DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Abdullah, H. (2017). Peranan manajemen sumber daya manusia dalam organisasi. *Jurnal Warta, 51.*

Abdurrahman, D., Fadilah, S., & Suarsih, S. (2010). Hubungan konflik keluarga-pekerjaan dengan kepuasan kerja dan niat keluar kerja. *MIMBAR, 26*(1), 1-15.

Abendroth, A.-K., & den Dulk, L. (2011). Support for the work-life balance in Europe: the impact of state, workplace and family support on work-life balance satisfaction. *Work, Employment and Society, 25*(2), 234–256. doi:10.1177/0950017011398892

Agha, K., Azmi., F. T., & Irfan, A. (2017). Work-life balance and job satisfaction: An empirical study focusing on higher education teachers in oman. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 7*(3). doi: 10.18178/ijssh.2017.7.3.813

Alfatihah, I., Nugroho, A. S., Haessel, E., & Maharani, A. (2021). The influence of work-life balance with work motivation as mediating factor on job satisfaction a prediction toward transition to new normal situation. *The Management Journal of BINANIAGA, 6*(1).

Asari, A. F. (2022). Pengaruh work life balance terhadap kinerja karyawan melalui kepuasan kerja pada karyawan BPJS ketenagakerjaan. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen, 10*(3).

Atoum, A. Y., & Al-Shoboul, R. A. (2018). Emotional support and its relationship to emotional intelligence. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 5*(1), 7-16. doi: 10.14738/assrj.51.4095.

Ayuningtyas, L., & Septarini, B. G. (2013). Hubungan family supportive supervisor behaviors dengan work family balance pada wanita yang bekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi, 2*(1).

Azwar, S. (2017). *Metode penelitian psikologi.* Pustaka Belajar

Azwar, S. (2015). *Reliabilitas dan validitas.* Pustaka Belajar

Barak, M. E. M., Travis, D. J., Pyun, H., & Xie, B. (2009). The impact of supervision on worker outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Social Service Review, 83*(1), 3-32. https://doi.org/10.1086/599028

Bhate, R. (2013). *Supervisor supportiveness: Global perspectives.* The Sloan Center on Aging & Work at Boston College

Business Wire. (2022). *Warning to managers: Survey shows most workers will quit a bad boss.* Diakses pada Juni 2022. https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20220111005272/en/Warning-to-Managers-Survey-Shows-Most-Workers-Will-Quit-a-Bad-Boss

Carstensen, L. L., Turan, B., Scheibe, S., Ram, N., Ersner-Hershfield, H., Samanez-Larkin, G. R., Brooks, K. P., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2011). Emotional experience improves with age: Evidence based on over 10 years of experience sampling. *Psychology and Aging, 26*(1), 21–33. doi:10.1037/a0021285

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations, 53*(6), 747-770.

Crain, T. L., & Stevens, S. C. (2018). Family-supportive supervisor behaviors: A review and recommendations for research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2320

De Carlo, A., Dal Corso, L., Carluccio, F., Colledani, D., & Falco, A. (2020). Positive supervisor behaviors and employee performance: The serial mediation of workplace spirituality and work engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11.* doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01834

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 565-573. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565

Elnanto, J. G., & Suharti, L. (2021). The impact of work from home to work-life balance and its implication to employee happiness. *International Journal of Social Science and Business, 5*(3), 311-318.

Fardianto, N. A., & Muzakki. (2020). Support at work and home as a predictor of work life balance. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia, 6*(2), 144-153.

Fiernaningsih, N., Nimran, U., Raharjo, K., & Arifin, Z. (2019). The role of supervisory support and life balance work in increasing organizational citizenship behavior: Study at hotel employees in Malang. *Journal of Public Administration Studies, 4*(2), 76-84.

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

Galuh, K. G. (2019). *Hubungan antara family-supportive supervisor behaviors dan dimensi-dimensi work-life balance pada pekerja wanita usia dewasa awal yang telah menikah.* Skripsi. Diakses pada Januari 2023.

Ghozali, I. (2016). *Aplikasi analisis multivariete dengan program IBM SPSS 23.* Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Gordon, S., Adler, H., Day, J., & Sydnor, S. (2019). Perceived supervisor support: A study of select-service hotel employees. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 38,* 82-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.12.002

Gragnano, A., Simbula, S., & Miglioretti, M. (2020). Work–life balance: Weighing the importance of work–family and work-health balance. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(3).

Greenhaus, J. H., Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63,* 510-531. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8

Greenhaus, J. H., Ziegert, J. C., & Allen, T. D. (2012). When family-supportive supervision matters: Relations between multiple sources of support and work–family balance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*(2), 266–275. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.10.008

Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Yragui, N. L., Bodner, T. E., & Hanson, G. C. (2009). Development and validation of a multidimensional measure of family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB). *J Manage, 35*(4), 837-856. doi: 10.1177/0149206308328510

Hammer, L. B., Kossek, E. E., Zimmerman, K., Daniels, R. (2007). Clarifying the construct of family supportive supervisory behaviors: A multilevel perspective. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being, 6*, 171–211.

Jindal, A., Agarwal, S., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Role of job design for achieving work life balance. *Conference on Excellence in Research and Education.*

Khateeb, F. R. (2021). Work life balance-A review of theories, definitions and policies. *Cross-Cultural Management Journal, 23*(1).

Kim, H., & Gong, Y. (2016). Effects of work–family and family–work conflicts on flexible work arrangements demand: a gender role perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(20), 2936–2956. doi:10.1080/09585192.2016.1164217

Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assesment of organizational responses. *Human Relations, 48*(5). https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679504800504

Koch, A. R., & Binnewies, C. (2015). Setting a good example: Supervisors as work-life-friendly role models within the context of boundary management. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(1), 82–92. doi: 10.1037/a0037890

Kopp, L. R. (2013). The effects of perceived supervisor work-life support on employee work-life balance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *American Psychological Association,* 1-55.

Kossek, E. E., Lautsch, B. A., & Eaton, S. C. (2006). Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 347-367. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.07.002

Kumar, A., Channa, K. A., & Bhutto, N. A. (2018). When and how workplace social support improves family performance. *Applied Research Quality Life, 14,* 1183-1204. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9647-7

Lamovsek, A., Cerne, M., Radevic, I., & Bozic, K. (2022). The key to work–life balance is (enriched) job design? Three-way interaction effects with formalization and adaptive personality characteristics. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 18,* 647-676. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-022-10100-9

Lestari, D. D. (2019). *Hubungan antara family supportive supervisor behaviors dengan work life balance pada pekerja wanita.* Skripsi. Diakses pada Juni, 2022.

Martono, N. (2010). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif.* PT Rajagrafindo Persada

Mas-Machuca, M., Berbegal-Mirabent, J., & Alegre, I. (2016). Work-life balance and its relationship with organizational pride and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(2), 586–602. doi:10.1108/jmp-09-2014-0272

Maszura, L., & Novliadi, F. (2020). The influence of perceived organizational support on work life balance. *International Journals of Sciences and High Technologies, 22*(1), 182-188.

Nora, E., Sudarmiatin, Hermawan, A. (2022). Flexible working arrangements in realizing work-life balance in women workers of small and medium enterprises PIA RB Sidoarjo East Java. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Management, 1*(2), 146-152. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijebm.v1i2.361

Pan, S. Y., Chuang, A., & Yeh, Y. J. (2021). Linking supervisor and subordinate's negative work-family experience: The role of family supportive supervisor behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 28*(1), 17-30. doi: 10.1177/1548051820950375

Panisoara, G., & Serban, M. (2013). Marital status and work-life balance. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 78,* 21-25. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.243

Permatasari, J. A., Nimran, U., & Afrianty, T. W. (2020). Pengaruh family supportive supervisor behavior terhadap kepuasan kerja melalui work life balance dan employee engagement. *Matrik: Jurnal Manajemen, Strategi Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan, 14*(1), 94-106. https://doi.org/10.24843/MATRIK:JMBK.2020.v14.i01.p10

Pohl, S., & Galetta, M. (2016). The role of supervisor emotional support on individual job satisfaction: A multilevel analysis. *Applied Nursing Research.* doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2016.10.004

Poulose, S., & Sudarsan, N. (2014). Work life balance: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics, 3*(2), 1-17.

Pranindhita, E. Y., & Wibowo, D. H. (2020). Hubungan work life balance dengan kepuasan kerja pada guru di SMK Kabupaten Pati. *Jurnal Psikologi Konseling, 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.24114/konseling.v16i1.19141

Pri, R., & Zamralita. (2017). Gambaran work engagement pada karyawan di PT EG (manufacturing industry). *Jurnal Muara Ilmu Sosial, Humaniora, dan Seni, 1*(2), 295-303.

Redwood, M. (2015). *Wellbeing & business performance.*

Richert-Kaźmierska, A., & Stankiewicz, K. (2016). Work–life balance: Does age matter?. *Work, 55*(3), 679–688. doi:10.3233/wor-162435

Russo, M., Shteigman, A., & Carmeli, A. (2015). Workplace and family support and work-life balance: Implications for individual psychological avaiability and energy at work. *The Journal of Positive Psychlogy.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1025424

Rondonuwu, F. A., Rumawas, W., & Asaloei, S. (2018). Pengaruh work-life balance terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada hotel sintesa peninsula manado. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis, 7*(2).

Samsudin, A., & Ismail, A. (2019). The impact of supervisor support towards extra-role behavior. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, 8*(4).

Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D.* Alfabeta.

Talukder, A. K. M., Vickers, M., & Khan, A. (2018). Supervisor support and work life balance: Impacts on job performance in the Australian finansial sector. *Personnel Review.* https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-12-2016-0314

Telkomsel Indonesia. (2021). *Digitalization for a better future: Laporan tahunan 2021.* PT Telkom Indonesia (Persero) Tbk.

Thacker, R. A., & Stoner, J. (2012). Supervisors' instrumental and emotional influences on subordinate help-seeking behavior: An exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(1), 40–61. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00870.x

Thakur, A., & Kumar, N. (2015). The effect of perceived organizational support, role related aspects and work involvement on work-life balance: Self efficacy as a moderator. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5*(1).

Thomas, L. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variabels on work– family conflict and strain: A control perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 6–15.

Thompson, C. A., Beauvis, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392–415.

Thompson, B. M., Kirk, A., & Brown, D. F. (2005). Work based support, emotional exhaustion, and spillover of work stress to the family environment: A study of policewomen. *Stress and Health, 21*(3), 199–207. doi:10.1002/smi.1056

Uddin, M., Ali, K. B., Khan, M. A., & Ahmad, A. (2021). Supervisory and co-worker support on the work-life balance of working women in the banking sector: A developing country perspective. *Journal of Family Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2021.1922299

Umar. (2019). *Kontribusi work life balance terhadap kepuasan kerja pada polwan berstatus menikah di markas kepolisian daerah (mapolda) Sulawesi Selatan.* Skripsi. Fakultas Kedokteran Program Studi Psikologi, Universitas Hasanuddin.

Ummah, W. (2018). *Work life balance ditinjau dari model psikologis pekerja di Perusahaan Garmen Yogyakarta.* Skripsi. Fakultas Ilmu Psikologi dan Ilmu Sosial Budaya, Universitas Islam Indonesia.

Weiss, H. M. (1977). Subordinate imitation of supervisor behavior: The role of modeling in organizational socialization. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19*(1), 89–105. doi: 10.1016/0030-5073(77)900563

Yamamoto, I., & Matsuura, T. (2012). Effect of worklife balance practices on firm productivity: Evidence from japanese firm-level panel data. The B.E. *Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 14*(4). doi: 10.1515/bejeap2013-0186

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1. Skala Penelitian

IDENTITAS RESPONDEN

Inisial   :

Usia   :

Jenis Kelamin   : Laki-laki / Perempuan *)

Status Pernikahan : Menikah / Belum menikah *)

Jika sudah menikah : ☐   Tinggal dengan pasangan

                                ☐   Tidak tinggal dengan pasangan *(Long Distance Marriage)*

                                ☐   Tidak tinggal dengan pasangan (bercerai)

Jumlah Anak   :

Unit Departemen   :

Status Kepegawaian : Karyawan tetap / Karyawan kontrak *(outsourcing)* *)

Lama Bekerja   : ☐   < 1 tahun

                                ☐   1 – 5 tahun

                                ☐   6 – 10 tahun

                                ☐   > 10 tahun

No. HP   :

(Keperluan reward bagi 10 responden beruntung)

Ket: *) coret yang tidak perlu

SKALA I

Berikut adalah skala penelitian yang berisi sejumlah pernyataan dengan 5 pilihan jawaban, yaitu:

STS = Sangat Tidak Setuju

TS = Tidak Setuju

N = Netral

S = Setuju

SS = Sangat Setuju

Silakan beri tanda centang **(✓)** pada jawaban yang Anda pilih. Tidak ada jawaban yang benar dan salah, karena itu silakan memilih jawaban yang paling menggambarkan diri atau situasi Anda. Anda diharapkan mengisi setiap pernyataan yang ada.

No.	Pernyataan	Pilihan				
		STS	TS	N	S	SS
1	Atasan saya mampu mengelola departemen saya sebagai sebuah tim utuh yang memenuhi kebutuhan departemen.					
2	Atasan saya dan saya dapat berbincang secara efektif untuk menyelesaikan konflik antara masalah pekerjaan dan di luar pekerjaan.					
3	Atasan saya adalah teladan yang baik dalam hal menyeimbangkan pekerjaan dan kehidupan di luar pekerjaan.					
4	Saya dapat mengandalkan atasan saya untuk membantu mengatasi konflik terkait jadwal kerja saat saya butuhkan.					
5	Saya dapat mengandalkan atasan saya untuk memastikan bahwa tanggungjawab kerja saya dapat tertangani ketika saya mendapat tuntutan tak terduga di luar pekerjaan.					
6	Atasan saya berpikir tentang bagaimana pekerjaan di departemen saya dapat dikelola agar menguntungkan karyawan dan juga perusahaan.					
7	Atasan saya membuat saya nyaman untuk berbicara dengannya, tentang konflik antara pekerjaan dan di luar pekerjaan.					
8	Atasan saya bekerja secara efektif bersama para karyawan untuk secara kreatif menyelesaikan konflik antara pekerjaan dan di luar pekerjaan.					

9	Atasan saya mendengarkan masalah-masalah saya dalam mengelola pekerjaan dan kehidupan di luar pekerjaan.					
10	Atasan saya menunjukkan perilaku yang efektif dalam hal mengelola pekerjaan dan kehidupan di luar pekerjaannya.					
11	Atasan saya kreatif dalam mengalokasikan tugas untuk membantu departemen saya bekerja lebih baik sebagai sebuah tim.					
12	Atasan saya meluangkan waktu untuk memahami kebutuhan pribadi saya.					
13	Atasan saya menunjukkan cara menjadi sukses dalam memadukan pekerjaan dan kehidupan di luar pekerjaan secara bersamaan.					
14	Atasan saya meminta masukan agar lebih mudah bagi karyawan untuk menyeimbangkan tuntutan pekerjaan dan di luar pekerjaan.					

SKALA II

Berikut adalah skala penelitian yang berisi sejumlah pernyataan dengan 5 pilihan jawaban, yaitu:

STS = Sangat Tidak Sesuai

TS = Tidak Sesuai

AS = Agak Sesuai

S = Sesuai

SS = Sangat Sesuai

Silakan beri tanda centang (✓) pada jawaban yang Anda pilih. Tidak ada jawaban yang benar dan salah, karena itu silakan memilih jawaban yang paling menggambarkan diri atau situasi Anda. Anda diharapkan mengisi setiap pernyataan yang ada.

No.	Pernyataan	Pilihan				
		STS	TS	AS	S	SS
1	Ketika pulang kerja, saya terlalu lelah untuk melakukan hal-hal yang saya ingin lakukan.					
2	Pekerjaan membuat saya sulit untuk mengelola kehidupan pribadi seperti yang saya inginkan.					
3	Saya sering mengabaikan kebutuhan pribadi karena tuntutan pekerjaan saya.					
4	Kehidupan pribadi saya terganggu karena pekerjaan saya.					
5	Saya harus kehilangan kegiatan pribadi yang penting karena waktu yang dihabiskan untuk bekerja.					
6	Kehidupan pribadi menguras energi yang saya butuhkan untuk melakukan pekerjaan.					
7	Pekerjaan saya kurang mendapat perhatian yang layak karena persoalan yang terjadi dalam kehidupan pribadi saya.					
8	Saya akan mencurahkan waktu lebih banyak untuk bekerja, apabila kehidupan pribadi tidak menyita waktu lebih banyak.					
9	Saya terlalu lelah untuk menjadi efektif di tempat kerja karena hal yang telah terjadi di kehidupan pribadi saya.					
10	Ketika saya bekerja, saya memikirkan hal-hal lain yang harus saya lakukan di luar pekerjaan.					
11	Saya mengalami kesulitan menyelesaikan pekerjaan kantor saya karena saya sibuk dengan hal-hal pribadi di tempat kerja.					

12	Pekerjaan memberi saya energi untuk melakukan kegiatan di luar pekerjaan yang penting untuk saya.					
13	Karena pekerjaan saya, suasana hati saya menjadi lebih baik ketika berada di rumah.					
14	Hal yang saya lakukan di tempat kerja membantu saya menangani masalah-masalah pribadi dan persoalan praktis di rumah.					
15	Suasana hati saya di tempat kerja baik karena hal-hal lain yang terjadi di hidup saya berjalan dengan baik.					
16	Kehidupan pribadi saya memberi saya energi untuk melakukan pekerjaan saya.					
17	Kehidupan pribadi saya membuat saya merasa santai dan siap untuk bekerja di hari berikutnya.					

Lampiran 2. Uji Validitas (CFA)

Uji Validitas *Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors*

Estimator ML

Optimization method NLMINB

Number of model parameters 24

Number of observations 124

Model Test User Model:

	Standard	Scaled
Test Statistic	52.703	37.617
Degrees of freedom	31	31
P-value (Chi-square)	0.009	0.192
Scaling correction factor		1.401
Yuan-Bentler correction (Mplus variant)		

Model Test Baseline Model:

	Standard	Scaled
Test statistic	517.848	341.213
Degrees of freedom	45	45
P-value	0.000	0.000
Scaling correction factor		1.518

User Model versus Baseline Model:

	Standard	Scaled
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.954	0.978
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	0.933	0.968
Robust Comparative Fit Index (CFI)		0.979
Robust Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	0.970	

Loglikelihood and Information Criteria:

Loglikelihood user model (H0)	-1074.098	-1074.098
Scaling correction factor	1.507	
for the MLR correction		
Loglikelihood unrestricted model (H1)	-1047.746	-1047.746
Scaling correction factor	1.447	
for the MLR correction		
Akaike (AIC)	2196.195	2196.195
Bayesian (BIC)	2263.882	2263.882
Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (SABIC)	2187.992	2187.992

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:

RMSEA	0.075	0.041
90 Percent confidence interval - lower	0.038	0.000
90 Percent confidence interval - upper	0.109	0.077
P-value H_0: RMSEA <= 0.050	0.118	0.616
P-value H_0: RMSEA >= 0.080	0.435	0.034
Robust RMSEA		0.049
90 Percent confidence interval - lower	0.000	
90 Percent confidence interval - upper	0.098	
P-value H_0: Robust RMSEA <= 0.050		0.478
P-value H_0: Robust RMSEA >= 0.080		0.171

Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:

SRMR   0.046   0.046

Parameter Estimates:

Standard errors   Sandwich

Information bread   Observed

Observed information based on   Hessian

Latent Variables:

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
ES =~						
ES1	1.000				0.457	0.729
ES2	1.403	0.166	8.434	0.000	0.642	0.774
IS =~						
IS1	1.000				0.462	0.657
IS2	1.221	0.213	5.737	0.000	0.564	0.687
IS3	1.108	0.155	7.155	0.000	0.512	0.790
RM =~						
RM1	1.000				0.550	0.690
RM2	0.825	0.125	6.622	0.000	0.453	0.678
CM =~						
CM1	1.000				0.418	0.694
CM2	1.089	0.119	9.147	0.000	0.455	0.696
CM3	0.929	0.165	5.641	0.000	0.389	0.613
FSSB =~						
ES	1.000				0.981	0.981
IS	0.917	0.133	6.873	0.000	0.890	0.890

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
RM	1.113	0.172	6.485	0.000	0.908	0.908
CM	0.885	0.114	7.768	0.000	0.949	0.949

Variances:

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
.ES1	0.184	0.032	5.749	0.000	0.184	0.468
.ES2	0.275	0.074	3.741	0.000	0.275	0.401
.IS1	0.281	0.051	5.481	0.000	0.281	0.569
.IS2	0.357	0.077	4.655	0.000	0.357	0.528
.IS3	0.158	0.044	3.621	0.000	0.158	0.376
.RM1	0.332	0.078	4.248	0.000	0.332	0.524
.RM2	0.242	0.052	4.684	0.000	0.242	0.540
.CM1	0.189	0.041	4.660	0.000	0.189	0.519
.CM2	0.221	0.068	3.264	0.001	0.221	0.516
.CM3	0.250	0.045	5.544	0.000	0.250	0.624
.ES	0.008	0.028	0.279	0.780	0.038	0.038
.IS	0.044	0.032	1.395	0.163	0.208	0.208
.RM	0.053	0.047	1.134	0.257	0.175	0.175
.CM	0.017	0.022	0.806	0.420	0.100	0.100
FSSB	0.201	0.043	4.721	0.000	1.000	1.000

Uji Validitas *Work Life Balance*

Estimator	ML
Optimization method	NLMINB
Number of model parameters	34
Number of observations	124

Model Test User Model:

Test statistic	97.224
Degrees of freedom	71
P-value (Chi-square)	0.021

Model Test Baseline Model:

Test statistic	820.695
Degrees of freedom	91
P-value	0.000

User Model versus Baseline Model:

Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.964
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	0.954

Loglikelihood and Information Criteria:

Loglikelihood user model (H0)	-1838.623
Loglikelihood unrestricted model (H1)	-1790.011
Akaike (AIC)	3745.246
Bayesian (BIC)	3841.136
Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (SABIC)	3733.626

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:

RMSEA	0.055
90 Percent confidence interval - lower	0.022
90 Percent confidence interval - upper	0.080
P-value H_0: RMSEA <= 0.050	0.372
P-value H_0: RMSEA >= 0.080	0.049

Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:

SRMR   0.058

Parameter Estimates:

Standard errors   Standard

Information   Expected

Information saturated (h1) model   Structured

Latent Variables:

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
WIPL =~						
WIPL2	1.000				0.782	0.795
WIPL3	1.011	0.111	9.095	0.000	0.791	0.803
WIPL4	0.824	0.099	8.308	0.000	0.645	0.738
WIPL5	0.922	0.107	8.637	0.000	0.722	0.764
PLIW =~						
PLIW1	1.000				0.558	0.699
PLIW2	1.095	0.143	7.653	0.000	0.611	0.765
PLIW4	1.080	0.131	8.221	0.000	0.603	0.835
PLIW6	1.050	0.132	7.985	0.000	0.586	0.804
WEPL =~						
WEPL1	1.000				0.567	0.580
WEPL2	1.229	0.233	5.278	0.000	0.697	0.751
WEPL3	0.975	0.195	4.992	0.000	0.553	0.646
PLEW =~						
PLEW1	1.000				0.612	0.727

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
PLEW2	0.965	0.127	7.604	0.000	0.590	0.775
PLEW3	1.161	0.151	7.707	0.000	0.710	0.791

Covariances:

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
WIPL ~~						
PLIW	0.261	0.059	4.411	0.000	0.598	0.598
WEPL	0.042	0.051	0.827	0.408	0.096	0.096
PLEW	0.129	0.055	2.368	0.018	0.270	0.270
PLIW ~~						
WEPL	0.004	0.036	0.111	0.911	0.013	0.013
PLEW	0.142	0.043	3.335	0.001	0.417	0.417
WEPL ~~						
PLEW	0.240	0.061	3.962	0.000	0.692	0.692

Variances:

	Estimate	Std.Err	z-value	P(>|z|)	Std.lv	Std.all
.WIPL2	0.355	0.062	5.734	0.000	0.355	0.367
.WIPL3	0.344	0.061	5.615	0.000	0.344	0.355
.WIPL4	0.347	0.054	6.403	0.000	0.347	0.455
.WIPL5	0.371	0.060	6.137	0.000	0.371	0.416
.PLIW1	0.326	0.048	6.801	0.000	0.326	0.511
.PLIW2	0.265	0.042	6.274	0.000	0.265	0.415
.PLIW4	0.158	0.030	5.242	0.000	0.158	0.303
.PLIW6	0.188	0.033	5.780	0.000	0.188	0.354
.WEPL1	0.635	0.096	6.613	0.000	0.635	0.664
.WEPL2	0.376	0.082	4.607	0.000	0.376	0.436

.WEPL3	0.428	0.071	6.056	0.000	0.428	0.583
.PLEW1	0.333	0.055	6.112	0.000	0.333	0.471
.PLEW2	0.231	0.042	5.487	0.000	0.231	0.399
.PLEW3	0.302	0.058	5.227	0.000	0.302	0.375
WIPL	0.612	0.122	5.022	0.000	1.000	1.000
PLIW	0.311	0.074	4.229	0.000	1.000	1.000
WEPL	0.322	0.105	3.072	0.002	1.000	1.000
PLEW	0.374	0.086	4.331	0.000	1.000	1.000

Lampiran 3. Uji Reliabilitas

Reliabilitas Skala *Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors*

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.883	10

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
ES1	37.52	20.187	.663	.869
ES2	37.60	18.649	.695	.866
IS1	37.53	20.267	.561	.876
IS2	37.63	19.260	.607	.874
IS3	37.50	19.911	.689	.867
RM1	37.54	19.535	.588	.875
RM2	37.61	20.288	.594	.874
CM1	37.35	20.637	.605	.873
CM2	37.40	20.257	.616	.872
CM3	37.42	20.668	.564	.876

Reliabilitas Skala *Work Life Balance*

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.832	14

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
WIPL2	49.81	38.445	.607	.811
WIPL3	49.94	39.817	.486	.820
WIPL4	49.46	40.462	.504	.819
WIPL5	49.73	39.534	.539	.816
PLIW1	49.51	41.211	.486	.820
PLIW2	49.44	41.142	.492	.820

PLIW4	49.46	40.738	.604	.814
PLIW6	49.39	41.410	.521	.819
WEPL1	50.38	42.936	.229	.839
WEPL2	50.02	41.772	.349	.830
WEPL3	50.01	43.341	.245	.836
PLEW1	49.56	40.947	.481	.820
PLEW2	49.48	41.504	.484	.821
PLEW3	49.53	39.633	.564	.814

Lampiran 4. Uji Normalitas dan Linearitas

Uji Normalitas

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Unstandardized Residual	.059	124	.200[*]	.976	124	.029

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Uji Linearitas

ANOVA Table

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
WLB * FSSB	Between Groups	(Combined)	1582.939	19	83.313	2.073	.011
		Linearity	830.514	1	830.514	20.663	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	752.425	18	41.801	1.040	.423
	Within Groups		4180.028	104	40.193		
	Total		5762.968	123			

Lampiran 5. Uji Hipotesis

Uji Korelasi *Family Supportive Supervisor Behaviors* dan *Work Life Balance*

Correlations

		FSSB	WLB
FSSB	Pearson Correlation	1	.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	124	124
WLB	Pearson Correlation	.380**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	124	124

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Uji *Bivariate Correlation*

Correlations

		ES	IS	RM	CM	WIPL	PLIW	WEPL	PLEW	FSSB	WLB
ES	Pearson Correlation	1	.649**	.596**	.669**	.176	.127	.305**	.361**	.854**	.339**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.051	.160	.001	.000	.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
IS	Pearson Correlation	.649**	1	.558**	.608**	.094	.205*	.233**	.378**	.860**	.313**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.297	.022	.009	.000	.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
RM	Pearson Correlation	.596**	.558**	1	.603**	.145	.066	.154	.271**	.798**	.226*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.107	.468	.088	.002	.000	.012
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
CM	Pearson Correlation	.669**	.608**	.603**	1	.213*	.192*	.261**	.441**	.854**	.392**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.017	.033	.003	.000	.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
WIPL	Pearson Correlation	.176	.094	.145	.213*	1	.536**	.054	.223*	.182*	.752**

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.297	.107	.017		.000	.549	.013	.043	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
PLIW	Pearson Correlation	.127	.205*	.066	.192*	.536**	1	-.013	.329**	.183*	.721**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.160	.022	.468	.033	.000		.886	.000	.042	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
WEPL	Pearson Correlation	.305**	.233**	.154	.261**	.054	-.013	1	.519**	.283**	.503**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.009	.088	.003	.549	.886		.000	.001	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
PLEW	Pearson Correlation	.361**	.378**	.271**	.441**	.223*	.329**	.519**	1	.435**	.705**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	.000	.013	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
FSSB	Pearson Correlation	.854**	.860**	.798**	.854**	.182*	.183*	.283**	.435**	1	.380**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.043	.042	.001	.000		.000
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124
WLB	Pearson Correlation	.339**	.313**	.226*	.392**	.752**	.721**	.503**	.705**	.380**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.012	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Uji Regresi Linear Sederhana

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.380[a]	.144	.137	6.358

a. Predictors: (Constant), FSSB

b. Dependent Variable: WLB

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	830.514	1	830.514	20.542	.000[b]
	Residual	4932.453	122	40.430		
	Total	5762.968	123			

a. Dependent Variable: WLB

b. Predictors: (Constant), FSSB

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	31.562	4.877		6.471	.000
	FSSB	.527	.116	.380	4.532	.000

a. Dependent Variable: WLB