary. Finally, Chapter 5 provides the discussion, implications, and recommendations to include the summary of the results, conclusions, limitations, implications recommendations, and the conclusion.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in U. S. adult workers. Chapter 2 focuses on methods of searching: theoretical orientation, literature review, synthesis of the research findings, a critique of previous research methods, and the summary. The methods of searching include all sources supporting the information presented. The theoretical orientation includes Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. The literature review of job satisfaction spans from the 1950s to current research. The literature review of work-life balance spans from the 1970s current research, and the literature review of turnover intention spans from 1970 to current research. Seminal research is included in the literature review.

Methods of Searching

Scholarly databases such as Academic Search Premier, Business Source Complete, and ProQuest Central contained studies conducted on the topics of job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention. Job satisfaction research could be traced back to Hoppock (1935), who defined job satisfaction as the integration of psychological, physiological, and environmental conditions that affect employees’ level of satisfaction. Studies cited within the reviewed research studies were part of the review process for the current study, expanding the literature review to include not only the original research but research was linked. Job satisfaction research was contained within the database covered a period of many decades. Work-life balance research was reviewed to the seminal work of Moore and Hedges (1971), who proposed eight major conceptual categories in an attempt to analyze the quality of working life.
According to Hill, Miller, Weiner, and Colihan (1998), earlier research addressed employee’s work or the employee’s life responsibilities, it was during the 1970’s work-life balance research identified telecommuting and the changing working environment. Turnover intention researched by Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978), studied employee withdrawal behavior. Methods of searching included Business Source Complete, PsycARTICLES, Summon, and Academic Search Premier.

Additionally, the Capella library was a source for books relevant to the topics for the current study. Searching the databases was aided by the use of search words such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, turnover intention, Herzberg, Maslow, employee retention, and organizational challenges. A search of the databases provided an abundance of previous studies for review. Measuring instruments for the current study were located through the review of the literature process. The validity and reliability of the measuring instruments were verified within the literature.

**Theoretical Orientation for the Study**

The theoretical foundations applied to the current study were Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors were used by many scholars as the theoretical framework in many studies focused on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory was identified is one of the most influential theories of motivation in the behavior of management and organizational behavior (as cited in Acevedo, 2018). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory was applied along with Herzberg’s theory to support previous studies on job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention (as cited in Cooley & Shen, 2000; Okediji, Etuk, & Anthony, 2011; Udechukwu, 2009).
Herzberg’s Theory of Motivation and Hygiene Factors

Job satisfaction and employee motivation have been the topic of studies using many different theoretical foundations Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in DeShields, Kara, & Kaynak, 2005). According to Herzberg et al. (1959), two-factor motivational theory included motivators and hygiene factors to explain employee behavior. Motivator factors represented an increased level of job satisfaction and hygiene factors represented a decreased level of job dissatisfaction. Herzberg’s theory includes motivation factors and hygiene factors as represented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factors</th>
<th>Hygiene Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work itself</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of growth</td>
<td>Policies and administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Motivation factors increase job satisfaction, hygiene factors decrease job satisfaction.*

Herzberg et al. (1959) believed work filled the lives of individuals. Herzberg et al. developed the theory of motivation and hygiene factors presenting two factors relate to job dissatisfaction and job satisfaction of the most absorbing topics of discussion. Motivators include “recognition, achievement, growth opportunities, responsibility, and work itself” (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 44). Hygiene factors included “salary, company policies, supervision, working conditions, status with the organizations, interpersonal relations, and job security” (Herzberg et
al., 1959, p. 46). Herzberg believes as motivator factors increased, so job satisfaction increased. Additionally, Herzberg proposed as hygiene factors decreased job dissatisfaction would decrease as well.

Research studies on job satisfaction have applied Herzberg’s two-factor theory as the theoretical foundation for their studies because Herzberg (1959) focused on satisfaction and dissatisfaction to explain changes in individual attitudes (Khanna, 2017). Research conducted by Khann applied Herzberg’s two-factor theory and determined both motivation and hygiene factors were significantly and positively related to job satisfaction. The current study was a quantitative nonexperimental correlational design applying Herzberg’s two-factor theory to determine the extent of the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Motivators. Recognition coming from a supervisor, a manager, a client, a professional colleague, a peer, or the general public could include negative recognition, such as criticism and/or blame, identifying first and second level recognition (Herzberg et al., 1959). The reasons employees experience good or bad feelings toward their jobs were listed as first-level recognition (Herzberg et al., 1959). These acts of recognition with no concrete reward, such as a promotion or wage increase were identified as second-level recognition (Herzberg et al., 1959). Herzberg suggested the act of recognition could be identified as the successful completion of a job, vindication, seeing the results of one’s work, or solutions to problems.

Herzberg et al. (1959) discussed negative achievement as a failure or the absence of achievement and environmental competitiveness influences an employee’s pursuit of goals and behaviors in achievement situations (as cited in Elliot, Jury, & Murayama, 2018). Growth opportunities include the possibility for advancement within the organization, taking a position
within the organization which was previously unavailable, or the opportunity to advance within the same job at a higher skill level (Herzberg et al., 1959). Ohunakin, Adeniji, Oludayo, and Osibanjo (2018) suggested various strategies for retaining employees and offering strategies for adequate growth opportunities, attempting to minimize and overcoming the alarming rate of employee turnover.

Responsibility includes the employee acknowledging satisfaction from assigned responsibility for their work, or the work of others, or given a new set of responsibilities (Herzberg et al., 1959). According to Herzberg et al., loss of satisfaction or experiencing a negative attitude toward one’s job can stem from a lack of responsibility. Herzberg et al. identified company policy and administration as factors impacting an employee’s authority and the authority the employee needs to complete their job requirements. The current study assessed the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention. If job satisfaction is significantly related to work-life balance and turnover intention, the human resource management community can implement policies reflect understanding of job satisfaction, reduce employee turnover and increase understanding of work life balance.

Herzberg et al. (1959) included work itself and task-related events such as interesting, difficult, or boring. Herzberg et al. discussed work when applied to the employee discussing the actual duties involved in completing their job or task and identified their job as one source for positive or negative feelings. According to Herzberg et al. advancement was either positive or negative, positive advancement included expected or unexpected promotion and negative advancement would include not receiving an expected promotion.

Herzberg et al. (1959) discussed advancement when the status or employee position changed within the organization. Additionally, employees transferred to a different division of
the organizations, with increased opportunities and responsibility, considered the transfer an advancement in their employment status (Herzberg et al., 1959). According to McComiskey et al. (2018) creating career advancement opportunities increases satisfaction.

**Hygiene factors.** Salary includes any area of work that incorporates events that wages play a role in, promoting an employee’s work performance and willingness, and as hygiene factors maintain the employees’ current level of work performance (Herzberg, 1968). Additionally, policymakers and managers should examine their approach to policies and practices concerning salary distribution. According to Sengupta and Yoon (2018), not all pay, dispersion is detrimental or undesirable, policies and procedures should focus on upholding the perception of fairness and equity rather than indiscriminately reducing pay distribution.

Company policies include organizational management lines of communication addressing situations when employees are unclear who is their supervisor or if company policy is not followed due to the inadequate organization of work tasks (Herzberg et al., 1959). According to Herzberg et al., personnel policies involve the beneficial effects of the policies, and when viewed as inadequate, are ineffective.

Working conditions include the work area itself, the amount of work required to complete, or having adequate facilities available for completing the work, adequacy of ventilation, lighting, space, tools, and environmental characteristics (Herzberg et al., 1959). Included in Herzberg’s hygiene factors is the employee’s status with the organization identified by perks or authority within the organization and interpersonal relations with co-workers, supervisors or customers. Herzberg et al. suggested job security or insecurity of employees is identified by how the employee feels about their job or their view of how secure their job is.
King (1970) contended a correlational study examined relationships between job satisfaction and job factors, and their contributions toward Herzberg’s satisfaction and dissatisfaction terms, by measuring job satisfaction and individual job factors. Herzberg’s theory is the foundation for research on job satisfaction and retention. The seminal study of DeShields et al. (2005) concluded the individual level of satisfaction was determined by their experience. Additionally, Herzberg’s theory focused on satisfaction as well as aligning organizational processes and procedures (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2004). Extensive research on job satisfaction had included the theoretical foundation of Herzberg’s two-factor theory (Alfayad, & Mohd Arif, 2017; Babayi & Ijantiku, 2016; Sikowo, Namusong, Makokha, & Nyagechi, 2016; Suleman & Hussain, 2018).

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs Theory**

Maslow (1970) formulated a positive theory of motivation from clinical experiences. Maslow formulated the theory of motivation in the “functionalist tradition of James and Dewey and is fused with the holism of Wertheimer, Goldstein, and Gestalt psychology and with the dynamism of Freud, Fromm, Horney, Reich, Jung, and Adler” (p. 15). Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory included five categories of needs “physiological needs, safety needs, needs of belonging, esteem needs, and self-actualization” (as cited in Gibson & Petrosko, 2014, p. 6). Hong, Alison, While, and Barriball (2005) suggested Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory addressed the fulfillment of employee needs. Hong et al. included physical and psychological needs within the working environment to meet the needs of employees.

According to Maslow (1970), the theoretical discussion about the hierarchy of needs theory can give the impression as one need is satisfied, another need emerges. Maslow contended most members of society are partially satisfied in all of their basic needs, and partially satisfied
in all of the other needs as well, with a decreasing percentage of fulfillment as the individual goes up the pyramid (p. 28). Maslow’s theory is widely discussed as a theory of motivation contending if an individual were to focus on work alone, their life satisfaction would not be fulfilled (Smith, 2010). Smith based the studies theoretical foundation on Maslow’s theory, concluding to achieve a healthy life satisfaction, work-life balance was necessary. The five categories of Maslow’s theory depicted in Figure 1.

![Hierarchy of needs pyramid](image)

*Figure 1. Hierarchy of needs pyramid. (Maslow, 1970).*
Review of the Literature

Job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention are included in the literature for past decades in an attempt to verify and identify the impacts these variables have on employees and organizations (Cho & Song, 2017; Takrim & Siddiq, 2016; Tlaiss & Mendelson, 2014). Both qualitative and quantitative research designs are part of current and past studies, as well as many theoretical foundations. Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory will be reviewed as they were applied to past research and the current study. Although previous research applied these theories, it is important to examine gaps in the literature. The literature review will include information on the literature for job satisfaction, from the 1950s current research, work-life balance from the 1970s to current research, and turnover intention from the 1970s to current research.

Job Satisfaction

Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as the integration of psychological, physiological and environmental conditions affect employees’ level of satisfaction. Gruneberg (1979) characterized job satisfaction as the emotional reaction’s employees have toward a particular job and satisfaction involves fulfilling the employee’s needs. Arasli and Baradarani (2014) defined job satisfaction as the feeling employees have when they view their job positively.

As the literature progressed through the decades, definitions, as well as the job satisfaction research evolved. With the workforce changing with each generation, organizations identified challenges within the business environment. One challenge was examining and understanding job satisfaction and how it was affecting the workforce. Review of the job satisfaction literature took a historical look at the literature from past decades to the present.
1950 – 1959. According to Brayfield and Rothe (1951), the business organization’s interest in job satisfaction and the moral of their employees was increasing. Seminal research on job satisfaction demonstrated an interest in determining how job satisfaction affects employees as well as organizations. Brayfield and Rothe created an index of job satisfaction in an attempt to describe the construction and validation of a quantitative index of job satisfaction.

Seminal research from Schaffer (1953) developed a theoretical conceptualization of job satisfaction. Schaffer determined understanding the human factors are present in the workplace, particularly in the areas of employee adjustment to their work environment and satisfaction, were of interest to social scientists. Results from Schaffer’s study indicated employees could not identify the strengths of their needs. Job satisfaction was identified as one of the employee relations problems as Herzberg et al. (1959) began to ask, “What do people want?” (p. xvii).

Determining what employees wanted was important as employees spent the majority of their time at work. According to Herzberg et al. (1959), industries wanted to know if employee attitudes toward their job had any effect on the employee’s job performance and willingness to continue working. Herzberg et al. conclusion the focus of employee relations problems within organizations would continue through the sixties and seventies. Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included; measures of and general job satisfaction (Brayfield, Wells, & Strate, 1957), job satisfaction and job survival (Weitz & Nuckols, 1955), sales success and job satisfaction (Pearson, Barker, & Elliott, 1957), and effect of job satisfaction upon employee attitudes (Anikeeff, 1957).

Research conducted during the decade of the 50s focused on employee attitudes, how they felt about their jobs, and how and if feelings were connected to job performance. The present study examined relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job
satisfaction and turnover intention to determine if a significant relation could be identified and the strength of those relationships. Researching job satisfaction continued into the decade of the 1960s.

**1960 – 1969.** Concerns about attitudes of employees were evident in the vast amount of literature on job satisfaction conducted during the 1960s. Researchers continued to investigate the link between employee job satisfaction and productivity. Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer (1966) conducted a quantitative study to determine issues and problems have been identified from studying job satisfaction. Research from Fournet et al. identified some confusion and complexity in the job satisfaction area of study. The confusion and complexity included the failure to identify specific populations and identification of the different participants used in studies of job satisfaction Fournet et al.

Lawler and Porter (1967) conducted a quantitative study determining job satisfaction was important because it influenced employee turnover. Blood’s (1969) study measured differences in an individual’s work values with job satisfaction as an outcome of these differences. Outcomes from Blood’s research suggested management should discover if changes in employee work values are affected by the changes in the employee’s job satisfaction and performance.

Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included; sex differences and job satisfaction (Hulin & Smith, 1964), organizational climate and job satisfaction (Friendlander & Margulies, 1969), intrinsic and extrinsic factors in job satisfaction (Wernimont, 1966), and work and motivation (Vroom, 1964). The current study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship and the strength of the relationships filling an important gap in the literature. With the continuing interest in the topic of job satisfaction,
research on job satisfaction and its relation to many areas of study continued in the decade of the 1970s.

**1970 – 1979.** During the 1970s, job satisfaction literature focused on the working environment, employee demographics and employee turnover intention. Carrell and Elbert (1974) conducted a quantitative study to identify variables, both personal and organizational, were determinants of job satisfaction. The present study identified the significant variables had the largest effect on job satisfaction such as the age of the employee home as well as their home environment. Hunt and Saul (1975) conducted a study to examine the relationships between age and job satisfaction in both male and female employees. Conclusions from Saul’s research determined it was impractical to develop a simple statement describing the relationships between job satisfaction and employee age as well as tenure in an organization. Hunt and Saul recommended future research should be conducted over a longer period of time to determine how job satisfaction changes as employees age and increase their tenure with the organization.

Mobley (1977) conducted a study to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. Mobley’s study suggested if the cost of quitting were high for the employee, or the prospects of new employment were low, the employee may have less motivation to quit their current job. Mobley suggested additional research was needed to address some or most of the step’s employee experience in the turnover intention process. According to Wild (1970), there is a significant relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention and identifying job dissatisfaction could be a step before remedial action. Seminal research by Porter and Steers (1973) suggested job satisfaction was an important predictor of turnover and turnover intention was an important topic had been identified as the precursor to an employee deciding to quit their current job.
Herzberg’s two-factor theory presented factors that contribute to an employee’s job satisfaction and dissatisfaction identified as Hygiene’s. Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included relationships between job satisfaction and organizational climate (Churchill et al., 1976; Schneider & Snyder, 1975), organizational communication and job satisfaction (Muchinsky, 1977), individual needs, job satisfaction, and performance (Downey, Hellriegel, Slocum, & John, 1975). Job satisfaction research continued in the 1980s expanding into areas examining employee job performance and turnover intention.

1980 – 1989. As the decade of the 1980s began, job satisfaction research expanded into many different areas of study. Research examining the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance was identified in the literature. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) conducted a quantitative study to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky’s study concluded job satisfaction and job performance were related, questioning the assumptions high levels of job satisfaction translated into high levels of job performance. According to Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, thirty years before their study, organizational theorists endorsed the idea a happy worker was a productive worker.

As research identified the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, researchers expanded areas of research on job satisfaction, such as turnover intention. Chalykoff and Kochan (1989) conducted a study to determine the impact of monitoring of employee job satisfaction and turnover intention. Results from Chalykoff and Kochan’s study identified some employees experience a negative experience of monitoring, but for other employees, the negative experience was mitigated by feedback and the appraisal process.

Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included; organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover (Johnston, Varadarajan, Futrell, & Sager, 1987), unemployment and
job satisfaction (Carsten & Spector, 1987), and job switching and job satisfaction (Akerlof, Rose, Yellen, Ball, & Hall, 1988). During the decade of the 1980s research on job satisfaction expanded into areas to include examining productive workers, as well as organizational commitment. These topics of research continued into the decade of the 1990s.

1990 – 1999. Research conducted by Mathieu and Farr (1991) was a quantitative study, of 194 participants, which investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Findings from Mathieu and Farr’s study provided evidence of discriminant validity between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Judge and Watanabe (1993) pursued a qualitative study to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Judge and Watanabe’s seminal research came to the conclusion a positive relationship existed between life satisfaction and job satisfaction. These authors suggested future research should build on these results and investigate the cognitive processes involved in the relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

Adams, King, and King (1996) engaged in a study to examine the relationships work-family conflict with job and satisfaction. Adams et al.’s seminal research was a quantitative study included 164 participants (400 questionnaires were sent out with a 41% response rate) indicating a positive relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction, as job satisfaction levels increased, the levels of job involvement increased as well.

Transformational leadership and its relationship to job satisfaction is of interest to researchers. Medley and Larochelle (1995) conducted a quantitative, correlational study included 122 participants. The goal of Medley and Larochelle’s research was to identify the relationship between the head nurse leadership style to the staff nurse’s job satisfaction. Results
indicated the nursing staff perceived the head nurse’s leadership style to be both transactional and transformational.

Medley and Larochelle’s study did not find a significant relationship between transactional leadership and job satisfaction. Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included overall job satisfaction (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997), job satisfaction and age (Oswald & Warr, 1996), work-life conflict and job-life satisfaction relationship (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), determinants of employee job satisfaction (Agho, Mueller, & Price, 1993), and turnover intention and job satisfaction (Hom & Griffeth, 1991). Research on job satisfaction expanded during the decade of the 1990s and the literature continued onto the decade of the 2000s.

2000 – 2020. The review of the literature over the past 20 years brought new directions for job satisfaction research and how it related to employees. With changes in society, the number of individuals responsible for both home and work increased (Clark, 2000). Seminal research performed by Saari and Judge (2004), utilizing a quantitative methodology, analyzed the interplay between employee job satisfaction and the employee’s life satisfaction. These researchers identified three relationships between job satisfaction and the employee’s life satisfaction. First, spillover occurred when the employee’s job experiences spill over into their non-working live, and life experiences spilling over into the employee’s work life. Second, job and personal life are separate and have little to no intersection. Third, employees seeking to compensate for feeling dissatisfied in their job and seeking fulfillment and happiness through their personal life. Malik, Saleem, and Ahmad (2010) pursued a study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance.
These authors concluded most progressive organizations recognized the issues employees face related to work and family responsibilities. One key finding was work-life balance was identified as a major contributor toward the job satisfaction of the research participants. Wnuk (2017) determined an employee’s private and work life exerts influence over the decisions and choices they make. With the changing demographics of the workplace and increasing numbers of women in the workforce, research expanded to examine challenges employees face balancing both work and home responsibilities.

Research on job satisfaction continued to consider the relationship between job satisfaction, as it relates to productivity. Additionally, research continued to investigate the relationship between turnover intention and work-life balance. According to Tlaiss and Mendelson (2014), the importance of job satisfaction can be found through the effect on employees and organizational productivity. Job satisfaction research examined the different areas for employees and organizations, focusing on individual demographics and the employees’ job. Tlaiss and Mendelson engaged in a quantitative study to determine the impact of age, education, tenure, marital status, and religious affiliation on women manager’s job satisfaction. Results indicated job satisfaction was related to age, religious affiliation, and tenure.

Not only were researchers examining individual demographics of employees, job satisfaction research was beginning to link job satisfaction to the employee’s job. Wnuk (2017) initiated a quantitative study to determine if organizational support and perceived supervisory support impacted employee’s job satisfaction. Results indicated the levels of job satisfaction were impacted by the attitudes of supervisors. In this context, job satisfaction research was moving into multiple areas of employee’s work and home life as well as the organization as a whole.
Job satisfaction was identified as a problem associated with recruitment and retention of employees (Hong, et al., 2005). According to Hong et al., although many reasons have been presented for employee turnover, job satisfaction was identified as one of the most frequently attributed to turnover intention in the literature. Addressing the topic of job satisfaction, Kianto, Vanhala, and Heilmann (2016) suggested if organizations ensure fair and satisfactory performance appraisals, reward systems as well as benefits, it is possible to increase job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is an important topic for organizations to recognize, not only because it is one of the most researched topics, but it is continually studied since the 1930s.

Research on job satisfaction and its relationship to employee turnover intention is the focus of many studies. Agarwal and Sajid (2017) conducted a quantitative study examined two relationships job satisfaction and turnover intention, and organizational commitment and turnover intention. Results revealed job satisfaction was a strong predictor of turnover intention. The role of job satisfaction in an employee’s turnover intention can be found throughout the literature (Simone, Planta, & Cicotto, 2018; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016; Zhang, W., Meng, Yang, & Liu, 2018). Chen, Ployhart, Thomas, Anderson, and Bliese (2011) identified retention of key employees as a critical issue for organizations.

Job satisfaction research included the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement, job satisfaction, and psychological contract breach. Rayton and Yalabik (2014) initiated a study to determine if the employee’s feelings of resource loss have any impact on their work engagement, and ultimately impact on the employees’ level of job satisfaction. Rayton and Yalabik’s study concluded work engagement is more present in the workplace as the employee’s experience of job satisfaction. Lu et al. (2016) lead a quantitative study to investigate if an employee’s position with the organizations had any influence on their work engagement, job
satisfaction, and turnover intention. Findings from Lu et al.’s study indicated supervisors experienced a higher level of work engagement and a lower turnover intention than employees with jobs having less authority.

Nyberg (2010) conducted a quantitative study of 12,545 employees and examined the influences of employee perception, objective rewards, and job opportunities on the performance and voluntary turnover relationship. Results suggested company policies and external job opportunities were related to the employee’s performance-voluntary turnover relationship. A second result from Nyuberg’s study suggested the growth of pay is independent of job satisfaction influence on voluntary turnover.

Singh and Loncar (2010) executed a quantitative study, of 200 registered nurses, to investigate the relationship of the three variables; pay satisfaction, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Results from Singh and Loncar’s study indicated satisfaction with pay had some effect on the employee’s turnover intention, and job satisfaction was more crucial in terms of employee turnover. Job satisfaction research focused on turnover intention because employee turnover intention impacts actual turnover.

Kanwar, Singh, and Kodwani (2012) conducted a quantitative study of 313 IT and ITES sector of employees, to determine the impact of gender and industry background on job satisfaction, turnover intention, and organizational commitment. Results showed the IT employees demonstrated lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment when compared to the ITES participants. When analyzing the gender segment of the responses, males showed a significantly higher level of job satisfaction and lower turnover intention than the female participants. Kanwar et al. suggested future research should include a longitudinal inquiry into
the nature of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and their impact on turnover intention.

Job satisfaction research examined employee personality and job satisfaction. Törnroos, Jokela, and Hakulinen (2019) embarked on a quantitative study to determine if the personality of an employee matches the established model personality of the job. The conclusions from Törnroos et al’s study revealed similar personalities to others in their field experience a higher level of job satisfaction. Steel, Schmidt, Bosco, and Uggersley (2019) ran a quantitative, correlational study to determine the extent to which an employee’s personality affects their perception of job satisfaction and life satisfaction. Results indicated personality traits accounted for approximately 10% of the variance in job satisfaction, affecting the variance in the life satisfaction data.

Furnham, Eracleous, and Chamorro-Premuzic (2009) initiated a quantitative study to investigate the extent to which personality and demographic variables contribute to employee job satisfaction and employee motivation relating to Herzberg’s two-factor theory. Results indicated significant predictors of job satisfaction were job status and conscientiousness, with 11% of job status and 13% of conscientiousness contributing to personality variables. Several additional studies on employee personality and job satisfaction reviewed (Ahmad, Jasimuddin, & Kee, 2018; Avery, Smillie, & Fife-Schaw, 2015; Aydogmus, Metin Camgoz, Ergeneli, & Tayfur Ekmekci, 2018; Smith, Patmos, & Pitts, 2018).

The literature on job satisfaction indicated many studies have been in the area of work-life balance and its relationship to job satisfaction. Padma and Reddy (2014) conducted a quantitative study of 54 participants to identify the impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction. These authors believed job satisfaction was the driving force for employees to
perform their job and continue working for the organization. Analysis of their data found employees perceived their job satisfaction equally, regardless of experience or age. Additionally, the data indicated work-life balance was a predictor of job satisfaction with the participants.

Employees are considered to be a very important part of an organization’s strategic resources because they contribute to the success of the organization. Additionally, employee satisfaction, as it relates to their job, can be a source for the organization’s competitive advantage (Rama Devi & Nagini, 2013). Rama Devi and Nagini completed a quantitative study of 103 employees, to determine the impact of work-life balance and burnout on the employee’s job satisfaction. Results indicated job satisfaction was positively related to work-life balance, and work-life balance was a predictor of the employee’s job satisfaction.

A similar quantitative study by Mauno, Kinnunen, and Feldt (2012) examined work-family culture and job satisfaction to highlight the work-family culture and its link to job satisfaction. Results indicated females with children benefited from higher levels of work-family support than their male counterparts, and high work-family support increased job satisfaction in females more than males. Additional areas of research on job satisfaction included; work-life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health (Haar et al., 2014), stress and job satisfaction (Christiana & Rajan, 2014), and job and family involvement for job and family satisfaction (Konradt & Garbers, 2016). The historical review of job satisfaction from the 1950s to the decade of the 2000s addressed areas of interest to both employees and organizations.

**Work-Life Balance**

Work-life balance is defined as an individual’s perception of how well their two life roles, work-life, and personal life are balanced (Haar et al., 2014). Balven et al. (2018) defined work-life balance as the support organizations give to their employees for different aspects of
their personal life. According to Haar et al., employee’s perceptions of their work-life balance can be affected by the amount of time they have to respond to life and work requirements such as flexibility in the workplace and how supported they feel in the workplace.

Grawitch, Maloney, Barber, and Mooshegian (2013) stated, when employees experience a high level of work-life balance, they are experiencing compatibility between their work and home life. Work-life balance addressed employees who maintain a job and family responsibilities. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2011), in 1970 there were 140 million United States eligible workers excluding those individuals who were in prison or the active military. More women were entering the workforce as family demands changed.

1970 – 1979. In 1970, 72.8 million women were living in the United States. Of these, 29.7 million (41%) were employed (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011), which may have created challenges in balancing work and family obligations. According to Moore and Hedges (1971), most employees experience the problem of dissatisfaction with working life. Moore and Hedges (1971) proposed eight major conceptual categories in an attempt to analyze the quality of working life. Some of the categories identified were; compensation, working conditions, opportunity for development, future opportunity, and social integration. Moore and Hedges anticipated the 1970s will reflect the same levels of change in leisure time and income as the 1960s, anticipating changes in organizational conditions will progress slower than employee’s expectation of change.

Pleck (1976) wrote a paper addressing work and family life, identifying developments in family and labor history make it possible to examine the link between these two important areas of an employee’s life. Pleck contends a two system of work had been around since 1900, as two-
thirds of families living in the United States earned their living from farming their land. At the same time, household production, as well as factory work coexisted.

With many avenues for family support, many worked from home to construct products for manufactures to sell, such as sewing clothing (Pleck, 1976). Pleck contends as individuals reconcile managing home and work life, it was important for social historians to examine how employees moved between and manage the demands of both worlds. Additional areas of research on work-life balance included class mobility in Britain (Goldthorpe & Llewellyn, 1977), working-class jobs, (Ferree, 1976) and, job stress and employee behaviors (Gupta & Beehr, 1979).

1980 – 1989. In 1980, 88.3 million women were living in the United States. Of these, 42.1 million (48%) were employed (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). Seminal research by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) stated the work-life interface could be viewed as a conflict employee may experience when managing both roles, work, and home. Greenhaus and Beutell’s study identified some sources of conflict between the employee’s work role and family role. Greenhaus and Beutell identified several kinds of conflict employees experienced when balancing both work and home responsibilities such as role conflict, inter-role conflict, work-family conflict, time-based conflict, strain-based conflict and, behavior-based conflict. These researchers suggested future research should examine; pressures employees experience from both work and family role, self-perceptions of the requirements from both roles, if role salience is positively related to the conflict between the two roles, and if role salience moderates the relationship between the two roles.

Work-life balance research examined the many areas affecting employees. One such area was technology and working from home. Shimar and Salomon (1985) wrote a research paper
addressing the changing technology and the opportunity for individuals to work from home. Additionally, they addressed employee’s work experience and its relevance to their quality of life, the differences between working from home and working at a site, and consequences for employees who transition from working out of the home to working from the home.

Examining the employee’s quality of work, the outcome of the study by Shimar and Salomon (1985) concluded the work-from-home arrangement may improve the employee’s quality of life, under some circumstances. Additional areas of research on work-life balance included; women, gender research on work-family stress (Baruch, Biener, & Barnett, 1987), and relations between work and life (Sorcinelli & Near, 1989). The work-life balance research conducted during the 1980s included many areas of study which examined the employee’s work-life balance experience. These areas of study continued to appear in the research in the decade of the 1990s.

1990 – 1999. In 1990, 98.8 million women were living in the United States. Of these, 53.7 (54%) were employed (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). With the increased number of women entering the workforce, work-life balance research addressed how organizations were reacting to the challenges facing employees. Zedeck and Mosier (1990) believed the workforce was changing and would continue to change into the year 2000. These researchers published a paper addressing work-life balance issues such as family-responsive policies which include flextime schedules for employees as well as leave programs, such as maternity or parental leave. Additionally, child and dependent care and alternative work schedules were examined (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990).

Conclusions addressed the responsibility for employee work-family issues. Although organizations attempted to implement policies and programs to assist employee’s work-life
challenges, Zedeck and Mosier identified costs for these programs could be readily identified but it was unclear how profits were impacted.

Research on work-life balance took a different direction when employer involvement in an employee’s work-life balance issues began to appear in the literature. Goodstein (1994) wrote a research paper addressing employer involvement in the work and family issues of employees which included determinants of employer involvement. These determinants could be attributed to the cause, control, and context of employer involvement (Goodstein, 1994). Some responses organizations implemented were in the area of child care benefits and workplace flexibility.

According to Goodstein (1994), the research contributed to the development of a theoretical framework which included insight into how organizations conform to institutional expectations. Additional areas of research on work-life balance included; the future of gender and organizations (Acker, 1998), technology in the workplace (Stokes, 1996), reducing work/home conflicts (Kushnir, Malkinson, & Kasan, 1996), and virtual office aspects of work and work/life balance (Hill et al., 1998). Work-life balance research conducted during the 1990s examined many areas of study can have an impact on employee work-life balance. Work-life balance research continued into the next decade.

2000 – 2020. In 2000, 110.6 million women were living in the United States. Of these, 63.6 million (58%) were employed (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). Work-life balance researchers attempt to answer the question, Can I have a life and a career? (Lyness & Judiesch, 2008). Lyness and Judiesch (2008) initiated a quantitative study, which included 9,627 participants in 33 countries, to determine if managers with perceived high work-life balance would be more or less likely to achieve advancement in their careers, than managers with less perceived work-life balance. Data from Lyness and Judiesch’s study revealed managers with
higher levels of work-life balance, achieved a higher level of advancement than managers who perceived less work-life balance. Research on work-life balance considered the connection between employees’ level of work-life balance and turnover. Lyness and Judiesch (2008) discovered higher levels of perceptions of work-life balance were positively related to the potential for career advancement.

Employees with high levels of education and/or experience were part of the cognitive structure of the organization employed them (Cegarra-Leiva, Sánchez-Vidal, & Cegarra-Navarro, 2012). Cegarra-Leiva et al. conduct a quantitative study of 149 managers to determine the relationship between the employee’s dissatisfaction with their current job, turnover rates, and work-life balance initiatives, as they affect job satisfaction. Finding from the study conducted by Cegarra-Leiva et al. indicated the presence of a work-life balance culture had a greater effect on job satisfaction than the availability of work-life balance practices.

Darcy, McCarthy, Hill, and Grady (2012) oversaw a quantitative study of 729 employees from 15 organizations, to determine if and how work-life balance was affected. Any changes impacting the many diverse career stages, distinguished by age, were observed. Findings suggested employees are concerned about work-life balance at every stage of their employment. Darcy et al.’s study was important because it concluded employees without children were impacted as well as employees with children. Work-life balance literature indicated the workforce was changing and had been changing for the past 40 years.

With increasing numbers of women in the workforce, work-life balance research expanded into the family status and work attitudes of employees. De Janasz, Forret, Haack, and Jonsen (2013) conducted a quantitative study, of 454 employees, to determine differences in attitudes of employees with and without families. Findings indicated employees who did not
utilize work-family benefits had a more favorable view of these benefits than those employees who needed or used them.

The literature on work-life balance indicated organizational success depended on employee performance, which in turn depended on several factors (Christiana & Rajan, 2014). Christiana and Rajan contend one such factor is the employee’s ability to balance their work and family success, at the job site, and enjoyment of their family life. Addressing concerns about work-life balance from both employees and organizations, Christiana and Rajan initiated a quantitative study, of 313 participants, to examine how job satisfaction was impacted by both work-life balance and job stress. Findings indicated job satisfaction and work-life balance were positively related and determined work-life balance was found more in the executives, and more in males than females. Over the past 40 years, an increasing number of females have entered the workforce. Christiana & Rajan discovered that work-life balance impacted males on the job more than females.

The research examined relationships between work-life balance, job performance and turnover intentions of employees. Asiedu-Appiah, Mehmood, and Bamfo (2015) conducted a qualitative study, interviewing 100 participants, to determine the effects of work-life balance policies and practices on the performance and turnover intention of employees. Results confirmed that employees were having difficulty balancing both work and life responsibilities wanting help to achieve balance. According to Asiedu-Appiah et al., employees believe that if they received help balancing work and life responsibilities, their job performance would increase.

A review of the work-life balance literature revealed organizations attempted to implement policies to help employees maneuver their two worlds (Butts, Casper, & Yang, 2013;
Deery & Jago, 2015; Lewis, 2010; Luci-Greulich, A. & Thévenon, 2013). Dizaho, Salleh, and Abdullah (2017) wrote a paper addressing work-life balance and flexible work schedules. The goal of Dizaho et al.’s paper was to broaden the existing knowledge from scholars, experts in the field, and authors. The literature review revealed the many avenues employees, as well as organizations, have utilized to help achieve effective means for employees to balance work and home obligations. Dizaho et al. determined that aids in successfully implementing a work-life balance included employees’ ability to work from home, the opportunity for job sharing, and telecommuting.

Research on work-life balance took a broader view as Chandra (2012) lead a qualitative study, to compare and contrast work-life balance from an eastern and western perspective of 50 multinational organizations and 50 organizations located in India. Chandra’s study opened the possibility of different cultures addressing the work-life balance challenge, concluding the majority of literature addressing the work-life balance topic originated from Anglo-Saxon and West European countries. According to Chandra, western countries presented differences in precept and practice while Asian countries largely attributed the work-life balance movement more to women than men.

Work-life balance in the mediating role of job satisfaction is the basis for Orkibi and Brandt’s (2015) quantitative study of 108 participants. Orkibi and Brandt acknowledged increasing attention is being paid to factors associated with positive outcomes from managing both work and family responsibilities which include employee’s life satisfaction, optimism, and self-esteem. These authors identified that few studies have examined work-life balance as a mediator, and suggested for future research to include analyzing work-life balance and job satisfaction as influences of employee performance and well-being.
A mixed-method study, of 200 participants, was conducted by Takrim and Siddiq (2016) to determine the influences of work-life balance on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Conclusions addressed the difficulty employees experience when trying to remove work/life conflicts. Additionally, marital status did not impact the employee’s perception of work-life balance and organizational commitment but did affect the employee’s job satisfaction.

Addressing a gap in the literature, Akanji, Mordi, and Ojo (2015) presented a study that suggested employees need to consolidate their efforts in finding the right balance between their work and family roles. These authors highlighted the ability of employees to manage the boundaries between their work and family life. Minimizing conflicts between these two roles, and gaining the ability to leverage the benefits from these two roles, helped to produce beneficial outcomes for all stakeholders. Akanji et al. suggested policy guidelines and supervisory support of organizations could be achieved by implementing work-life balance practices.

A review of the literature included examining the relationship between work-life balance and turnover intention. Work-life balance and turnover intention research were investigated by Kakar, Mansor, Saufi, and Singh (2019). The purpose of Kakar et al.’s quantitative study, which included 250 participants, was to investigate work-life balance practices and how well a person fits the organization. The results revealed turnover intention was directly and significantly affected by work-life balance practices and how well the employee fits the organization.

Research on work-life balance included examining mediators to the relationship between work-life balance and turnover intention. Additional areas of research on work-life balance included; embeddedness as a mediator to work-life balance (Thakur & Bhatnagar, 2017), human resource interventions on work-life balance (Panda & Sahoo, 2017), work-family practices, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction as a mediator (Pérez-Pérez, Vela-Jiménez,
Abella-Garcés, & Martinez-Sanchez, 2017), building a work-life balance model (Kaliannan Kaliannan, Perumal, & Dorasamy, 2016), and work-life balance and authentic leadership (Braun, & Peus, 2018). Work-life balance research provided new information as researchers endeavored to expand work-life balance knowledge. The historical review of the literature from 1950 to the decade of the 2000s expanded knowledge and provided information that could impact employees as well as organizations.

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover intention is defined as the precursor to an employee deciding to quit their present job (Haque et al., 2019). Demirtas and Akdogan (2015) defined turnover intention as the reason an employee decides to leave an organization. According to Jaharuddin and Zainol (2019) researched turnover intention and identified it as an employee’s thoughts of quitting and willingness to seek another job outside of the organization. When employee turnover intention becomes actual turnover, organizations can experience costs associated with recruitment and hiring employees. Additionally, the hiring of new employees may include new employee training and development of needed skills as well as retaining employees within the organization.

Employee turnover intention and turnover research attracted the attention of practitioners and scholars for many decades (Hom, Lee, Shaw, & Hausknecht, 2017; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). If turnover intention is determined to be a precursor to turnover, how does turnover impact organizations? According to Glebbeek and Bax (2004), turnover can harm the performance of organizations. Because turnover can harm organizational performance, and turnover intention is a precursor to turnover, it is important to understand what the literature concluded about turnover intention.
Seminal research by Mobley et al. (1978) contended that employee withdrawal and its relationship to job satisfaction is studied extensively. Mobley’s (1978) quantitative research study, which included data from 203 employees, investigated the employee withdrawal decision process, determining that turnover intention was the immediate precursor to the employee withdrawal behavior (Mobley et al., 1978). Additionally, Mobley’s study indicated that employee dissatisfaction and the likelihood of finding other employment contributed to the employee’s turnover intention. Herzberg’s two-factor theory addressed satisfaction and dissatisfaction as hygiene factors which are presented as extrinsic variables such as salary, supervision, and working conditions (Herzberg et al., 1959). Organizations looked to the area of salary, supervision, and working conditions when attempting to address turnover intention.

Waters and Roach (1979) conducted a study to determine the relationships between job satisfaction, absenteeism, and behavioral intention to turnover. Additionally, Waters and Roach wanted to determine how each relationship contributed to the prediction of turnover. Findings from Waters and Roach’s study concluded that when employees expressed turnover intention, it was the better predictor of actual turnover. Martin (1979) continued to research turnover intention focusing on a variety of determinants of turnover intention impacting employee

1980 – 1989. Additional research by Mobley (1982) focused on several aspects of the turnover intention and turnover process which included organization, employee (intending to leave), and employee (staying with the organization). The consequences of employee turnover intention and turnover for organizations could include replacement costs associated with the loss of an employee and the possibility of losing a high performing employee. Outcomes for employees intending to leave could include the loss of seniority and career path regression. Results experienced by employees intending to stay include loss of valued coworkers, increased
workload, and decreased commitment (Mobley, 1982). Michaels and Spector (1982) identified turnover and employee withdrawal as variables that are often included in organizational research. Michaels & Spector concluded that turnover intention could be impacted by the availability of employment opportunities, and could be the catalyst for search behaviors in employees.

Arnold and Feldman (1982) examined the relationship between turnover intention and actual turnover, as well as the relationship between intention to change jobs and actual turnover. Findings from Arnold and Feldman’s study confirmed turnover intention was strongly related to the intention to change jobs. These researchers believed that turnover was significantly influenced by variables affecting employees which included job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and perceived job security. Additional areas of research on turnover intention included predicting turnover intention, and turnover behavior (Parasuraman, 1982), shift work schedules and their relationship to turnover intention (Zedeck, Jackson, & Summers, 1983), and turnover and job performance (Jackofsky, 1984). Research on turnover intention continued in the 1990s examining employee stress and its effect on performance.

1990 – 1999. Additional areas of turnover intention research included stress and its impacts on employees and employee performance. Turnover intention research included actual turnover due to concerns of organizations at the increasing turnover rates. Stress was examined as an intervening variable for role conflict and role overload (Fang & Baba, 1993). Fang and Baba (1993) engaged in a study of 1,130 participants to determine the moderating effect of social support and personal experience on role overload and role conflict. Fang and Baba’s study was ambitious to included participants from both the United States and Canada. These researchers concluded that although the primary purpose of the current study was to establish the role of
stress in the turnover model, they determined that stress indirectly impacted job satisfaction and attitudinal variables and that it directly impacted turnover intention (Fang & Baba, 1993).

Bedeian, Kemery, and Pizzolatto (1991) researched career commitment and the expected value of an employee’s job and attempted to determine if career commitment was a predictor of turnover intention and subsequent turnover behavior. Bedeian et al. conducted a study, of 244 participants, to examine the employee withdrawal process and its relationship to the employee expected utility of their present job, as well as their career commitment. Bedeian et al. concluded that turnover intention had a direct effect on turnover, while career commitment and the involvement of the current job predicted turnover intention, and individual career factors did in fact impact turnover through the turnover intention of the individual.

Another area of study in the turnover intention research was the role of organizational citizenship behavior in the turnover process. Chen, Hui, and Sego (1998) lead a study, of 205 participants, to determine the strength of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior, performance, and employee turnover. Results from Chen et al.’s study indicated organizational citizenship behavior as a predictor of employee turnover. Additionally, turnover intention was identified as the predictor of turnover.

With added studies, turnover intention had been identified to be related to many variables affecting employees. The historical review of the literature beginning in 1970 indicates research had focused on turnover intention because turnover intention had been identified as a predictor of turnover. Researchers strived to understand the components of turnover intention and how to prevent or predict its presence in the workplace (Koh & Goh, 1995). Koh and Goh conducted a quantitative study to determine what factors affected turnover intention and constructed a model
that could predict turnover intention. Results from Koh and Goh’s study concluded that job
satisfaction had a significant impact on turnover intention.

The job satisfaction- turnover intention relationship had been identified by other
researchers (George, & Jones, 1996; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid, & Sirola, 1998; Russ &
McNeilly, 1995). Additional areas of research on turnover intention included turnover intention
and career commitment (Chang, 1999), turnover intention, employment relationship (Geurts,
Schaufeli, & Rutte, 1999), and determinants of turnover intention (Igbaria & Guimaraes, 1999),
job satisfaction and turnover intention (Hom & Griffeth, 1991).

2000 – 2020. With the beginning of a new century, turnover intention research examined
turnover intention and managerial practices, as well as areas that had been researched in prior
decades of study. As the workforce and working environments changed, gaining knowledge from
the turnover intention research was important for organizations and individuals as well. Some
turnover intention research focused on determinants and understanding factors that would
determine turnover intention.

Acknowledging the importance of retaining employees, Cho and Song (2017) completed
a study that explored what determinants of turnover intention could be identified. Cho and
Song’s study examined what factors impacted determinates of turnover intention and what
managerial practices could alleviate the turnover intention of employees. Not only were
determinants examined, but solutions to alleviate turnover intention was incorporated into the
study. Osuji, Uzoka, Aladi, and El-Hussein (2014) conducted a study to examine factors that
determine turnover intention, concluding that management and leadership styles contributed
greatly to turnover intention. Each study added to the knowledge identifying determinist of
turnover intention.
Working on the assumption formulated from turnover studies, turnover intention is a precursor of turnover, and turnover harms organizational performance and was identified as an important problem for organizations (Hur, 2013). Hur contends that high levels of turnover can be an indicator that employees are less satisfied with their jobs, have lower levels of organizational commitment, and employees considered to be good performers are more likely to quit their job. Additionally, many workplace factors have been identified as the reasons why employees resign from their current jobs.

According to Gächter et al. (2013), a great effort had been in place to discover how to recruit and retain qualified employees, while increasing job satisfaction. These researchers conducted a study to investigate the relationship between turnover intention and workplace factors, one factor being job satisfaction. Gächter et al. concluded that although job satisfaction is the subject of many studies, the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention had not been investigated.

Multiple studies have been completed on the relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction (Huang, & Chih-Hao, 2016; Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016; Mathieu & Babiak, 2016; Tongchaipratisit, & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016). With the increasing technological advances and changing working environments, it became important for organizations to understand the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in the workforce.

Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011) conducted a study to increase understanding of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. These researchers contended that the effect of job satisfaction determined the level of turnover intention and as employees became dissatisfied with their job, it would be more likely they would leave. Agarwal and Sajid (2017) conducted a study examining the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention.
With the increased globalization and workforce diversity, Agarwal and Sajid acknowledged that many organizations were not meeting the challenge these factors brought to the workplace.

Chen et al. (2011) conducted a similar study to investigate how changes in job satisfaction affected or changed the employee’s turnover intention, acknowledging that employee retention had been a critical issue for organizations. Chen et al. developed a theoretical framework to understand how changes in job satisfaction related to changes in turnover intention. Conclusions from Chen et al.’s study suggested organizations survey their employees, at different stages of their employment to identify changes in job satisfaction and turnover intention.

An additional direction for turnover intention research came from Gibson and Petrosko (2014), examining the effects of trust in leadership on job satisfaction and turnover intention. These researchers contended that trust in leadership could prove to be important to the employee’s job satisfaction and turnover intention in particular. Gibson and Petrosko believed that positive feelings towards leadership could suppress the employee’s turnover intention and quitting their job, suggesting future research should focus on job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Research examined the relationship between burnout and turnover intention. Kim and Stoner (2008) conducted a study to examine the effects of social support, job autonomy, and role stress on employee burnout and turnover intention. Findings from Kim and Stoner’s study indicated higher levels of role stress are related to higher levels of burnout and higher levels of burnout increase the employee’s turnover intention. Additionally, if the employee feels the working environment is supportive, they may feel a higher level of attachment toward the organization, therefore reducing their turnover intention (Kim & Stoner, 2008). Additional areas
of research on turnover intention included absenteeism and turnover intention (Staufenbiel & König, 2010), employee empowerment and turnover intention (Kim & Fernandez, 2017), and transformational leadership and turnover intention (Sun & Wang, 2017).

Synthesis of the Research Findings

Review of the job satisfaction literature spanned from 1950 to the present day, revealing a progression of concepts and identified challenges for organizations. One such concept was offered by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) who created an index of job satisfaction to describe the construction and validation of a quantitative index of job satisfaction. With this effort, job satisfaction and terms such as employee morale could be defined from the employee’s actions. Seminal research from Schaffer (1953) developed a theoretical conceptualization of job satisfaction. The theory of job satisfaction was developed to examine satisfaction and dissatisfaction employees experience.

Herzberg et al. (1959) developed motivation and hygiene factors which identified two factors related to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Herzberg’s (1959) theory included motivators and hygiene factors to explain employee behavior. Extensive research was conducted utilizing Herzberg’s theory to examine job satisfaction from its development to present-day studies. Herzberg’s theory opened up new avenues of discussions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and what it means, for employees, in each study. Additionally, Herzberg’s theory was included in studies that examined employee retention (King, 1970). Job satisfaction is extensively researched (Ahmad et al., 2018; Avery et al., 2015; Aydogmus et al., 2018; Konradt & Garbers, 2016;) and included many variables and theories.

Herzberg’s theory of motivators and hygiene factors is the theoretical basis for many studies. Not all researchers believed Herzberg’s theory adequately explained job satisfaction as it
relates to employee behavior. Fournet et al. (1966) conducted a study to determine problems that have been identified from studying job satisfaction. Fournet et al’s theoretical foundation was Herzberg’s theory of motivators and hygiene factors. Fournet et al. pointed out that Herzberg et al. (1959) presented job satisfaction as a dichotomous instead of a continuous variable that stemmed from job factors such as; work itself, earned recognition, and advancement.

Recent research continued to link job satisfaction and productivity (Henriques, Luque, Marcenaro-Gutierrez, & Lopez-Agudo, 2019; Mateos-Romero & Salinas-Jiménez, 2018; Salau et al., 2018), and eventually linking job satisfaction and productivity research to turnover intention (Labrague et al., 2018). Additionally, some research included work-life balance (Soomro, Breitenecker, & Shah, S., 2018). Lawler and Porter (1967) continued to conduct quantitative research on job satisfaction and its link to turnover.

As each decade of research was reviewed, research on job satisfaction and turnover intention was researched often (Chhabra, 2018; Justin, & Still, 2019; Martin, 1979; Schwepker, 2001; Zedeck et al., 1983; Zhang, X., Ma, Xu, & Xu, 2019). Because of the many different work environments, it was important to examine how job satisfaction research had contributed to the present-day understanding of job satisfaction.

Research on transformational leadership and its relationship to job satisfaction continued and results from these studies included employee perceptions of transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention were studied by Malik et al., (2010). Malik’s study determined that work-life balance was a major contributor to job satisfaction and helps produce job satisfaction. Recommendations for future research included analyzing different relationships of work-life balance and job satisfaction and explore different sectors of the society. A similar study by Tlaiss and Mendelson (2014) researched the
relationship between job satisfaction, worker productivity, turnover intention, and work-life balance, determining that women face inequality in the workplace and point out the need for organizations to take up initiatives to improve the dissatisfaction in women through Human Resources practices and policies.

Avery et al. (2015) conducted a study to determine if employee achievement orientations and personality were predictors of job satisfaction. Results found partial support for the predicted relations and provided important illustrations of how workplace job satisfaction was linked to stable competence motivational tendencies in employees. Research examining an employee’s personality traits relating to their job satisfaction was examined by Steel et al., (2019). Additionally, Steel et al. determined that the Big Five personality traits examined accounted for about 10% of the variance in job satisfaction, and accounted for 13% of the variance in life satisfaction. Steel et al. concluded that employee job satisfaction was important but it was difficult to describe it as necessary for employee life satisfaction.

Research on work-life balance and job satisfaction focused on predictors of work-life balance (Panda & Sahoo, 2017), as well as the impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction. Work-life balance research examined how employees balanced responsibilities for work and home life. Much of the work-life balance research focused on the challenges presented to employees and how work-life balance impacted productivity, family support, and policies. Goodstein (1994) addressed employer involvement in the work-life balance process for employees. According to Goodstein, organizations implemented workplace flexibility and childcare benefits to assist with the employee’s ability to maneuver between work and life responsibilities.
Work-life balance research linking work-life balance to turnover and work-life balance to job satisfaction. Cegarra-Leiva et al. (2012) found that if a work-life balance culture existed in the organization, job satisfaction was impacted to a greater degree than work-life balance practices. Cegarra-Leiva et al.’s finding gave organizations a path for greater job satisfaction, and potentially creating greater productivity from employees. Asiedu-Appiah et al. (2015) determined that the effects of work-life balance policies and practices helped employees to balance their work and home responsibilities, and increasing productivity. Haque et al. (2019) defined turnover intention as the precursor to actual turnover.

**Critique of Previous Research Methods**

The present quantitative correlational research study applied the Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors (Herzberg, et al., 1959) and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1970) that relate the job satisfaction to work-life balance and job satisfaction to turnover intention. The Job Satisfaction Survey scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS) of Cammann et al. (1983) was applied to measure job satisfaction. Work-life balance was measured using the Work-Life Balance scale of Brough et al. (2014). And the turnover intention was measured using the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al.).

The majority of studies reviewed indicated the researcher’s utilized quantitative, survey questionnaire methods of research (Asiedu-Appiah et al., 2015; Lu et al., 2016; Orkibi & Brandt, 2015; Padma & Reddy, 2014). According to Fournet et al. (1966), utilizing a questionnaire for studying job satisfaction is one method utilized by researchers. Early research on job satisfaction used multiple-regression analyses for the validity of the proposed hypotheses (Hulin & Smith, 1964). Friendlander and Margulies (1969) conducted a quantitative study, surveying 114
employees. The analysis used in the present study was a simple first-order correlation and the use of multiple prediction equations.

Many quantitative studies linked job satisfaction and productivity. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky (1985) reported that thirty years of job satisfaction and productivity research concluded that a happy worker was a productive worker. Malik et al. (2010) conducted a quantitative study of 175 participants, to examine the relationship between job satisfaction, turnover intention, work-life balance, and burnout. Malik’s study used Levine’s test, the Pearson Correlation test, and multiple regression to determine the results.

Tlaiss and Mendelson (2014) conducted a study to determine the relationship between job satisfaction, employee productivity, turnover intention, and work-life balance. Tlaiss and Mendelson’s study faced challenges with language for the surveys. English was the selected language but many potential participants were eliminated due to language barriers. To solve the language barriers, these researchers utilized the survey translated into French and Arabic, and the responses were back-translated to English, by two linguists.

All the participants needed was an opportunity to participate regardless of the language they spoke. Language barriers were not discovered in any additional studies conducted in the literature review. Additionally, Tlaiss and Mendelson’s (2014) study used a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with job satisfaction as the objective and subjective scores as the dependent variables, and the independent variables were the demographics.

Although job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention had been extensively reviewed, the literature review did not contain a correlational study of job satisfaction and work-life balance, or job satisfaction and turnover intention in U.S. adult workers. The present study was a quantitative, nonexperimental correlational study that utilized a questionnaire to include
U.S adult workers. Studies on job satisfaction utilized different techniques of statistical analysis, and methods of data collection, correlations, and factor analysis have been the most frequently used methods. Some measuring instruments identified in the literature included; Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Halpin & Crofts, 1963), Index of Job Satisfaction (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Carrell & Elbert, 1974), The Scale of Global Job Satisfaction (Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979).

**Summary**

Chapter 2 consisted of the introduction of the topics of research as well as the theoretical foundation, Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors (Herzberg et al., 1959) that included motivators and hygiene factors. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1970) included the five categories of needs stated within the theory. Additionally, an extensive literature review was presented on job satisfaction to include a historical review beginning in the decade of the 1950s and ending in the decade of the 2000s.

Work-life balance was reviewed beginning with the decade of the 1970s and progressing through the decade of the 2000s. Work-life balance research contributed to the existing literature and expanded the knowledge in areas of work-life balance and working-class jobs, (Ferree, 1976), work-life balance, job stress, and employee behaviors (Gupta & Beehr, 1979). work-family practices, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction as a mediator (Pérez-Pérez et al., 2017), building a work-life balance model (Kaliannan et al., 2016), and work-life balance and authentic leadership (Braun, & Peus, 2018).

The historical review of turnover intention spanning from the decade of the 1970s through the decade of the 2000s. Studies conducted in turnover intention included job insecurity, absenteeism and turnover intention (Staufenbiel & König, 2010), employee empowerment and turnover intention (Kim & Fernandez, 2017), and transformational leadership, turnover intention,
and actual turnover (Sun & Wang, 2017). Review of the literature revealed that in each decade, areas of interest related to job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention.

Some topics were researched in more than one decade demonstrating the interest in these topics extending from decade to decade as each study added to the literature. Many studies reviewed, revealing a variety of variables that had been included in the research along with different theoretical foundations. Job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention are topics of interest to many researchers and continue to add to the literature on the employee experience in the workplace.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 reviewed the methodology for the present nonexperimental quantitative correlational study that evaluated the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adults working in the United States. Included in the review were the purpose of the study. The research questions and hypothesis are discussed as well as the research design. The research questions and hypothesis are followed by discussion of the target population and sample. The power analysis is discussed which include procedures and instruments. And finally, the ethical considerations for the present study are discussed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present quantitative study was to answer two research questions: (a) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers (RQ1), and (b) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in U.S. workers (RQ2). Job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention have been continually researched as each new generation of employees are affecting and are affected at the workplace (Kaliannan et al., 2016; Kim & Fernandez, 2017; Smith et al., 2018). It is important to understand the importance of these variables and how each one contributes and impacts individuals as well as organizations.

Analyzing the correlational relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention contributed to the current literature. According to Curtis et al. (2016), “preliminary correlational research studies can provide invaluable information about what future research may be required to investigate the variables shown to be correlated with the outcomes or attributes preciously studied” (p. 25). Curtis et al.’s study contributes to the literature on job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention by...
utilizing a quantitative correlational study, applying Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory, that related job satisfaction to work-life balance and job satisfaction to turnover intention.

The measure applied to job satisfaction was the Job Satisfaction scale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS) (Cammann et al., 1983). The measure applied to work-life balance was the Work-Life Balance scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014). The measure applied to turnover intention was the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame, as modified by Brough et al., in 165 adult U. S. workers, and utilized the Qualtrics database for the study participants who met the studies inclusion criteria.

The current study could have important implications for Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory when applied to modern-day populations of employees. Herzberg et al. (1959) developed their theory of motivation and hygiene factors and is the theoretical foundation for many studies (Alfayad, & Mohd Arif, 2017; Sikowo, Namusong, Makokha, & Nyagechi, 2016). It is important to determine if Herzberg’s theory remains relevant as applied to the current study of job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers.

Additionally, Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory is applied as the theoretical foundation for many studies and will be analyzed as applied to the current study of job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers (Gordon, 2017; Rasskazova, Ivanova, Sheldon, 2016; Smith, 2010). HR Managers seeking to implement or modify work-life balance policies towards promoting job satisfaction and reducing employee turnover intention could benefit from the data collected from the current study. Although the
topic of job satisfaction includes extensive research, understanding the relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention within U.S. adult workers can fill an important gap within the literature (Haar et al., 2014; Huang et al., 2017; Mas-Machuca et al., 2016).

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The current study is a quantitative nonexperimental study utilizing a data collection company, Qualtrics, to administer a survey to determine the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adult U.S. workers. Two research questions were applied:

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

- **H10.** There is no statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.
- **H1a.** There is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

- **H20.** There is no statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.
- **H2a.** There is a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.
Research Design

The current study is a nonexperimental correlational design to determine the relationship, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working in the United States. The quantitative research method is based on the number of responses, volumes, or the strength of the relationship between variables (Gelo, Braakmann, & Benetka, 2008). According to Gelo et al., the quantitative research method investigates relationships by generalizable causal effects which allows predictions of relationships between variables. Apuke (2017) identifies quantitative research as a research method dealing with quantifying and statistically analyzing the variables to determine results of the data collected. The quantitative research method is appropriate for the current study because the goal of the study is to determine the relationship, if any, between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Qualitative research was not appropriate for this study because it attempts to capture life as it is being lived, watching participants in their environment, and interacting with them on the participants terms (Abusabha & Woelfel, 2003). The current study’s goals were to collect data from participants across the United States. Data was collected from 165 participants across 34 states in the U.S. utilizing an online data collection company, Qualtrics. According to Harry and Lipky (as cited in Rahman, 2017), using a qualitative research method requires a smaller sample size than the quantitative method of research, which can raise concerns for generalizability to the whole population being researched.

According to Leedy and Ormron (as cited in Curtis et al., 2016), correlational research involves identifying relationships between two or more variables in one population or between two populations. According to Cokley and Awad (2013), correlational designs include the use of
surveys and assesses the relationships among variables. A correlational design for the current study was appropriate because the goal was to measure the strength of the relationships between measures of job satisfaction and work-life balance, and between measures of job satisfaction and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers.

Advantages identified in the use of correlational research are; the research is straightforward, can be relatively inexpensive; can be completed quickly, and results from correlational research can be used to create hypotheses for testing in experimental research design (Curtis et al., 2016). According to Curtis et al., correlational research does not identify cause and effect in relationships which has been identified as a disadvantage in the use of this research method.

**Target Population and Sample**

The purpose of this quantitative nonexperimental correlational study was to acquire a sample from adults working fulltime in a United States organization for the past year. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2020), approximately 130.6 million individuals were employed, in a fulltime capacity, in a U.S. organization, representing the population for the current study. The research questions examined if statistically significant relationships could be identified between job satisfaction and work-life balance and between turnover intention and job satisfaction. Based on the data collected from the sample, the significant relationships were identified as well as the strength of these relationships.

**Population**

The target population for the current study included adults working in the United States who were employed in U.S. business organizations for the past full year. Anyone under 18 years of age, self-employed, employed for less than one year at their present job, or from outside the
United States were not included in the study. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2020), approximately 130.6 million individuals were employed, in a fulltime capacity, in a U.S. organization representing the population for the current study.

Sample

The current study’s sample population met the inclusion criteria: (a) adults, 18 years or older; (b) working fulltime for the past full year; and (c) in a United States organization. The exclusion criteria for the current study were participants (a) younger than 18 years of age, (b) self-employed, (c) working less than the last full year, and (d) working outside of the United States. Random sampling conducted by Qualtrics, an online data company emailed participants collecting completed surveys participants who met the inclusion criteria and completed the survey, were included in the current study. According to Setia (2016) random sampling allows all individuals, contacted for participation, an equal and independent probability of gaining the opportunity to participate.

Power Analysis

The sample size was calculated using the power analysis of G*Power (version 3.1.9) Faul et al., 2009). Power analysis was necessary to ensure that the study had an adequate sample to demonstrate that statistically significant relationships exist between study variables (Cohen, 1988, 1992; Howell, 2016). According to Faul et al. (2009), G*Power is a stand-alone analysis program used for many statistical tests commonly used in the areas of social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. Additionally, statistical textbooks stress the importance of power analysis because the power of a statistical test is the probability that the Null hypothesis ($H_0$) will be rejected (Faul et al., 2007).
The fundamentals of power analysis include the anticipated effect size, the confidence interval, whether the calculation is based on a one-tailed or two-tailed test, and the chosen level of statistical power (Cohen 1988, 1992). According to Cohen (1992), correlation effect sizes could be categorized as small (\( r = .10 \)), medium (\( r = .30 \)), and large (\( r = .50 \)) or greater. A 95% confidence interval reflected the 0.05 threshold for statistical significance.

For the present study, it was important to calculate power analysis using a two-tailed test, so that the 95% confidence interval and the associated \( p < 0.05 \) thresholds provided equal opportunity for both positive and negative statistically significant correlational results. Additionally, the hypotheses of the present study were that job satisfaction and work-life balance would be positively correlated (Hypothesis 1), and that job satisfaction and turnover intention would be negatively correlated (Hypothesis 2), it was also possible that the results would be in the opposite directions, or no statistically significant relationship would be identified. A two-tailed test is in contrast to a one-tailed directional test, which is less conservative, so the threshold for statistical significance is lower than that of a two-tailed test. Therefore, the power calculation for the present study was conducted using a more conservative two-tailed test. The chosen level of statistical power was set at .95. The level of statistical power was chosen to ensure that, assuming the assumed effect size occurred, statistically significant results would occur on 95% of opportunities.

Accordingly, the Exact test family was chosen within G*Power, so the Correlations: Bivariate normal model statistical test could be selected. The Type of power analysis was set as A prior: compute required sample size – given, power, and effect size. For input parameters, Tail(s) was set at two, corresponding to a two-tailed test. Correlation \( H1 \) was set at 0.3, corresponding to a medium size effect. Err prob was set at 0.05, corresponding to a 95%
confidence interval, reflecting to a statistical significance threshold of $p < 0.05$. Power (1 – error prob) was set at 0.95, reflecting the desired power of 95%. Correlation $H_0$ was set at 0, as the study hypotheses were tested for statistical significance versus a comparator of zero correlation. From these parameters, G*Power indicated a total sample size of $N = 138$. Therefore, to ensure adequate power, guarding against excessive dropout of recruitments, 179 potential participants were recruited by Qualtrics, of whom 165 completed the survey. Thus, the final sample size for statistical analyses to test the study hypotheses was 165 ($N=165$).

**Procedures**

Chapter 1 provided an overview of the background of the problem, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, definitions of terms, research design, assumptions and limitations, and organization of the remainder of the study. Chapter 2 provides methods of searching, theoretical orientation for the study, review of the literature, synthesis of the research findings, and critique of the previous research methods. The procedures section of Chapter 3 provides the processes for participant selection, protection of participants, data collection, and data analysis.

**Participant Selection**

Survey data was collected online from workers employed in a U.S. business organization through Qualtrics. Qualtrics provided the sample which met the inclusion criteria, adults working in the United States who were employed in a business organization for the last full year. Anyone under 18 years of age, self-employed, employed for less than 1 year at their present job, or from outside the U. S. did not participate in the current study. Qualtrics provided a link through email directly connecting the participants to the survey.
Participants were given an opportunity to read the informed consent form, once accepted, were allowed to begin the survey. Any potential participant who declined to provide informed consent was taken directly to the Thank You page at the end of the survey and no data was collected from them. Screening questions began the survey (employed full time in a U.S. organization for the last full year, gender, and at least 18 years of age) to ensure that participants met the inclusion criteria. Qualtrics was responsible for participant recruitment. No researcher was in contact with study participants.

**Protection of Participants**

One area of concern was the protection of the respondent’s privacy. According to Evans and Mathur (2005), the security of transmitted information and how the data will be used are two of the most concerning areas of online surveys. According to Ross, Iguchi, and Panicker (2018), although data with no individual identifiers usually will not present major problems for participants, in smaller communities or in studies where small subsamples are used, individual participants could be identified.

The sample was provided by Qualtrics who confirmed that the participants met the inclusion criteria. Data acquired from Qualtrics was encrypted and password protected (Qualtrics, 2017). Additionally, the survey did not ask any individuating information from participants. Data collected from Qualtrics was stored on a password-protected thumb drive in a locked file cabinet and will be maintained for seven years after completion of the current study, in compliance with university guidelines. Data collected was not shared with anyone outside of the study.
Data Collection

Qualtrics was contacted to discuss, analyze, and review the data collection process. Requirements for the current study were discussed with the Qualtrics representative and the survey was built within the Qualtrics software. A small sample of the survey was collected for analysis before launching the questionnaire. Review of the sample data was completed, and the survey was launched.

Qualtrics provided the sample based on the inclusion criteria and provided a link through email directing participants to the survey. Participants were required to give informed consent before beginning the survey and participant who declines to provide informed consent was taken directly to the Thank You page at the end of the survey, no data was collected from them. Screening questions began the survey (employed full time in a U.S. organization for the last full year, gender, and 18 years old or older) to ensure participants meet the inclusion criteria. Any potential participant who failed to meet the inclusion criteria was taken directly to the Thank You page at the end of the survey and no data was collected from them.

Data Analysis

The data for the current study was collected from three interval scales: the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Survey scale (MOAQ-JSS, Cammann et al., 1983), the Turnover Intention scale (Brough et al., 2014), and the Work-life Balance scale (Brough et al., 2014). Demographic data of age and gender was collected for descriptive purposes. Data was downloaded from Qualtrics and organized on an Excel spreadsheet for error checking. Error checking included eliminating incomplete surveys from participants who did not consent, or who did not meet the inclusion criteria. Once the error checking was complete, a
score was assigned to each scale in preparation for analysis in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows.

SPSS was selected for data analysis and generating figures because of the data collection company, Qualtrics, offered on export option for data transfer to Excel and/or SPSS. Scored data was exported for SPSS for statistical analysis, and results were exported to an Excel spreadsheet so all study data could be maintained in one password protected Excel workbook. Data preparation included variable scoring conducted using commands in Excel, including the creation of scales by summing items within each scale following revers scoring of items, as appropriate.

Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) was used to test the hypotheses and the strength of the relationships for job satisfaction and work-life balance, $H1_0$: There is no statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers. $H1_a$: There is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers. Additionally, Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient was used to test the hypotheses and the strength of the relationships for job satisfaction and turnover intention, $H2_0$: There is no statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers. $H2_a$: There is a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

Pearson’s $r$ was appropriate to test the hypotheses because Pearson’s $r$ measures the strength and direction (positive or negative) of linear relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention. For these analyses, relationships were considered statistically significant at the $p < .05$ threshold.
Pearson’s $r$ tested interval level, related pairs, normally distributed, and without outliers (Howell, 2016). The Explore function in SPSS statistical was utilized to assess normality. Pearson’s $r$ statistics for hypothesis testing were calculated in SPSS statistical software (version 23). Additionally, SPSS was used to generate the required statistical tests for the current study.

**Descriptive statistics.** RQ1 was a correlation analysis, producing the means and standard deviation. The hypothesis testing was Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient and no post hoc analysis was conducted. RQ2 was also a correlation analysis, producing the means, standard deviation, and ranges. The hypothesis testing was a Pearson $r$ correlation coefficient and no post hoc analysis was conducted on the data. Scatterplots were generated for visual presentation of the data sets.

**Hypothesis testing.** Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) was used to test the hypotheses and to determine the strength of the relationship between two sets of variables, having a long tradition in the sciences (Pearson, 1920). Pearson’s $r$ was appropriate to test the hypotheses of the presently proposed study, which is designed to determine the strength of the relationships between the job satisfaction and work-life Balance (Hypothesis 1) as well as between the job satisfaction and turnover intention (Hypothesis 2), which were all interval-level measuring instruments. For these analyses, relationships were considered statistically significant at the $p < .05$ threshold.

Pearson’s $r$ correlation assumed the data were interval level measures, related pairs, normally distributed, and without outliers (Howell, 2016). The Explore function in SPSS statistical software was utilized to assess normality. Pearson’s $r$ statistics for hypothesis testing were calculated in SPSS statistical software (version 23). Additionally, SPSS was used to generate descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations). Data was stored on a password-
protected thumb drive in a locked file cabinet and will be maintained for seven years after completion of the current study, in compliance with university guidelines. Data was not shared with anyone outside of the study. Types of data are represented in Table 2.

Table 2

Types of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>IV/DV</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work-life Balance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Interval Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Interval Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Interval Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>Interval Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* RQ = Research Question.

Table 3 represents the data analysis summary that includes the type of analysis, deceptive statistics, hypothesis testing, and post hoc analysis. The data analysis summary represents the correlation, means, standard deviation, ranges, and hypothesis testing in Table 3. Both RQ1 and RQ2 are represented.
Table 3

**Data Analysis Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Hypothesis Testing</th>
<th>Post hoc Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Means, standard deviation, ranges</td>
<td>Pearson r Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Means, standard deviation, ranges</td>
<td>Pearson r Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. RQ = Research Question.*

**Instruments**

**The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS)**

The current study used the Job Satisfaction Survey scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS) of Cammann et al. (1983) to measure job satisfaction. Permission to use the MOAQ-JSS measures in the current study was requested and permission was granted. The MOAQ-JSS scale includes three items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job, In general, I like working here, and In general, I don’t like my job,” (Cammann et al., 1983, as cited in Bowling & Hammond, 2008, p. 64). Each rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). After reverse-scoring the third item, all MOAQ-JSS items were summed to create a total job satisfaction score, with the higher scores indicating greater job satisfaction.

---

Validity. The construct validity and the reliability of the MOAQ-JSS were determined by Bowling and Hammond (2008), who used a meta-analytic assessment of 80 published journal articles (N = 30,703). The advantages of using the MOAQ-JSS measure was its length consisting of only three items. Other measures of job satisfaction are much longer, and the MOAQ-JSS measure involved not only the participant’s thoughts but also their feeling about their current job (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). Bowling and Hammond utilized Hunter and Schmidt’s (2004) method to examine the construct validity of the MOAQ-JSS, computing the sample-weighted mean correlations corrected for unreliability in the MOAQ-JSS (as cited in Bowling & Hammond).

Aloisio et al (2018) measured job satisfaction in their study to identify factors that predict job satisfaction such as demographics, organizational, or individuality. Bowling, Wagner, and Beehr (2018) measured job satisfaction using the MOAQ-JSS. Bowling et al.’s study examined the measurement qualities of the Facet Satisfaction Scale (FSS) by conducting four studies to examine the quality of the MOAQ-JSS measure. The MOAQ-JSS was used to measure global job satisfaction and the results were compared to the Facet satisfaction measures.

Spector et al. (2007) conducted a study to determine work interference with family among managers, contrasting four countries by individualistic and collectivistic. The current study utilized the MOAQ-JSS to measure job satisfaction, although the MOAQ-JSS measure included three items, Spector et al.’s study chose to eliminate one measure due to the negatively worded item, choosing not to reverse score one item.

Reliability. Bowling and Hammond (2008) found the MOAQ-JSS had internal reliability of .85. Bae and Yang (2017) found the Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability of the MOAQ-JSS
was .90. These values exceeded the minimal internal reliability of .70 recommended by Nunnally (1978) and Tabachnick and Fidel, (2013) for survey research. Aloisio et al. (2018) found the Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability of the MOAQ-JSS was .82 in measuring job satisfaction. Bowling et al. (2018) found the Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability of the MOAQ-JSS was .91 in measuring job satisfaction. Spector et al. (2007) reported a coefficient alpha of .90 demonstrating the reliability of the MOAQ-JSS measure, as higher scores indicated a higher level of job satisfaction.

Work-life Balance Scale of Brough et al. (2014)

Work-life balance was measured using the Work-Life Balance scale of Brough et al. (2014). Permission to use the Work-Life Balance measures in the current study was requested and permission was granted. The four work-life balance items include: “I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities, I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities, I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right, and Overall, I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced2” (Brough et., 2014, p. 2730). Each was rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. After reverse-scoring the second item, all work-life balance items were totaled to create a total work-life balance score, with higher scores indicating greater work-life balance.

The structure of the four-item work-life balance was confirmed using factor analysis across four samples of employees, ranging from $N = 467$ to $N = 5094$ (Brough et al., 2014).

---

Work-life balance is positively correlated with job satisfaction and negatively related to turnover intention (Brough et al., 2014). Chan et al. (2016) conducted a study to examine how work-family enrichment contributes to the employees’ job and family satisfaction. Chan et al. (2016) measured work-life balance using Brough et al. (2014) four-items, utilizing a five-point Likert-type scale.

**Validity.** The work-life balance scale was developed based on literature reviews and face-to-face interviews with 81 employees, which generated nineteen items screened for face validity, ease of understanding, and esoteric or complicated content, resulting in four items (Brough et al., 2014). The face validity of the work-life balance measures was achieved by examining the tree items, determining they were appropriate to ask and appropriately worded for the population and generally relevant to Brough and Frame’s (2004) research. Talukder, Vickers, and Khan (2018) validated the work-life balance scale of Brough and Frame.

**Reliability.** The Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability for the work-life balance across four samples ranged from .84 to .94 (Brough et al., 2014), each of which exceeded the minimal internal reliability of .70 recommended by Nunnally (1978) and Tabachnick and Fidel, (2013) for survey research. Chan et al. (2016) reported the reliability of the Work-life Balance scale of Brough et al. by indicating a Cronbach’s alpha for the Work-life Balance scale of .94.

**Turnover Intention Scale of Brough and Frame (2004)**

The turnover intention was measured in the current study using the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014). Permission to use the Turnover Intention measures in the current study was requested from the author and permission was granted by the author. The turnover intention scale included three items: “How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months, How likely are you to
leave your job in the next six months, and How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization" (Brough and Frame, 2004), as modified by (Brough et al., 2014, p. 2730). Each was rated on a 1 (never) to 5 (a great deal) scale. Brough et al. conducted two studies of workers determining the turnover intention scale was significantly, negatively correlated with job satisfaction and with work-life balance.

Validity. The turnover intention scale was developed from qualitative interviews, with the face validity of the three items determined by a panel of human resource managers (Brough & Frame, 2004). The internal structure was determined using principal components analysis and inter-item correlation (Brough & Frame, 2004). Siu, Cheung, and Lui (2015) utilized the turnover intention scale of Brough and Frame in an Australian police force, determining the turnover intention scale measure demonstrated adequate reliability and construct validity.

Reliability. The Cronbach’s alpha internal reliability for the turnover intention was measured to be .79 and .84 across two measurement periods in the sample of Brough and Frame (2004), and .84 and .85 across two independent samples by Brough et al. (2014). These exceeded the minimal internal reliability of .70 recommended by Nunnally (1978) and Tabachnick and Fidel, (2013) for survey research. Siu et al. (2015) utilized the turnover intention scale of Brough and Frame, finding the Cronbach’s alpha to be .84, confirming the reliability of turnover intention scale measure. Additionally, Yang, Liu, Liu, and Zhang (2015) utilized the turnover intention scale of Brough and Frame and produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .85 confirming the reliability of the turnover intention scale measure.

---

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations for the current study included institutional review board (IRB) review and approval before the study could begin. The informed consent form was reviewed and approved by the IRB before including it in the current study. All participants had access to the informed consent form and had a choice to accept or deny the form leading to participation, or exiting the survey. The rights of participants were protected, consistent with Title 45, Part 46 of the Federal Code of Regulation regarding Protection of Human Subjects. Participation was anonymous. The sample was acquired through Qualtrics, which did not provide any information about the participants other than confirmation they met the inclusion criteria. Qualtrics data was encrypted and password protected (Qualtrics, 2017). Additionally, the survey did not ask for any individuating information (names, addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, email) from participants. Alpha-numeric codes (S001, S002…) were assigned to each participant data before analysis.

Participant rights to privacy and confidentiality were upheld, by not sharing data with anyone not associated with the study. Data was stored on a password-protected thumb drive in a locked file cabinet and will be maintained for seven years after completion of the study. Because the sample included only employed U.S. adults, no special ethical considerations were necessary, as would be necessary for investigations including at-risk populations. Research findings included data and statistics which were reported clearly and honestly without deception to the readers. Quantitative research concerns included numerical and mathematical accuracy, including outliers are not always included in the numbers, but the occurrence of outliers was included in the findings, (Remenyi, 1998).
Summary

Chapter 3 reviewed the purpose of the current study, which was to conduct a correlational, nonexperimental study to determine the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adults working in an organization for at least one year, in the United States. Two research questions, with their hypothesis, were included to determine the relationships between the two variables in RQ1, work-life balance and job satisfaction, and the two variables in RQ2, turnover intention, and job satisfaction. The methodology applied was a quantitative, nonexperimental, correlational design (Curtis et al., 2016).

The target population was adults working in the United States and employed in a U.S. business organization for the past full year. Sampling consisted of 165 participants with which met the minimum requirement of as few as 138 participants, according to G*Power software to ensure adequate power. Participant selection included utilizing an online survey instrument, Qualtrics. Data analysis was managed in a password protected Excel workbook. Scored data was exported for SPSS for statistical analysis, and results were exported back to Excel so all study data could be maintained in one password-protected Excel workbook.

Three measuring instruments were discussed, the Job Satisfaction Survey scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS) of Cammann et al. (1983), Work-Life Balance scale of Brough et al. (2014), and the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014). The validity and reliability of each instrument were discussed. Chapter 4 will include discussion of the results of the current study.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Background

The current quantitative nonexperimental correlational study utilized an online survey, provided by Qualtrics data collection company, to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working in a U.S. organization for the past year. A nonexperimental correlational design was appropriate because the goal of the study was to measure the strength of the relationships between measures of job satisfaction and work-life balance, and between measures of job satisfaction and turnover intention in adult United States workers (Curtis et al., 2016).

The current study applied Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory related job satisfaction to work-life balance, and job satisfaction to turnover intention. Additionally, two research questions were considered: (a) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers” (RQ1) and (b) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers? (RQ2).

The three measures used were the Job Satisfaction scale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann et al., 1983), the Work-Life Balance Scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. (2014), and the Turnover Intention scale of Brough and Frame (2004).
The MOAQ-JSS scale includes three items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job, In general, I like working here, and In general, I don’t like my job,” (Cammann et al., 1983, as cited in Bowling & Hammond, 2008, p. 64). Each rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Work-Life Balance Scale of Brough and Frame (2004), as modified by Brough et al. which included four items. The four work-life balance items include: “I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities, I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities, I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right, and Overall, I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced” (Brough et al., 2014). Each was rated on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) scale. The Turnover Intention Scale included three items: “How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months, How likely are you to leave your job in the next 6 months, and How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization” (Brough & Frame, 2004). Each was rated on a 1 (never) to 5 (a great deal) scale. The measures totaled 10 questions for the participants to consider.

**Description of the Sample**

The target population of the current study was adults working in the United States who were employed in a U.S. business organization for the past full year. Anyone under 18 years of age...
age, self-employed, employed for less than one year at their present job, or from outside the United States were not part of the target population and were not eligible to participate. The sample size was determined using the power analysis of G*Power (version 3.1.9, Faul et al., 2009). Determining statistical power using G*Power software was calculated using the following information; assuming a 95% confidence interval, a medium-sized effect ($r = .30$), statistically significant results power = .95, adequate power was calculated to be as few as 138 participants. Qualtrics, an online data collection company, provided the probability sample. Although G*Power software identified 138 participants as adequate power, Qualtrics randomly selected participants throughout the United States who met the target criteria from their database.

A total of 179 potential participants logged on the Qualtrics study website. Of these, 14 provided informed consent and met all study inclusion criteria, but did not complete the survey, resulting in 165 completed surveys for statistical analysis ($N = 165$). The collection of demographic data included (a) With what gender do you identify? (b) What is your age? (c) How long have you worked for a current US company? and (d) Are you self-employed? Participants were 165 U.S. adults, and of the 165 participants, 87 were female (53%) and 78 were male (47%).

**Participants**

The target population included adults working in the United States who were employed in a U.S. business organization for the past full year. A probability sample using a simple random sampling method totaling 179 responses, of which 165 were completed. Table 4 displays the participants by gender. Of the 165 participants, 87 were female (53%) and 78 were male (47%).
Table 4

*Gender of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* % = Percent of male, female, and total sample; Code = 1 representing male participants; Code = 2 representing female participants.

Figure 2 presents the participant totals by state. Although Qualtrics recruited participants from all 50 states in the U.S., participants from 34 states responded, met the inclusion criteria, and were included in the current study. Prior studies of job satisfaction utilized random sampling in which not every state was represented but considered the results generalizable to the U.S. population (Rode, 2004; Shanafelt et al., 2015).
Figure 2. Participants by state.

Hypothesis Testing

Testing of Statistical Assumptions

Data were analyzed using Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient to determine whether the assumptions of correlational statistics were met. The current study utilized the significance test for $r$ for the random sampling of 165 independent observations (White, 2003). Assumptions of
correlation include two continuous variables, the variables be paired, linearity, assumption of bivariate normality, and lack of significant outliers (Howell, 2013; SPSS, 2018; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2019). The MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction, Work-life Balance Scale, and Turnover Intention Scale variables were tested using the Explore function in SPSS. Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient was used with SPSS to analyze the data in the current study. Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient does not identify dependent or independent variables, all variables in the study were treated equally. Consistent with the assumptions, the correlations in the present study were derived from paired observations, with each participant contributing a pair to be correlated.

To determine the assumption of bivariate normality the Shapiro-Wilk test was selected for each variable in SPSS. According to Doornik and Hansen (2008), the Shapiro-Wilk test is the most effective for use of weighted sums of ordered observations. Using SPSS, the Shapiro-Wilk’s test was run (excluding outliers) with the results presented in Table 5. Identified under the Sig. column, JS, WLB, and TI were all less than .05. The Shapiro-Wilk’s test is significant at the $p < .05$. The Shapiro-Wilk’s test can calculate a statistically significant result even if the variables are normal. Although not all of the variables indicated a normal distribution, the Pearson’s correlation test is considered robust to deviations from normality (Laerd, 2020).

Table 5

Tests of Normality (Without Outliers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Simirvov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sig = Significance; df = degrees of freedom; Var = Variables.
Correlations between job satisfaction and work-life balance are presented in Table 6. The sign of the Pearson $r$ correlation coefficient is positive represented by .328, concluding a positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance in the studies participants. Outcomes from the positive correlation between job satisfaction and work-life balance can assume as job satisfaction increases, work-life balance increases as well.

Table 6

*Job Satisfaction-Work-Life Balance Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>WLB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.328*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLB</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig. (2-tailed) = significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations between job satisfaction and turnover intention are presented in Table 7. The sign of the Pearson correlation coefficient is negative represented by -.648 concluding a negative relationship exists between job satisfaction and turnover intention in the studies participants. Outcomes from the identified negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intention can assume as the level of job satisfaction increases, turnover intention decreases.
### Table 7

*Job Satisfaction-Turnover Intention Correlation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.648*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sig. (2-tailed) = Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Outliers for job satisfaction (JS), work-life balance (WLB), and turnover intention (TI) are identified in Figures 3 – 5. 3 outliers for the job satisfaction variable were identified in SPSS, which included 1 male and 3 female participants represented in Figure 3. Assumptions for Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient require outliers not be significant. The male response outlier represents .01% of all male respondents, the female response outliers represent .03 % of all female respondents.
Figure 3. Outliers for job satisfaction were identified in the sample.

Figure 4. No outliers were identified for work-life balance in the sample.
Figure 5. No outliers were identified for turnover intention in the sample.

Removing the outliers from the analysis produced the job satisfaction, turnover intention correlation of -.645 (correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, 2-tailed), and the job satisfaction, work-life balance correlation of .320 (correlation is significant at the 0.01 level, 2-tailed), with N=161. Pearson’s $r$ correlation coefficient’s assumption for no significant outliers has been met. Additionally, there were no outliers exceeding three standard deviations from the mean rule (Barnett, 1978; Iglewicz & Hoaglin, 1993). All three variables were represented on a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. Q-Q (quantile-quantile) plots showed no deviation from normality (see the appendix) and there was no statistically significant skew or kurtosis in the MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Scale, Work-life Balance Scale, and the Turnover Intention Scale (each $p < .05$). Because all three variables met the assumptions of correlation statistics, the study hypotheses could then be tested.
Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS)

Job satisfaction was measured using the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (MOAQ-JSS; Cammann et al., 1983). The MOAQ-JSS scale includes three items: “All in all, I am satisfied with my job, In general, I like working here, and In general, I don’t like my job” (Cammann et al., 1983, as cited in Bowling & Hammond, 2008, p. 64) each rated on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). After reverse-scoring the third item, all MOAQ-JSS items were summed up to create a total job satisfaction score, with the higher scores indicating greater job satisfaction. Table 8 shows the overall MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction average score was 3.49 and the standard deviation of 1.25.

Table 8

MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Item Response Descriptive (Total Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOAQ-JSS Scale Total</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9 displays the MOAQ-JSS job satisfaction item response frequencies for the total sample. The average of each of the three measure responses indicate participants responded at a higher rate for neither agree nor disagree, somewhat agree, and strongly agree. Somewhat disagree and strongly disagree reflected the least number of responses for these measures. For each MOAQ-JSS item, the entire 1 to 5 scale represented the participants responses.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 10 shows the overall MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction average female score was 3.54. Standard deviation of 1.27. Count represented the total female responses to the MOAQ-JSS measures. Finally, ranges of 1 – 5 are represented. The respondents represented in Table 10 include 87 female participants of the total sample of 165 in the current study.

Table 10 shows the overall MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction average female score was 3.54. Standard deviation of 1.27. Count represented the total female responses to the MOAQ-JSS
measures. Finally, ranges of 1 – 5 are represented. The respondents represented in Table 10 include 87 female participants of the total sample of 165 in the current study.

Table 10

MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Scale Item Response Descriptive (Females Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOAQ-JSS Scale Total</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 11 displays the MOAQ-JSS job satisfaction item response frequencies for females. The average of the three measure responses indicate the female participants responded at a higher rate to somewhat agree, somewhat agree, and strongly agree. Strongly disagree and neither agree or disagree received the least number of responses for these measures. For each MOAQ-JSS item, the entire 1 to 5 scale represented in female participant responses.
Table 11

**MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Scale Item Response Frequencies (Females Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>count</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>count</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>count</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 12 shows the overall MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction average male score was 3.45. Standard deviation total for males is 1.22. Count represents 78 males who responded to the MOAQ-JSS measures. Ranges represented from 1 – 5. The respondents represented in Table 12 include 78 male participants of the total sample of 165 in the current study.
Table 12

**MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Item Response Descriptive (Males Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOAQ-JSS Scale Total</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 13 displays the MOAQ-JSS job satisfaction item response frequencies for males.

The average of the three measure responses indicate the male participants responded at a higher rate to somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and strongly agree. Strongly disagree and somewhat agree received the least number of responses for these measures. For each MOAQ-JSS item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in male participant responses.
Table 13

MOAQ-JSS Job Satisfaction Scale Item Response Frequencies (Males Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strongly disagree count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somewhat agree count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strongly agree count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don’t like my job*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Work-Life Balance Scale

The work-life balance was the Work-Life Balance scale (Brough et al., 2014). The four work-life balance items were measured by: “I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities, I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities, I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right, and Overall, I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced.” Respondents included 87 females (53%) and 78 males (47%). After reverse-scoring the second item, all Work-Life Balance scale items were averaged to create a total Work-Life Balance Scale score, with the higher scores indicating greater work-life balance. Table 14

---

shows the response descriptive for the total sample of the Work-Life Balance Scale average total sample score of 3.33. The standard deviation average for the total sample was 1.19. The respondents represented in Table 14 include 87 female and 78 male participants of the total sample of 165 in the current study.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time I have available for non-work activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is currently about right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work-Life Balance Scale Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance Scale Total</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 15 displays the total sample Work-Life Balance Scale item response frequencies. The average of the four measure responses from the total sample of participants responded at a higher rate to somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and somewhat agree. Strongly disagree and strongly agree received the least number of responses for these measures. For each Work-Life Balance Scale item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in participant responses.
Table 15

Participant Responses to Work-Life Balance Measures (Total Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities</td>
<td>13 8%</td>
<td>29 18%</td>
<td>37 22%</td>
<td>50 30%</td>
<td>36 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities</td>
<td>30 18%</td>
<td>44 27%</td>
<td>30 18%</td>
<td>48 29%</td>
<td>13 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right</td>
<td>7 4%</td>
<td>27 16%</td>
<td>36 22%</td>
<td>62 38%</td>
<td>33 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced</td>
<td>8 5%</td>
<td>28 17%</td>
<td>37 22%</td>
<td>51 31%</td>
<td>41 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 16 displays the Work-Life Balance Scale item response frequencies for females.

All four measures represented responses from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree. Percentage of responses for each measure are provided in Table 16 as well. The average of the four measure responses for the female participants responded at a higher rate to somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and somewhat agree. Strongly disagree and strongly agree received the least
number of responses for these measures. For each MOAQ-JSS item, the entire 1 to 5 scale represented in female participant responses.

Table 16

*Work-Life Balance Scale Item Response Frequencies (Females Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 17 shows the Work-Life Balance Scale average female score was 3.38. The standard deviation average is 1.22. For each Work-Life Balance Scale item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in female responses totaling 87. The respondents represented in Table 17 include 87 female participants of the 165 total sample in the current study.
Table 17

*Work-Life Balance Scale Item Response Descriptive (Females Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time I have available for non-work activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is currently about right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance Scale Total</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 18 shows the Work-Life Balance Scale item response frequencies for males. All four measures represented responses from *Strongly disagree* to *Strongly agree*. Percentage of responses for each measure provided in Table 18 as well. The average of the four measure responses for the male participants responded at a higher rate to somewhat disagree, neither agree nor disagree, and somewhat agree. Strongly disagree and strongly agree received the least number of responses for these measures. For each Work-Life Balance Scale item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in male participant responses.
Table 18

**Work-Life Balance Scale Item Response Frequencies (Males Only)**

| Measures                                                                 | Strongly disagree | | Somewhat disagree | | Neither agree nor disagree | | Somewhat agree | | Strongly agree |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---|-------------------|---|--------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities | 5 6%              | 12 15% | 17 22%           | 28 36% | 16 21% |
| I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities             | 12 15%            | 25 32% | 14 18%           | 19 24% | 8 10% |
| I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right | 3 4%              | 11 14% | 16 21%           | 33 42% | 15 19% |
| I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced                   | 3 4%              | 12 15% | 20 26%           | 25 32% | 18 23% |


Table 19 displays the overall Work-Life Balance Scale average male score was 3.45. Standard deviation average was 1.16. Range of 1 – 5 are represented in table 19 for response descriptive of male respondents. The respondents represented in Table 19 include 78 male participants of the 165 total sample in the current study.
Table 19

Work-Life Balance Scale Item Response Descriptive (Males Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I currently have a good balance between the time I spend at work and the time I have available for non-work activities</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have difficulty balancing my work and non-work activities</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the balance between my work demands and non-work activities is currently about right</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my work and non-work life are balanced</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Life Balance Scale Total</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Turnover Intention Scale

Turnover intention was measured using the Turnover Intention Scale of Brough and Frame (2004). The turnover intention scale included three items: “How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months, How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months, and How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization\(^9\)” (Brough & Frame, 2004. p. 10). Respondents included 87 females (53%) and 78 males (47%). Turnover Intention Scale items were averaged to create a total Turnover Intention score, with higher scores indicating greater turnover intention.

Table 20 shows the total sample Turnover Intention Scale average score was 2.84. Standard deviation average was 1.34. Range of 1 – 5 are represented in Table 20 of the total sample responses of 165 participants. The respondents represented in Table 20 include 87 female and 78 male participants which is the total sample of 165 in the current study.

Table 20

**Descriptive Information for Turnover Intention Measures (Total Sample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention Scale Total</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 21 displays the total sample Turnover Intention scale item response frequencies. All three measures represented responses from Not at all to A great deal. The average of the three measure responses for the total sample participants responded at a higher rate to Very little, Somewhat, and Quit a bit. Not at all and a great deal received the least number of responses for these measures. For each Turnover Intention item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in participant responses.
Table 21

**Participant Responses to Turnover Intention Measures (Total Sample)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Not at all count</th>
<th>Not at all %</th>
<th>Very little count</th>
<th>Very little %</th>
<th>Somewhat count</th>
<th>Somewhat %</th>
<th>Quite a bit count</th>
<th>Quite a bit %</th>
<th>A great deal count</th>
<th>A great deal %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 22 shows the participant responses for Turnover Intention measures for females only. All the measures represented responses from *Not at all* to *A great deal*. The average of the three measure responses for the female participants responded at a higher rate to Not at all, Very little, and Somewhat. Quite a bit and A great deal received the least number of responses for these measures. For each Turnover Intention item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in female participant responses.
Table 22

**Participant Responses to Turnover Intention Measures (Females Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Not at all count</th>
<th>Very little count</th>
<th>Somewhat count</th>
<th>Quite a bit count</th>
<th>A great deal count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 23 displays the Turnover Intention scale and the overall Turnover Intention scale average female score was 2.73. Standard deviation average was 1.34 and the ranges 1 – 5 are represented in Table 23 as well. The respondents represented in Table 23 include 87 female participants of the total sample in the current study.
Table 23

Descriptive Information for Turnover Intention Measures (Females Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention Scale Total</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 24 shows the Turnover Intention Scale item response frequencies for males. All four measures represented responses from *Not at all* to *A great deal*. Percentage of responses for each measure provided in Table 24 as well. The average of the three measure responses for the male participants responded at a higher rate for *Not at all*, *Somewhat*, and *Quit a bit*. Very little and a great deal received the least number of responses for these measures. For each Turnover Intention item, the entire 1 to 5 scale was represented in male participant responses.
### Table 24

**Participant Responses to Turnover Intention Measures (Males Only)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Not at all count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Very little count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somewhat count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Quite a bit count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A great deal count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job in the last six months</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 25 displays the overall Turnover Intention Scale average male score was 2.96.

Standard deviation average was 1.32. 78 males participated in the current study. Ranges 1 – 5 are represented in Table 25 as well.
Table 25

Descriptive Information for Turnover Intention Measures (Males Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently have you seriously considered leaving your job</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last six months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to leave your job in the next six months</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you actively look for jobs outside your</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention Scale Total</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 26 displays the job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intentions descriptive information. Job satisfaction scores averaged 3.49 (SD = 1.25, range: 1-5), work-life balance scores averaged 3.33 (SD = 1.19, range: 1-5), and turnover intention scores averaged 2.84 (SD = 1.34, range: 1-5).

Table 26

Sample Descriptive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS)</th>
<th>Work-Life Balance (WLBS)</th>
<th>Turnover Intention (Turnover Intention Scale)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. MOAQ-JSS = Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Survey; WLBS = Work Life Balance Scale.
The hypotheses were tested. For each, the hypothesis is re-stated, followed by the results. Results include the $r$ value for the correlation and the $p$-value to assess statistical significance. Variance accounted for ($r^2$) is also provided to describe the magnitude of the relationship. Figures 6-11 include line of best fit to aid the interpretation of each relationship. Hypotheses were assessed at the $p < .05$ threshold for statistical significance.

**Work-life Balance and Job Satisfaction**

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

**H1.** There is no statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**H1a.** There is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

Hypothesis 1 stated, There is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in US workers and the corresponding Null hypothesis stated, there is no statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. The bivariate Pearson correlation established a moderate, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, $r (163) = .33$, $p < .01$. The relationship was positive in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance.

The relationship is visually displayed in Figure 6, which presents the x-axis indicating job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) and the y-axis indicates work-life balance (WLBS). Each point represents the datapoint for an individual participant’s MOAQ-JSS and WLBS scores. The correlation line shows the relationship between MOAQ-JSS and WLBS scores and the formula embedded in the graph ($y=0.296x + 2.38$) indicates for each unit increase in the x-variable
(MOAQ-JSS), the y-variable (WLBS) increased by approximately three tenths (.296) of 1 unit. The statistically significant result rejected $H_{10}$, supporting $H_{1a}$.

Figure 6. Scatterplot of job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) and work-life balance (Work-Life Balance Scale, total sample).

The bivariate Pearson correlation established a moderate, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance. Job satisfaction for the females, $r_{(86)} = .29, p < .01$. The job satisfaction, work-life balance relationship was positive in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance. The job satisfaction, work-life balance relationship is visually displayed in Figure 7, displaying the statistically significant result rejecting the Null Hypothesis 1 and supporting Alternative Hypothesis 1 for the female subsample.
Figure 7. Scatterplot of job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) and work-life balance (Work-Life Balance Scale, females only).

The bivariate Pearson correlation established a moderate, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance for the males, $r (77) = .40, p < .01$. The job satisfaction, work-life balance relationship was positive in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance. The job satisfaction, work-life balance relationship is visually displayed in Figure 8 presenting the statistically significant results rejecting the Null Hypothesis 1 and supporting the Alternative Hypothesis 1 for the male subsample.
Figure 8. Scatterplot of job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) and work-life balance (Work-Life Balance Scale males only).

**Turnover Intention and Job Satisfaction**

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

**H2a.** There is a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**H2b.** There is no statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

The bivariate Pearson correlation established a strong, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention, \( r (163) = -.65, p < .01 \). The job satisfaction, turnover intention relationship was negative in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intention. The job satisfaction, turnover intention
relationship is visually displayed in Figure 9, displaying the statistically significant result rejecting the Null Hypothesis 2 and supporting Hypothesis 2.

Figure 9. Scatterplot of job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) and turnover intention (Turnover Intention Scale, total sample).

The bivariate Pearson correlation established a strong, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention for the females, $r (86) = -.66, p < .01$. The job satisfaction, turnover intention relationship was negative in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intention. The job satisfaction, turnover intention relationship is visually displayed in Figure 10, displaying the statistically significant results rejecting the Null Hypothesis 2 and supporting the Alternative Hypothesis 2 for the female subsample.
Figure 10. Scatterplot of job satisfaction (MOAZ-JSS) and turnover intention (Turnover Intention Scale, females Only).

The bivariate Pearson correlation established a strong, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention for the males, \( r = -.63, p < .01 \). The job satisfaction, turnover intention relationship was negative in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intention. The job satisfaction, turnover intention relationship is visually displayed in Figure 11, displaying the statistically significant result rejecting the Null Hypothesis 2 and supporting the Alternative Hypothesis 2 for the male subsample.
Summary

The current study of 165 adult US workers revealed that job satisfaction was significantly and positively related to work-life balance, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance, supporting hypothesis 1. Additionally, the current study revealed job satisfaction was significantly and negatively related to turnover intention, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intention. Finding rejected Null Hypothesis 2 and supported Alternative Hypothesis 2. Results from both females and males mirrored the primary analyses results rejecting Null Hypothesis 1 and Null Hypothesis 2, instead supporting Hypothesis 1 and Alternative Hypothesis 2. These findings are discussed further in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The current quantitative nonexperimental correlational study contributed to the research on the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adults working in the United States. The current study answered two research questions: (a) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers (RQ1) and (b) To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in U.S. workers” (RQ2)

The current study applied two theories, Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory.

Chapter 5 includes examination of the study’s findings presented in Chapter 4 and discuss the summary of the results, discussion of the results, conclusions based on the results, limitations in the study, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Results

Job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention have been the topics for extensive research (Kakar et al., 2019; Kim & Fernandez, 2017; Padma & Reddy, 2014; Steel et al., 2019; Tlaiss & Mendelson, 2014). Findings from the current study could have practical implications for organizations for reducing turnover and to increase understanding of job satisfaction and its relationship to work-life balance and turnover intention. In fact, job satisfaction is associated with the mental and physical health of employees (O’Brien et al., 2019) identifying job satisfaction as an important topic of study. Additionally, human resources managers could gain important information to better understand the relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, and then enact policies towards obtaining and retaining the human capital assets of an organization (Batt &
Colvin, 2011). Understanding the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance and turnover intention and job satisfaction, in adults working in U.S. companies, can fill an important gap within the literature.

The literature review on job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention included seminal as well as recent research. Job satisfaction literature included review of studies conducted from 1951 to 2020. Seminal research on job satisfaction demonstrated an interest in determining how job satisfaction affects employees as well as organizations (Schaffer, 1953). Recent research on job satisfaction identified job satisfaction as a problem associated with recruitment and retention of employees (Motlou, Singh, & Karodia, 2016).

Work-life balance literature included review of studies from 1971 to 2020. Work-life balance literature addressed employees who maintain a job and family responsibilities. Seminal research by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) stated the work-life interface could be viewed as a conflict employee may experience when managing both roles, work, and home. Literature on work-life balance suggested employees have concerns in the area of work-life balance at every stage of their employment (Darcy et al., 2012).

Turnover intention research included review of studies from 1979 to 2020. Employee turnover intention and turnover research attracted the interest of practitioners and scholars for many decades (Hom et al., 2017). Seminal research conducted by Mobley et al. (1978) indicated that employee dissatisfaction and the likelihood of finding other employment contributed to the employee’s turnover intention. Research determined that high levels of turnover could be an indicator that employees are less satisfied with their jobs (Hur, 2013; Tongchaiprasit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016).
The theoretical foundations applied to the current study were Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. According to Kotni and Karumuri (2018), job satisfaction could be related to salary and relationships with others, which are two of the hygiene factors identified by Herzberg. Maslow’s theory addressed how employees achieve satisfaction with their personal needs while meeting the requirements of their work. The present study advanced Herzberg’s theory of motivation and hygiene factors and Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory by examining the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adults working full-time in a U.S. organization.

The present study was a quantitative nonexperimental, correlational design utilizing an online survey to determine the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction in adult U.S. workers. The two research questions included in the present quantitative correlational study were:

**RQ1.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

**H1**: There is no statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**H1a**: There is a statistically significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**RQ2.** To what extent is there a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers?

**H2**: There is no statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

**H2a**: There is a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.
$H2_a$. There is a statistically significant relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in U.S. workers.

Findings for RQ1 revealed a moderate, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, $r (163) = .33, p < .01$, and the relationship was positive in direction, meaning as job satisfaction increased, work-life balance increased as well. Findings from RQ2 revealed a strong, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention, $r (163) = -.65, p < .01$, and the relationship was negative in direction, meaning as job satisfaction increased, turnover intention decreased.

**Discussion of the Results**

Research Question 1 (RQ1) included examination of the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in adults working in the United States. Mercado (2019) and Padma and Reddy (2014) conducted a study examining the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance. Results identified a positive relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction which is in line with the results from the current study. Work-life balance was identified as impactful on worker productivity and retention (Jackson & Fransman, 2018). Jackson and Fransman conducted a study examining the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Results from Jackson and Fransman’s study confirmed work-life balance had a significant impact on the employee’s job satisfaction.

Additionally, work-life balance was a strong predictor of job satisfaction. Kaliannan et al. (2016) conducted a study to investigate how different generations of employees perceive their work-life balance and how they associate it with their job satisfaction. Findings supported previous empirical findings work-life balance contributed to employee job satisfaction. Analysis of the data in Chapter 4 revealed a moderate, statistically significant linear relationship between
job satisfaction and work-life balance, $r (163) = .33, p < .01$ and was positive in direction, confirming previously published conclusions. Based on the conclusions of the present study and confirmed by previous studies, Human Resources Managers could review and implement policies focus on the challenges employees experience when faced with work-life balance and job satisfaction (Jackson & Fransman, 2018).

Research Question 2 (RQ2) included examination of the relationship between turnover intention and job satisfaction in adults working in the United States. Job satisfaction is significant in the relationship between turnover intention and emotional intelligence (Feyerabend, Herd, & Choi, 2018). Tschopp, Grote, and Gerber (2014) conducted a study to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention on the impact of the employee’s career orientation. Results indicated an increase in job satisfaction was strongly related to a decrease in turnover intention.

Fasbender, Van der Heijden, and Grimshaw (2018) conducted a study to examine the predictive effects of job satisfaction on turnover intention. A negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention was identified in the findings. Flickinger, Allscher, and Fiedler (2016) conducted a study of job satisfaction and turnover intentions in temporary workers. Findings suggested temporary work reduces the impact of high job satisfaction on reducing turnover intentions and as job satisfaction increases, turnover intention does not decrease at the same rate as in permanent employees.

Analysis of the data in Chapter 4 revealed a strong, statistically significant linear relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention, $r (163) = -.65, p < .01$, and the relationship was negative in direction, as the level of job satisfaction increased, the level of turnover intention decreased, confirming previously published conclusions (Lu et al., 2017;
Mathieu, Fabi, Lacoursière, & Raymond, 2016). Findings from the current study are in line with previous research conducted by Shepard, Ployhart, and Kautz (2020) identified job satisfaction directly influenced the turnover intention of employees.

**Conclusions Based on the Results**

**Comparison of the Findings**

Employees create value for organizations (Meijerink, Bondarouk, & Lepak, 2016) and without employees, no productivity can be accomplished (Mulla et al., 2014). Job satisfaction was identified as one of the most important topics in employee attitudes directly impacting employees (Abelha et al., 2018). Christiana and Rajan (2014) researched work-life balance determining employee’s work-life balance can have a significant impact on the ability of organizations to be effective. Pandu and Sankar (2018) concluded if employees experience a better work-life balance their level of job satisfaction rises and subsequently turnover rates are reduced, supporting previous findings.

Jabeen et al. (2018) conducted a study include the work-life balance, job satisfaction relationship, determined a positive significant relationship existed. The current study results identified the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance as positive in direction, and job satisfaction was significantly correlated with work-life balance. The job satisfaction, work-life balance relationship was positive in direction, such that the greater the job satisfaction, the greater the work-life balance, and work-life balance was a strong predictor of job satisfaction. Findings from the current study were consistent with previous studies.

The theoretical foundations applied to the current study were Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. Herzberg et al. developed the theory of motivation and hygiene factors
presenting two factors relate to job dissatisfaction and job satisfaction. Outcome from the current study identified a positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance which was present in the findings. According to Smith and Shields (2013), job satisfaction is positively related to employee performance.

The current study identified a positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance. Organizations with identified goals of increasing employees work-life balance could begin by increasing the employees' level of job satisfaction. According to Herzberg’s (1959) two factor theory, as salary, company policies, supervision, or working conditions improve, so does the level of job satisfaction employee experience (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959). Organizations can examine Herzberg’s motivator factors; recognition, achievement, growth opportunities, responsibility, and work itself, and as these areas increase, so job satisfaction increases as well (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959).

Understanding the positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance can help organizations establish policies and procedures to increase the job satisfaction of employees. Employees create value for organizations (Meijerink et al., 2016) and without employees, no productivity can be accomplished (Mulla et al., 2014). In this context, satisfied employees associated with higher productivity, and job satisfaction was positively related to work-life balance. Organizations could consider these results to better understand the challenges employees face when balancing their work and home obligations.

Turnover intention is an important topic is identified as the precursor to an employee making the decision to quit their present job (Haque, Fernando, & Caputi, 2019). Fasbender et al. (2018) conducted a study which included examining job satisfaction and turnover intention. Results from Fasbender et al.’s study determined job satisfaction was negatively associated with
turnover intention. The current study identified job satisfaction (MOAQ-JSS) as significantly correlated with turnover intention (TIS), $r (163) = -.65, p < .01$, identifying the relationship as negative in direction.

Organizations could enact policies to increase the level of job satisfaction employee experience and subsequently lower the level of turnover intention. Because turnover can be costly for organizations, and turnover intention was identified as the step before quitting, a great deal of research has been conducted to understand which variables are involved in the decision-making process of employees to quit their jobs (Flint et al., 2013). Huffman et al. (2014) determined as employees experience negative job satisfaction and the employee becomes more dissatisfied with their job, they may find avenues to resolve their dissatisfaction.

The literature review provided a comprehensive look at the various studies on job satisfaction, work-life balance, and turnover intention. The current study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers. The results of the current study determined a positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance, the higher the job satisfaction, the higher the work-life balance. Additionally, the current study determined a negative relationship was present between job satisfaction and turnover intention, the lower the job satisfaction, the higher the turnover intention in adult U.S. workers.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

The theoretical foundations applied to the current study were Herzberg’s (1959) theory of motivation and hygiene factors (as cited in Herzberg et al., 1959) and Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs theory. Herzberg et al. developed the theory of motivation and hygiene factors presenting two factors relate to job dissatisfaction and job satisfaction. Outcome from the current
study identified a positive relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance which was present in the findings. According to Smith and Shields (2013), job satisfaction is positively related to employee performance.

Results from the current study identified a positive relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction. Human resources are considered one of the most important branches of an organization (Capnary, Rachmawati, & Agung, 2018). Processes within an organization could not run without the required employees, leading organizations to create strategies for retaining their human capital (Capnary et al., 2018). The current study provides results from a nonexperimental, correlational study on the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction in adults working in the United States. Results from the current study can inform human resource managers and organizations on the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance.

RQ2 of the present study included examination of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention in adult U.S. workers. Results indicated a negative relationship, as the employees’ level of job satisfaction decreased, the level of turnover intention increased. The employee’s level of job satisfaction can have a direct impact on the level of turnover intention. Suriyent, Ramayah, Lo, and Tarmizi (2014) conducted a study examining the relationship between work-live balance and turnover intention. Results indicate work-life balance had a significant negative relationship with turnover intention and work-life balance had been identified as a predictor of turnover. Turnover can be costly for organizations, and turnover intention had been identified as the step before quitting (Flint et al., 2013). Shu, Gong, Xiong, and Hu (2018) conducted a study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. Finding indicated levels of job satisfaction affected the employees’ level of
turnover intention and the relationship was negative, consistent with the current study and prior research findings (DeConinck & Stilwell, 2004; Trevor, 2001).

Limitations

Online survey use has increased due to access to, and the ability to contact large populations while providing a faster method of obtaining important data (McKay, Garcia, Clapper, & Shultz, 2018). There were several limitations from the use of an online survey. First, the survey reached participants who had access to the internet, excluding all participants without Internet access, even though they may have met the inclusion criteria. Second, not all participants who received the invitation to participate completed the survey, although participants selected accept on the informed consent page, not all surveys were completed. According to the data collected by Qualtrics, 179 participants, who met all of the inclusion criteria, began the survey with 165 completing the survey.

Third, the criteria that participants must be 18 years or older limited the ability to identify generational differences in the participants. Fourth, inclusion criteria included “worked full time for the past year.” These inclusion criteria eliminated any part-time, temporary, or contract workers who could have contributed to the research data identified as a limitation for the study. Fifth, significant differences can be identified between western countries, such as the United States, and Asia countries. Because the sample population came from the United States and no other counties, the current study is limited by the values, culture, and work ethic of the participants of the United States. Online surveys can reach a large population, they are convenient and accessible, and can be easily utilized if the basic population who can access the internet.
Implications for Practice

Findings from the current study revealed job satisfaction was significantly related to work-life balance and job satisfaction was significantly related to turnover intention. These findings may assist organizations in general and human resource departments, in particular, to better understand the relationships between job satisfaction and work-life balance, and job satisfaction and turnover intention, and then enact policies towards obtaining and retaining the human capital assets of an organization (Batt & Colvin, 2011). Additionally, outcomes from the current study can inform the human resources management community towards implementing policies reflect an understanding of job satisfaction, reduce employee turnover, and increase understanding of work-life balance.

Recommendations for Further Research

Three recommendations for future research have been identified. First, data from future research should be collected by the age of participants creating the opportunity to identify generational differences within the data. The U.S. Census Bureau (2014) defined the generations as Silent Generation (1928-1945), Baby Boomers (1944-1964), Generation X (1965-1980), Millennials (Generation Y, 1981-1995). Although not all members of a single generation are the same, it is important to collect meaningful data (Campbell, Campbell, Siedor & Twenge, 2015). Second, future research should include part-time and temporary workers. Each employee contributes to the success of the organization. Contribution, opinions, and attitudes toward the work environment, as a whole, can be included in future research to expand the research presented in the current study. Finally, future research could be qualitative. With a qualitative study, participants would have an opportunity to expand on the data provided in the current quantitative study.
Conclusion

The current study was a quantitative nonexperimental correlational design utilized an online survey to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and work-life balance and job satisfaction and turnover intention in adults working full-time in a U.S. Company for the past year. Chapter 1 introduced the background and the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, defined the terms, introduced the research design and presented the assumptions and limitations.

Chapter 2 presented the methods of searching, theoretical orientation for the study, review of the literature on job satisfaction (from the 1950s to 2000s), work-life balance (from 1970s to 2000s), and turnover intention (from 1970s to 2000s). Additionally, Chapter 2 presented a synthesis of the research findings and a critique of the previous research methods. Chapter 3 discussed the methodology including; the purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, research design, target population and sample, procedures, instruments, and ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 was the results chapter. The current study of 165 adult US workers revealed job satisfaction was significantly related to work-life balance, supporting Hypothesis 1. Additionally, the current study revealed job satisfaction was significantly related to turnover intention rejecting Null Hypothesis 2 and supported Alternative Hypothesis 2. Chapter 5 discussed the summary of the results, conclusions based on the results, limitations, implications for practice and recommendations for future research which could include a qualitative study to further the current study and expand the research of the relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction, and turnover intention and job satisfaction.
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