

The Influence of *Flexible Working Space* and *Work-Life Balance* on Employee Performance with *Gender* as Moderation

Ihtada Yogaisty¹, Herri², Hendra Lukito³

¹Master of Management, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Andalas, Indonesia

^{2,3}Faculty of Economics, Universitas Andalas, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the effect of FWS and WLB on the performance of the DGSAM employees moderated by gender. This research is explanatory quantitative research. The data analysis technique used Partial Least Square. The number of respondents amounted to 385 people who are official civil servants of DGSAM. The results of this study found: that (1) FWS has a positive significant effect on employee performance. WLB which has 4 dimensions produces findings: (2a) Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) has a positive significant effect on Employee Performance, (2b) Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) has a negative significant effect on Employee Performance. (2c) Personal Life Enhancement of Work (PLEW) has a positive significant effect on employee performance. (2d) Work Enhancement of Personal Live (WEPL) has a positive significant effect on Employee Performance. Gender, which is the moderating variable in the relationship between FWS and WLB on Employee Performance, results in the following findings: (3) Gender doesn't moderate the relationship between FWS and Employee Performance. (4) Gender partially moderates the relationship between WLB and Employee Performance. The magnitude of the effect of FWS and WLB on Employee Performance is indicated by R^2 of 37.6%.

Keywords

employee performance;
flexible working space,
work-life balance



I. Introduction

The phenomenon of the Covid-19 pandemic has changed many aspects of human life. Not only does it have a big impact on the health aspect, but the Covid-19 pandemic also brings various impacts and major changes to the economic, social, and cultural aspects that develop in society. Even in the world of work globally, the Covid-19 pandemic can echo foreign terms such as *work from home* which is part of the *flexible working space concept* which is now widely applied by various organizations, both government organizations, and organizations. private.

Even though the Covid-19 pandemic first became global at the end of 2019 and broke out in Indonesia in March 2020, the impact of the decline in community mobilization to the workplace can be seen directly to date. As a result, many organizations are starting to think about setting up work schemes with the concept of *flexible working space* through *work from home*. The Directorate General of State Assets, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia is one of the organizational units that has implemented the KMK policy number: 223/KMK.01/2020 concerning Workplace Flexibility for its employees since it was established on 06 May 2020. Definition of *Flexibility Working Space /FWS*) in this rule is an arrangement of employee work patterns that provide freedom in choosing a work location for a certain period by maximizing

information and communication technology to maintain and improve employee performance.

Employee performance is the result of a process that refers to and is measured over a certain period based on pre-determined provisions or agreements. To achieve its goals, an organization must be able to obtain and utilize the resources that will be used to achieve these goals. In this case, performance is one of the keys to success and plays a major role for the company in achieving its goals. With high performance, the company will find it easier to achieve goals and can grow rapidly in the future. (Lukito, 2019).

The performance of employees according to Abdullah (2014) is the result of the work of the organization, which is carried out by employees as well as possible in accordance with the instructions (manual), the direction given by the leader (manager), the competence and ability of employees to develop their reasoning at work. Furthermore, Abdullah (2014) describes several indicators for measuring employee performance, some of which are as follows: (a) Effectiveness; (b) Efficiency; (c) Quality; (d) Punctuality; (e) Productivity; and (f) Safety.

Employee performance (*job performance*) can be concluded as an ability based on knowledge, skills, attitudes, and work motivation in producing or completing a job. Employee performance is reflected when an employee already has the ability (*capability*) in understanding and master the field of work, has an interest in completing the work, as well as clear roles and good work motivation within the employee, so it can be said that the employee has a strong foundation. to perform better.

Although several survey results confirm the various benefits (*benefits*) of implementing *flexible working space* on employee performance, this exposes employees to other challenges in its implementation. The reason is that the practice of implementing work from home (*work from home*) is still faced with types of work that cannot be completed from home considering the limited support facilities if the work is carried out from home such as limited *personal computers*, internet networks, especially intranets, *printing devices*, *software* installation / required software, etc. In addition, the limited inter-unit/inter-functional coordination often slows down the work process due to the space and time differences of the *work from home workers*. Another challenge that must be faced by workers, especially female workers who choose to *work from home*, is that they often work at home in conditions while doing various activities outside of their main job, for example: working while taking care of the house, caring for sick parents. , accompanying children when they have to learn *online*, as well as doing other homework activities that have nothing to do with the main job. This fact is reinforced by research conducted by Waizenegger, McKenna, Cai & Bendz (2020) which revealed the finding that doing work activities in a shared room with other householders can interfere with work activities and cause difficulty focusing on completing work. These are some of the challenges faced by workers in implementing a *flexible working space*.

Policies in other organizations, especially in designing work patterns that support the creation of a *work-life balance* for employees are also one of the factors that can affect employee performance. Anwar's research (2013) reveals that a balanced *work-life relationship* can positively or negatively affect employee performance. The creation of a *work-life balance* is one of the goals that workers want to achieve in choosing their main job. Therefore, work patterns that support the creation of *work-life balance* (balance between personal and work life) in the workforce are one of the factors that support the goal of increasing performance and productivity within the organization. As the results of research by Abid & Barech (2017) state that there is an effective balance in the life and work (*work-life balance*) of workers directly affects employee performance.

Several previous studies that reviewed *flexible working space*, *work-life balance*, and employee performance resulted in various conclusions. Research on *flexible working spaces* conducted in different countries such as Altindag & Siller (2014) from Turkey and Abid & Barech (2017) from Pakistan concluded that the implementation of *flexible working spaces* has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Different conclusions are summarized from the research of Kattenbach, Demerouti & Nachreiner (2010) from Germany which concludes that *flexible working space* does not have a significant effect on employee performance. Meanwhile, research by Hofacker & Konig (2013) highlights the differences in perspective between men and women in how they deal with work arrangements, where flexibility in work leads to a decrease in the work-life conflict in women but leads to an increase in work-life conflict in men.

Research by Anwar (2013) and Soomro, et al. (2018) revealed that whether or not the relationship between work and personal life is balanced (*work-life relationship*) can have a positive or negative effect on employee performance. This is in line with the 4 (four) dimensions of *work-life balance* described by Fisher, et al. (2009) and Angin & Saragih (2021) where there are two dimensions of *work-life balance in the form of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL)* and *Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)* which describe how much *work-nonwork conflict* (conflict between work and personal life) or vice versa) experienced by a worker. Conflicts that occur in workers from the dimensions of WIPL and PLIW contribute negatively to employee performance. On the other hand, two other dimensions of *work-life balance*, namely *Personal Life Enhancement of Work (PLEW)* and *Work Enhancement of Personal Life (WEPL)* describe how much *work-nonwork enhancement* (increase between work and personal life or vice versa) is experienced by workers. An increase in the work life and personal life experienced by workers contributes to a positive influence on employee performance. Thus, a *work-life balance* can be achieved when a worker can improve the quality of the PLEW and WEPL dimensions and reduce the WIPL and PLIW conflicts he faces, to create a better performance from the workers.

III. Research Method

This type of research is quantitative research using an explanatory approach that is intended to obtain an explanation of the relationship between the independent variables *Flexible Working Space* and *Work-Life Balance* which has 4 (four) dimensions, namely: *Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL)*, *Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)*.), *Personal Life Enhancement of Work (PLEW)* and *Work Enhancement of Personal Life (WEPL)* on the dependent variable of DJKN Employee Performance, Ministry of Finance moderated by *Gender*. Data collection was carried out from February 2022 – March 2022. The sample in this study was selected using a non-probability sampling technique using the *purposive sampling method* where the characteristics of the sample used in this study were that the respondent had implemented *work from home* or used flexible facilities. *the time* during work. The number of samples in this study was 385 employees, with a proportion of 262 male employees and 123 female employees.

The data collection method used in this research is by distributing questionnaires/research questionnaires compiled online (*Electronic Questionnaire*). Each answer from the statement of the *flexible* implementation research questionnaire *regarding working space, work-life balance*, and employee performance of the Directorate General of State Assets is given weights or scores arranged in stages based on the Likert *scale* which

is used to reveal the attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of a person or group of people about this social phenomenon.

The instrument validity test on each variable of this research was conducted using *SmartPLS software*. Validity testing is evaluated based on *convergent* and *discriminant validity* where each indicator is measured from the *outer loading value* through the algorithm process. *Convergent validity* is used to determine the validity of each relationship between the indicator and its latent construct.

IV. Discussion

4.1 Respondent Profiles

The analysis of the *inner model* or structural model is carried out to ensure that the structural model built is accurate. Structural model testing produces a significant value of the path relationship between latent variables by using the *bootstrapping function*. This test will be evaluated using *R-Square* for the dependent construct. The *R Square values* in this study are:

Table 1. *R Square. Value*

Dependent Variable	R Square
Employee Performance	0.376

Source: Results of Primary Data Processing 2022

Based on the table above, it is known that the *R Square value* for the Employee Performance variable is 0.376, which can be interpreted that the Employee Performance variable is influenced by the *Flexible Working Space* and *Work-Life Balance variables* with 4 dimensions: WIPL (*Work Interference with Personal Life*), PLIW (*Personal Life Interference with Work*), PLEW (*Personal Life Enhancement of Work*), and WEPL (*Work Enhancement of Personal Life*) were 37.6%. While the remaining 62.4% is explained by other variables outside of this study.

The *Inner Model analysis* also looks at the coefficients, *T-statistics*, and *P values* of each *path* generated through the *bootstrapping process* to be used as a means of testing the significance between constructs in the structural model. The values in this study can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. *Path Coefficient Value, T-Statistics, and P Value*

Path	Path Coefficient	T Statistics	P Values	Results
FWS → KP	0.099	2,238	0.026	Sig.
WLB_WIPL → KP	0.202	4,379	0.000	Sig.
WLB_PLIW → KP	-0.235	5,643	0.000	Sig.
WLB_PLEW → KP	0.336	6,874	0.000	Sig.
WLB_WEPL → KP	0.217	4,660	0.000	Sig.

Source: Results of Primary Data Processing 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that:

1. The path analysis of FWS → KP produces a *path coefficient value* of 0.099, a *T statistic value* (2.238) > *T Table* (1.96), and a *P value* of 0.026 < 0.05. This means that *Flexible Working Space* has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, hypothesis H1 which states: *That flexible Working Space has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees, is supported.*
2. WLB_WIPL → KP analysis path produces *path coefficient value* 0.202, *T statistic value* (4.379) > *T Table* (1.96) and *P values* 0.00 < 0.05. This means that the *Work Interference with Personal Life* variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, hypothesis H2a which states: *that Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) has a negative and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees, is not supported.*
3. WLB_PLIW → KP analysis path produces *path coefficient values* of -0.235, *T Statistic value* (5.643) > *T Table* (1.96) and *P values* 0.00 < 0.05. This means that the *Personal Life Interference with Work* variable has a negative and significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, hypothesis H2b which states: *that Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) has a negative and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees, is supported.*
4. WLB_PLEW KP analysis path produces → *path coefficient values* of 0.336, *T Statistic values* (6.874) > *T Table* (1.96) and *P values* 0.00 < 0.05. This means that the *Personal Life Enhancement of. variable Work* has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, hypothesis H2c which states: *that Personal Life Enhancement of Work (PLEW) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees, is supported.*
5. WLB_WEPL → KP analysis path produces a *path coefficient value* of 0.217, *T statistic value* (4.660) > *T Table* (1.96) and *P values* 0.00 < 0.05. This means that the *Personal Life Interference with Work* variable has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Therefore, the hypothesis H2d which states: *that Work Enhancement of Personal Life (WEPL) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees, is supported.*

Gender variable is thought to moderate the relationship between *Flexible Working Space* and *Work-Life Balance* on Employee Performance, is carried out through *Multi-Group Analysis testing* using *SmartPLS software*. The test results of the moderating variable can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Path Coefficients and P Value Results of Gender Moderation Analysis

Path		Path Coefficient female	Male Path Coefficient	P Values	Results
FWS → KP		0.045	0.099	0.599	Not Sig.
WLB	WIPL → KP	0.172	0.202	0.788	Not Sig.
	PLIW → KP	-0.389	-0.192	0.030	Sig.
	PLEW → KP	0.444	0.286	0.148	Not Sig
	WEPL → KP	0.138	0.256	0, 243	Not Sig.

Source: Results of Primary Data Processing 2022

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the relationship between *Flexible Working Space* on Employee Performance with *gender* as a moderating variable produces a P-Value of: $0.599 > 0.05$. This means that *gender* does not moderate the relationship between *Flexible Working Space* and Employee Performance. Thus, hypothesis H3 which states: *gender* moderates the relationship between *flexible working space* and the performance of DJKN employees, **is not supported**.

Gender analysis as a moderation in the relationship of *Work-Life Balance* to Employee Performance, where *Work-Life Balance* is measured by 4-dimensional variables has detailed results as follows:

- a) The relationship between $WIPL \rightarrow KP$ and *gender* as a moderating variable resulted in a P-Value of: $0.788 > 0.05$. This means that *gender* does not moderate the relationship between *WIPL* and employee performance.
- b) The relationship between $PLIW \rightarrow KP$ and *gender* as a moderating variable resulted in a P-Value of: $0.020 < 0.05$. This means that *gender* moderates the relationship between *PLIW* and employee performance.
- c) The relationship between $PLEW \rightarrow KP$ and *gender* as a moderating variable resulted in a P-Value of: $0.148 > 0.05$. This means that *gender* does not moderate the relationship between *PLEW* and employee performance.
- d) The relationship between $WEPL \rightarrow KP$ and *gender* as a moderating variable resulted in a P-Value of $0.243 > 0.05$. This means that *gender* does not moderate the relationship between *WEPL* and employee performance.

Based on the results of the moderating analysis of the four dimensions of the *Work-Life Balance* variable on employee performance above, the hypothesis H4 which states: *that gender moderates the relationship between work-life balance and the performance of DJKN employees*, **is partially supported**.

Hypothesis 1 which states that *Flexible Working Space* has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees is fully supported in this study. The hypothesis is supported by evidence from the results of T Statistics: $2.238 > T$ Table 1.96 and P values: $0.026 < 0.05$. The path coefficient value of 0.099 indicates the direction of the relationship between *Flexible Working Space* and Employee Performance is positive.

This means that the *Flexible Working Space* policy/program implemented at DJKN has a positive and significant impact on employee performance. Several respondents' reviews in the questionnaire also agreed that the existence of *Flexible Working Space* policies such as *work from home* and *flexy time* supports their better performance, so some respondents gave suggestions so that the implementation of this *Flexible Working Space* policy can be maintained and even improved, socialized and implemented better. again in the future.

The findings of this study are in line with the findings in the research of Altindag & Siller (2014) which examined the effect of the application of the *flexible working method* that was able to increase (positive effect) on employee performance. In addition, research by Carlson, et al. (2010) also produces conclusions that are in line with this study where *Flexible Working Arrangements*, especially the flexibility of work schedules, contribute to improving employee performance.

Hypothesis 2a which states *Work Interference with Personal Life* (WIPL) has a negative and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees is not supported in this study. The direction of the relationship between constructs is the reason for the unsupportedness of this hypothesis. This is because the resulting path coefficient value of 0.202 indicates the direction of the relationship between *WIPL* and Employee Performance is positive, which is different from the hypothesis.

This means that although respondents respond that work interferes with their personal lives, this does not necessarily hurt the performance of DJKN employees. On the contrary, the majority of employees who tend to focus on work so that their work interferes with their personal lives tend to improve the performance of DJKN employees. This study produces conclusions that are in line with the research of Soomro, et al. (2018) which revealed that the existence of conflict between work and family (WIPL) had a significant positive effect on employee performance. The research of Angin & Saragih (2021) and the research of Mohsin & Zahid (2012) also concluded the results of the analysis stated that the WIPL variable did not affect employee performance. Performance can be influenced by various factors, both internal factors and environmental factors directly or indirectly. According to Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (Busro in Edward, 2020) that performance shows the ability and skills of workers. Performance is a person's success in carrying out tasks, work results that can be achieved by a person or group of people in an organization in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities (Wulandari, 2021).

Hypothesis 2b states that *Personal Life Interference with Work* (PLIW) has a negative and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees. This research is fully supported. The hypothesis is supported by evidence from the results of *T Statistics*: $5.643 > T \text{ Table } 1.96$ and *P values*: $0.00 < 0.05$. The *path* coefficient value is -0.235 , indicating the direction of the relationship between PLIW and Employee Performance is negative.

This means that the majority of respondents respond that personal life that interferes with work has a negative and significant impact on employee performance at work. The possible cause is due to an imbalance of employees in sharing roles between work and personal life outside of work, such as family, friends, and the environment. The problems of personal life that are more dominantly faced by workers have the potential to have an impact on the decline in the performance of these workers. This study produces conclusions that are in line with the research of Angin & Saragih (2021) and the research of Mohsin & Zahid (2012) which supports the hypothesis that the existence of family and work conflict (PLIW) hurts employee performance.

Hypothesis 2c states that *Personal Life Enhancement of Work* (PLEW) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees and is fully supported in this study. The hypothesis is supported by evidence from the results of *T Statistics*: $6.874 > T \text{ Table } 1.96$ and *P values*: $0.00 < 0.05$. The *path* coefficient value of 0.336 indicates the direction of the relationship between PLEW and Employee Performance is positive.

This means that the majority of respondents responded that a personal life that supports work has a positive and significant influence on employee performance at work. This can be because the support that comes from personal life such as family, friends, and the environment encourages employees to carry out their work activities it has an impact on improving employee performance. This study produces conclusions that are in line with the research of Angin & Saragih (2021) and the research of Aslam (2015) which supports the hypothesis that a personal life that supports work (PLEW) has a positive effect on employee performance.

2d hypothesis stating *Work Enhancement of Personal Life* (WEPL) has a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees and is fully supported in this study. The hypothesis is supported by evidence from the results of *T Statistics*: $4.660 > T \text{ Table } 1.96$ and *P values*: $0.00 < 0.05$. The *path* coefficient value of 0.217 indicates the direction of the relationship between WEPL and Employee Performance is positive. This

means that the majority of respondents who responded that work supports personal life has a positive and significant influence on employee performance at work. This can be because the results of the employee's work provide support such as material, health, and happiness so that the employee's personal life becomes better which has a positive impact on employee performance. This study produces conclusions that are in line with the research of Angin & Saragih (2021) and Puspitasari (2020) which supports the hypothesis that work that supports personal life (WEPL) has a positive effect on employee performance.

The result of hypothesis H3 which states that *gender* moderates the relationship between *flexible working space* and the performance of DJKN employees is not supported in this study. The hypothesis is not supported because the results of *P values*: 0.599 are greater than 0.05. This means that the existence of the *gender variable* does not play a role in moderating the relationship between *flexible working space* and employee performance. Both men and women have the same perception in responding to the *Flexible Working Space policy/program* implemented by the DJKN organization so that there is no significant *gap* /difference in the work results (performance) of employees while running the existing *flexible working space* program. This research is in line with research by Chung & Lippe (2018) and Chung (2018) which state that contextually *gender* does not moderate the relationship between *flexible working space* and employee performance.

The results of hypothesis H4 which analyzes *gender moderation* in the relationship of *work-life balance* to employee performance are seen in detail from the four *work-life balance dimension variables* which include: WIPL (*Work Interference with Personal Life*), PLIW (*Personal Life Interference with Work*), PLEW (*Personal Life Enhancement of Work*) and WEPL (*Work Enhancement of Personal Life*) on employee performance. Of the four dimensions of *work-life balance variables*, there is only 1 (one) variable, namely PLIW which is significantly moderated by *gender* in employee performance, where the resulting *P value* is: $0.020 < 0.05$. The effect of moderating power between women and men can be further seen based on the results of the *path coefficient* based on *gender*, where the *path coefficient* for women in the PLIW KP relationship is -0.389, while the \rightarrow *path coefficient* for men in the PLIW \rightarrow KP relationship is -0.192. This means that the negative impact of personal life that interferes with work (PLIW) on employee performance is greater for female employees than male employees. This study is in line with the research of Smith, et al. (2016), Michael, et al (2011), and Eagly & Karau (1991) which state that the ambiguous role of female workers in taking care of the house as well as working mothers makes the conflict between personal and work life (PLIW) affect their performance compared to male workers who are more tend to focus on work because they are not burdened with taking care of the household.

Meanwhile, the other three variables of *work-life balance* such as WIPL (*Work Interference with Personal Life*), PLEW (*Personal Life Enhancement of Work*), and WEPL (*Work Enhancement of Personal Life*) are not moderated by *gender* in employee performance. This is because the *gender moderation analysis* of the three variables on employee performance produces *P Values* greater than 0.05 (with detailed results: *P Value* (WIPL \rightarrow KP): $0.788 > 0.05$, *P Value* (PLEW \rightarrow KP): $0.148 > 0.05$ and *P Value* (WEPL \rightarrow KP): $0.243 > 0.05$). This means that there are no significant differences/ *gaps* felt by both male and female employees in the relationship between WIPL, PLEW, and WEPL on employee performance. Based on the description above, it can be concluded that hypothesis H4 which states that *gender* moderates the relationship between *work-life balance* and the performance of DJKN employees is only *partially supported* in this study. The results of this study are in line with the research of Schieman & Glavin (2016) which

supports some (*partially supported*) hypotheses on the perception of *work-life balance* based on the *gender* on employee performance.

V. Conclusion

Based on the discussion of the results of the previous analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. *Flexible Working Space* has a positive and significant impact on the performance of DJKN employees, fully supported. This means that the higher the flexibility in the work applied in the DJKN organization, the higher the performance improvement of DJKN employees. Work that interferes with an employee's life / *Work Interference with Personal Life* (WIPL) has a negative and significant effect on employee performance, not supported. On the other hand, the study found that WIPL had a positive and significant effect on the performance of DJKN employees. This means that the higher the workload that can interfere with the personal life of employees (WIPL), the higher the performance improvement of DJKN employees.
2. Personal life that interferes with employee work / *Personal Life Interference with Work* (PLIW) has a negative and significant impact on the performance of DJKN employees, fully supported. This means that the higher the disruption of personal life to work, the lower the performance of DJKN employees.
3. Personal life that supports work / *Personal Life Enhancement of Work* (PLEW) has a positive and significant impact on the performance of DJKN employees, fully supported. This means that the higher the employee's life support for work, the higher the increase in the performance of DJKN employees.
4. Work that supports personal life / *Work Enhancement of Personal Life* (WEPL) has a positive and significant impact on the performance of DJKN employees, fully supported. This means that the higher the work support in the personal life of the employee, the higher the increase in the performance of DJKN employees.
5. *Gender* does not moderate the influence of *Flexible Working Space* on DJKN employee performance. This means that both men and women have the same perception in viewing the flexibility of work implemented by the DJKN organization such as working *from home* and the *flexy time policy*. The existence of a flexibility policy in work does not bring significant *gaps*/differences in the work results (performance) of male employees and female employees as long as they run the existing *flexible working space* program.

Gender moderates the effect of *Work-Life Balance* on DJKN employee performance, partially supported (partially supported). The dimension of *Work-Life Balance* which is moderated by *gender* on employee performance is the PLIW (*Personal Life Interference with Work*) dimension. This means that personal life that interferes with work (PLIW) has a greater negative effect on the performance of female employees than male employees. Meanwhile, the other three dimensions of *Work-Life Balance*, such as WIPL (*Work Interference with Personal Life*), PLEW (*Personal Life Enhancement of Work*), and WEPL (*Work Enhancement of Personal Life*) are not moderated by *gender* about employee performance. This means that there are no significant differences/ *gaps* felt by both male and female employees in the relationship between WIPL, PLEW, and WEPL on the performance of DJKN employees.

References

- Abdullah, M. (2014). Management and Employee Performance Evaluation (BR Hakim (ed.). Aswaja Pressindo.
- Abid, S., & Barech, DK (2017). *The Impact of Flexible Working Hours On The Employee's Performance. International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5 (7), 450–466. <http://ijecm.co.uk/>
- Altindag, EA, & Siller, F. (2014). *Effects of Flexible Working Method on Employee Performance: An Empirical Study in Turkey. Business and Economics Journal*, 05 (03), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2151-6219.1000104>
- Anwar, J., Hansu, SAF and Janjua, SY (2013). *Work-life balance: What organizations should do to create balance? World Applied Sciences Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 10, pp. 1348-1354
- Aslam, Muhammad. (2015). *Influence of Work-Life Balance on Employees Performance: Moderated by Transactional Leadership. COMSAT Institute of Information Technology. Journal of Resources Development and Management ISSN 2422-8397 Vol.10, 2015*
- Carlson, DS, Grzywacz, JG, & Michele Kacmar, K. (2010). *The relationship between schedule flexibility and outcomes via the work-family interface. Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25 (4), 330–355. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011035278>
- Chung, Heejung & Lippe, Tanja Van Der. (2018a). *Flexible Working, Work-Life Balance, and Gender Equality. UK Economic and Social Future Research Leader*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2025-x>
- Chung, Heejung (2018b). *Gender, Flexibility Stigma and the Perceived Negative Consequences of Flexible Working in the UK*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-2036-7>
- Eagly, AH, & Karau, SJ (1991). *Gender and The Emergence of Leaders: A Meta-Analysis. Journal Of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(5), 685–710.
- Edward, Y.R., and Purba, K. (2020). The Effect Analysis of Emotional Intelligence and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Organizational Commitment as Intervening Variables in PT Berkas Bima Sentana. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (3): 1552-1563.
- Fisher, GG, Bulger, CA, & Smith, CS (2009). *Beyond Work and Family: A Measure of Work/Nonwork Interference and Enhancement. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14 (4), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016737>
- Gozali, Imam. (2015). *Multivariate Analysis Application with Program*. Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.
- Hair, JF, Black, WC, Babin BJ & Anderson, RE (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis Seven Edition*. Pearson Prentice Hall
- Hofacker, D., & Konig, S. (2013). *Flexibility and work-life conflict in times of crisis: a gender perspective*. <http://www.Emeraldinsight.Com/0144-333X.Htm> , 33 (9), 613–635. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-04-2013-0042>
- Karkouliau, S., Srour, J., & Sinan, T. (2016). *A gender perspective on work-life balance, perceived stress, and locus of control. Journal of Business Research*, 69 (11), 4918–4923. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.053>
- Kattenbach, R., Demerouti, E., & Nachreiner, F. (2010). *Flexible working times: Effects on employees' exhaustion, work-nonwork conflict, and job performance. Career*

- Lukito, Hendra. & Utama, M. Kurnia. (2019). The Influence of Absenteeism and Job Attitude on Performance in Leasing Companies in Padang City. *Journal of Business and Management (Bisma)* ISSN 1978-3108 (Print) ISSN 2623-0879 (Online) Vol. 13 No.3. pp. 139-147
- Mohsin, Maryam & Zahid, Hammad. (2012). *The predictors and performance-related outcomes of bi-directional work-family conflict: An empirical study*. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol.6 (46), pp. 11504-11510
- Michel, JS, Kotrba, LM, Mitchelson, JK, Clark, MA, & Baltes, BB (2011). *Antecedents of work-family Conflict: a meta-analytic review*. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 32(5), 689–725.
- Puspitasari, Inas Handayani. (2020). The Influence of *Work-Life Balance* Dimensions on Employee Performance Through Job Satisfaction at PT. Garam (Persero). Surabaya: *Journal of Management Science (JIM)* Volume 8 Number 2 – Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, State University of Surabaya
- Rehman, S., & Roomi, MA (2012). *Gender and work-life balance: A phenomenological study of women entrepreneurs in Pakistan*. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 19 (2), 209–228. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626001211223865>
- Schieman, Scott & Glavin, Paul. (2016). *Trouble at the Border?: Gender, Flexibility at Work, and the Work-Home Interface*. Toronto: *University of Toronto*
- Smith, KT, Smith, LM, & Brower, TR (2016). *How work-life balance, job performance, and ethics connect: Perspectives of current and future accountants*. *Research on Professional Responsibility and Ethics in Accounting*, 20, 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1574-076520160000020008>
- Soomro, AA, Breitenecker, RJ, & Shah, SAM (2018). *Relation of work-life balance, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict with the employee performance-moderating role of job satisfaction*. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 7 (1), 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-02-2017-0018>
- Waizenegger, L., McKenna, B., Cai, W., & Bendz, T. (2020). *An affordance perspective of team collaboration and enforced working from home during COVID-19*. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 29 (4), 429–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1800417>
- Wind, Irene Isabela Warin. & Saragih, Eva Hotnaidah. (2021). Effect of *Work-Life Balance* on the Performance of Generation X and Y Employees in Jakarta. *Journal of Emerging Business Management and Entrepreneurship Studies* Volume 1, Number 1, April (2021) Page: 48-57
<https://jebmes.ppmschool.ac.id/index.php/jebmes/article/view/14/13>
- Wulandari, R., Djawoto, and Prijati. (2021). The Influence of Delegative Leadership Style, Motivation, Work Environment on Employee Performance in Self-Efficiency Mediation in SNVT Housing Provision of East Java Province. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)* Vol 4 (3): 3294-3311.