International Conference on Economics, Technology, Management, Accounting, Education, and Social Science
Volume 01 Issue 01 Year 2025

Teacher Retention Strategies: The Role of Work-Life Balance and Employee Engagement

Rahmat Wiyoga[1]*, Doni Febrian Ashadimas[2]*

[1]Universitas Widyatama Bandung, Jl. Cikutra No.204A, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Widyatama Bandung, Jl. Cikutra No.204A, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia
*Corespondence email: rahmat.wiyoga@widyatama.ac.id, doni.ashadimas@widyatama.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received : 3 July 2025
Accepted : 21 July 2025
Available : 31 July 2025

Keywords:
Boarding School, Employee Engagement, Human Resources Management, Teacher Retention, Work Life Balance.

ABSTRACT

This study explores how work-life balance and employee engagement contribute to teacher retention strategies in boarding schools, specifically at Nurul Fikri Islamic Boarding School, Lembang. The data were collected through the administration of questionnaires to respondents, who were teachers at boarding schools. The collected data were then analyzed using statistical techniques. This study not only delineates the extant variables but also elucidates the underlying cause and effect relationship between these variables. Survey responses questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while interview transcripts were examined using open coding techniques to identify key themes. The results of the analysis show that work-life balance significantly affects teacher retention. Employee engagement has also been proven to significantly impact retention. Concurrently, Work-Life Balance and Employee Engagement have a substantial impact on teacher retention, accounting for 78% of the retention variable. Consequently, these two factors emerge as the predominant determinants of the efficacy of teacher retention strategies within the context of boarding school environments, characterized by substantial workloads and a profound level of engagement between teachers and students.

1. INTRODUCTION

Boarding schools exhibit distinctive characteristics that differentiate them from conventional schools, particularly with regard to the elevated level of involvement and time demands placed on teachers. Teachers at boarding

schools fulfill a multifaceted role, serving not only as educators but also as mentors, companions, and supervisors for students residing in dormitories. This phenomenon gives rise to challenges in achieving an optimal balance between professional obligations and personal commitments (i.e., work life balance), as well as in fostering employee engagement, which in turn impacts teacher retention rates within these educational institutions.

A substantial body of research has demonstrated that an imbalance between professional obligations and personal demands can precipitate work exhaustion (burnout) and diminish educators commitment to their institutions. Conversely, high employee engagement has been shown to enhance motivation and job satisfaction, thereby exerting a positive influence on teacher retention. Therefore, the objective of this study is to explore how work-life balance and employee engagement contribute to teacher retention strategies in boarding schools.

In light of the aforementioned background, the research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1. What is the level of work life balance among teachers in boarding schools ?
2. What is the level of employee engagement among teachers in boarding schools?
3. How much does work-life balance influence teacher retention?
4. How much does employee engagement influence teacher retention?
5. What strategies can be implemented to improve teacher retention in boarding schools?

The objective of this study is to:

1. A study of the work life balance among teachers in boarding schools is necessary to determine the extent of its presence in this particular professional environment.
2. A rigorous examination of the extent of employee engagement among teaching professionals in boarding schools is imperative to inform effective strategies for enhancing their well being and performance.
3. The present study aims to measure the influence of work life balance on teacher retention.

4. The present study aims to measure the influence of employee engagement on teacher retention.

5. The formulation of effective strategies to improve teacher retention in boarding schools is imperative.

The following parties are expected to benefit from this study:

1. For institutions dedicated to the education of boarding students: The objective of this study is to provide insights into the design of policies that support teacher well being and improve educator retention.

2. For academic audiences: The incorporation of references to studies on Human Resources Management (HRM), particularly in the context of education, is essential for comprehensive analysis.

3. This analysis is intended for education policymakers. The purpose of this foundation is to formulate policies that support work life balance for educators.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Human resources management plays a strategic role in managing human resources to create a productive, healthy, and sustainable work environment. The human resources department plays a pivotal role in the formulation of policies and programs that promote employee well being and engagement, thereby fostering increased loyalty to the organization. Furthermore, the field of Human Resources Management (HRM) has been shown to play a pivotal role in cultivating a healthy and inclusive organizational culture. Organizations that wish to attract and retain the most qualified candidates may consider cultivating a work environment that prioritizes diversity, transparency, and collaboration. Therefore, HRM strategies must be aligned with the organization's vision and mission, and be able to provide added value for both the organization and employees.

Employee retention is a strategy employed by organizations to ensure the continued employment of talented individuals, thereby fostering long term organizational growth and success. In the context of an increasingly competitive educational environment, the issue of employee retention has become a crucial aspect. High rates of employee turnover can have a detrimental effect on a variety of outcomes, including but not limited to productivity, recruitment costs, and operational stability. The financial

investments required for the recruitment and training of new employees frequently exceed those necessary for the retention of existing personnel. Therefore, it is imperative for educational institutions to develop and implement effective retention strategies.

One theoretical framework that can be employed to elucidate employee retention is Job Embeddedness Theory, which was proposed by Mitchell et al. in 2001. This theoretical framework elucidates the underlying factors that motivate employees to remain in their organizations. The model posits that employees' decisions to stay are influenced by three primary factors: The concepts of "link," "social bonding," "fit," and "sacrifice" are examined in this study. The implications of these factors for employees' decisions to stay or leave their jobs are significant.

Work life balance is a pivotal concept in contemporary society, where the demands of professional life frequently become enmeshed with personal needs. This concept refers to the ideal balance between time spent on work and time spent on personal life, enabling individuals to pursue both aspects harmoniously without feeling overwhelmed. In contemporary work environments characterized by increasing dynamism and competitiveness, the significance of work-life balance has become paramount. This is due to the fact that it exerts a direct influence on the well-being and productivity of employees in the workplace.

The Work Family Boundary Theory, proposed by Clark in 2000, posits that individuals must effectively manage and balance the demands of work and personal life. This theory posits that the boundaries between work and personal life are often indistinct, particularly in specific contexts such as boarding schools. Within the context of an educational environment, educators assume dual roles as mentors and caregivers for their students. These professionals frequently inhabit the school environment and possess a high degree of flexibility in their work hours. This can, however, engender a certain degree of difficulty in distinguishing between work time and personal time. For instance, a teacher residing in a dormitory may feel compelled to be perpetually accessible to students, even beyond the conventional workday. This phenomenon can result in a state of exhaustion, both mental and physical, which can in turn have a deleterious effect on an individual's academic performance.

Work life balance encompasses more than the mere management of time between professional and personal domains, it refers to the establishment of a harmonious equilibrium that enables employees to function at their optimal level while preserving their well-being. Employees who perceive an equilibrium

between professional and personal domains tend to exhibit higher levels of contentment, enhanced productivity, and increased organizational loyalty. For instance, organizations that implement flexible work policies, such as remote work or flexible hours, often observe increased productivity and job satisfaction among their employees. This suggests that by empowering employees to manage their own time, companies can foster a healthier and more committed workforce.

Employee engagement is defined as the emotional attachment, commitment, and high motivation of employees toward their work and organizational goals. In this context, emotional attachment is defined as a profound sense of commitment and responsibility for the success of the organization, which extends beyond the mere enjoyment of one's work. Employees who are emotionally engaged tend to feel that they are an integral part of the team and the organization. This increased sense of belonging fosters heightened confidence in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. In a competitive educational environment, employee engagement is a key factor in increasing productivity, loyalty, and innovation in the workplace. For instance, a teacher who feels involved in the development of the curriculum and teaching methods will be more motivated to find innovative ways to teach, which will ultimately improve the quality of education provided to students.

According to the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), employee well-being and engagement are influenced by the balance between high job demands, emotional stress in teaching and educating students in a boarding school environment, and resources such as support from management, training, a comfortable work environment, and work-life balance. Within an educational framework, elevated job demands frequently emanate from substantial workloads, encompassing teaching responsibilities, lesson preparation, and student evaluation. Conversely, resources such as support from colleagues and management, relevant training, and adequate facilities can help alleviate these demands. For instance, a school that provides training for teachers on stress management and effective teaching techniques can help teachers feel more prepared and capable of handling job demands, thereby increasing their level of engagement.

In order to establish an organizational environment conducive to engagement, it is imperative for management to play an active role in this process. Constructive feedback, career development opportunities, and an inclusive work atmosphere are all components of this framework. For instance, management can implement regular training sessions to enhance employee skills and facilitate opportunities for professional advancement. Furthermore, it is imperative to establish an equilibrium between professional obligations

and personal demands. This enables employees to maintain a sense of equilibrium and avoid being overwhelmed by their professional responsibilities. This will enable employees to perform better in their jobs.

Employee engagement is a critical component in establishing a productive and innovative work environment, particularly within the challenging domain of education. By comprehending and implementing the principles of the JD-R Model, organizations can achieve an optimal balance between job demands and available resources, thereby enhancing employee well-being and engagement. Furthermore, cultivating a positive and sustainable work culture has been shown to result in happier and more committed employees, which ultimately benefits the organization as a whole. Consequently, investing in employee engagement strategies is not merely an option but rather an imperative for organizations aspiring for long-term success.

3. METHODS

This study employs a quantitative approach to assess the impact of work-life balance and employee engagement variables on teacher retention. The data were collected through the administration of questionnaires to respondents, who were teachers at boarding schools. The collected data were then analyzed using statistical techniques. This study not only delineates the extant variables but also elucidates the underlying cause-and-effect relationship between these variables. The present study utilized the statistical data processing application SPSS version 29, a software that employs statistical analysis to facilitate data processing and interpretation.

The population of this study was comprised of permanent and non-permanent teachers who had worked at Nurul Fikri Boarding School Lembang for a minimum of one year. Conversely, the research sample was derived from a population of 200 individuals, with an alpha level of 5%, employing the Slovin formula. This calculation yielded a result of 83.333, which was subsequently rounded to 84 subjects. Primary data was collected through the administration of questionnaires distributed directly to the target population. The questionnaires employed a 5 point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) to assess work-life balance, employee engagement, and retention (i.e., the desire to remain employed).

The research instrument employed was a questionnaire incorporating a Likert scale (1–5) consisting of:

1. Work-Life Balance

The measurement was based on two aspects: work flexibility and well-being. In addition, school support was included as a third aspect.

2. Employee Engagement

   The measurement of these outcomes is based on work motivation, loyalty, and job satisfaction.

3. Teacher Retention

   The measurement of this variable is based on two key factors: job satisfaction and the desire to continue working at the school.

Validity Test

Validity testing is a methodical process that aims to ascertain the instrument's (in this case, a questionnaire) capacity to accurately measure the intended constructs. The corrected item-total correlation analysis is employed. The following criteria have been established to evaluate the validity of the test. The validity of an item is determined by the r-calculated value exceeding the r-table value. For a sample size of n = 92, the r-table value is approximately 0.2028. Pursuant to the r-count value being less than the r-table value, there is a determination that the item in question is considered invalid. Therefore, the item must be either deleted or corrected, as appropriate.

Reliability Test

Reliability testing is a methodical procedure designed to ascertain the uniformity of respondents' responses to the instrument. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was utilized in this study. Cronbach's Alpha reliability criteria are employed to assess the internal consistency of a measuring instrument, such as a questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha values range from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater reliability.

1. It has been determined that an alpha greater than or equal to 0.9 is indicative of a highly reliable outcome.

2. The interval of $0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ is considered to be reliable.

3. The interval of $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.8$ is indicative of moderately reliable data.

4. It has been determined that $\alpha < 0.7$ is indicative of reduced reliability.

Normality Test

In the present study, normality tests were conducted to ascertain whether the residual data were normally distributed. The normality test employed in the present study utilized the Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Shapiro-Wilk method. The following criteria are employed to facilitate the evaluation of normality:

1. Sig. > 0.05 → data is normally distributed
2. Sig. < 0.05 → data is not normally distributed

Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test in this study is intended to ascertain whether there is a high correlation (multicollinearity) between independent variables. Multicollinearity can be detected using the multicollinearity test, which utilizes two indicators. Firstly, tolerance is required to be greater than 0.10, and secondly, the VIF (Variances Invariant Factor) must be less than 10. The presence of multicollinearity is indicated if these conditions are not met.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The multicollinearity test in this study is intended to ascertain whether there is a high correlation (multicollinearity) between independent variables. Multicollinearity can be detected using the multicollinearity test, which utilizes two indicators. Firstly, tolerance is required to be greater than 0.10, and secondly, the VIF (Variances Invariant Factor) must be less than 10. The heteroscedasticity test is a statistical procedure employed to evaluate the presence of any potential differences in the variance of the residuals for all observations within a linear regression model. This test is a classical assumption test that is required for the implementation of linear regression. In the event that the heteroscedasticity assumption is not met, the regression model is deemed invalid for forecasting purposes.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

The utilization of multiple linear regression models is imperative in ascertaining the extent to which two independent variables exert an influence on a single dependent variable. The General Equations of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis are as follows:

$$Y=\beta 0+\beta 1X1+\beta 2X2+\varepsilon$$

It has been established that:

- Y = Teacher Retention
- X_1 = Work-Life Balance
- X_2 = Employee Engagement
- β_0 = constant
- β_1, β_2 = regression coefficients
- ε = error

"t" Test (partial)

The t-test was employed to evaluate the research hypothesis regarding the partial effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The following criteria were established for the t-test in this study:

- Sig. < 0.05 → significant effect
- t-calculated > t-table → significant

"F"-Test (Simultaneous)

The F test is a statistical procedure employed to ascertain whether a set of independent variables collectively exert a simultaneous influence on a designated dependent variable. The F test is a statistical procedure employed to ascertain the collective influence of all independent variables on the dependent variable. The level employed is 0.05 or 5%. When the Sig. value is less than 0.05, it can be interpreted that the independent variables simultaneously influence the dependent variable or vice versa (Ghozali, 2016). The simultaneous F test, also referred to as the "Simultaneous Test," is a statistical procedure employed to ascertain the existence of a joint or simultaneous influence between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

Correlations

		X1_1	X1_2	X1_3	X1_4	X1_5	X1_6	X1_7	X1_8	X1_9	X1_10	Work Life Balance
X1_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.695**	.544**	.419**	.487**	.534**	.381**	.487**	.037	.579**	.760**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.730	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_2	Pearson Correlation	.695**	1	.561**	.398**	.436**	.568**	.380**	.469**	.038	.686**	.766**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.720	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_3	Pearson Correlation	.544**	.561**	1	.488**	.477**	.575**	.384**	.581**	.100	.571**	.768**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.341	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_4	Pearson Correlation	.419**	.398**	.488**	1	.358**	.453**	.353**	.407**	.266*	.430**	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.010	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_5	Pearson Correlation	.487**	.436**	.477**	.358**	1	.479**	.224*	.486**	.179	.491**	.672**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	.032	<.001	.088	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_6	Pearson Correlation	.534**	.568**	.575**	.453**	.479**	1	.413**	.595**	.138	.749**	.791**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	.190	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_7	Pearson Correlation	.381**	.380**	.384**	.353**	.224*	.413**	1	.294**	.026	.411**	.568**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.032	<.001		.004	.807	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_8	Pearson Correlation	.487**	.469**	.581**	.407**	.486**	.595**	.294**	1	.082	.606**	.714**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.004		.437	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_9	Pearson Correlation	.037	.038	.100	.266*	.179	.138	.026	.082	1	.131	.319**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.730	.720	.341	.010	.088	.190	.807	.437		.215	.002
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X1_10	Pearson Correlation	.579**	.686**	.571**	.430**	.491**	.749**	.411**	.606**	.131	1	.817**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.215		<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Work Life Balance	Pearson Correlation	.760**	.766**	.768**	.668**	.672**	.791**	.568**	.714**	.319**	.817**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.002	<.001	
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Figure 1. Results of the validity test of the Work-Life Balance (x1) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Correlations

		X2_1	X2_2	X2_3	X2_4	X2_5	X2_6	X2_7	X2_8	X2_9	X2_10	Employee Engagement
X2_1	Pearson Correlation	1	.351**	.484**	.675**	.336**	.370**	.214*	.290**	.468**	.380**	.627**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	<.001	<.001	.001	<.001	.040	.005	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_2	Pearson Correlation	.351**	1	.587**	.459**	.289**	.135	.328**	.057	.278**	.412**	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		<.001	<.001	.005	.201	.001	.590	.007	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_3	Pearson Correlation	.484**	.587**	1	.531**	.385**	.268**	.343**	.210*	.340**	.446**	.650**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	.010	<.001	.044	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_4	Pearson Correlation	.675**	.459**	.531**	1	.417**	.394**	.316**	.260*	.356**	.381**	.657**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	.002	.012	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_5	Pearson Correlation	.336**	.289**	.385**	.417**	1	.423**	.670**	.605**	.388**	.704**	.792**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.005	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_6	Pearson Correlation	.370**	.135	.268**	.394**	.423**	1	.480**	.409**	.355**	.331**	.585**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.201	.010	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_7	Pearson Correlation	.214*	.328**	.343**	.316**	.670**	.480**	1	.523**	.251*	.691**	.739**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.001	<.001	.002	<.001	<.001		<.001	.016	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_8	Pearson Correlation	.290**	.057	.210*	.260*	.605**	.409**	.523**	1	.484**	.658**	.690**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.590	.044	.012	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_9	Pearson Correlation	.468**	.278**	.340**	.356**	.388**	.355**	.251*	.484**	1	.483**	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	.007	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.016	<.001		<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
X2_10	Pearson Correlation	.380**	.412**	.446**	.381**	.704**	.331**	.691**	.658**	.483**	1	.839**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Employee Engagement	Pearson Correlation	.627**	.554**	.650**	.657**	.792**	.585**	.739**	.690**	.653**	.839**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Figure 2. Results of the validity test of the Employee Engagement (x2) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Correlations

		Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Retensi
Y1	Pearson Correlation	1	.568**	.438**	.583**	.468**	.518**	.565**	.472**	.461**	.416**	.724**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y2	Pearson Correlation	.568**	1	.706**	.498**	.476**	.706**	.480**	.414**	.401**	.571**	.780**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y3	Pearson Correlation	.438**	.706**	1	.615**	.623**	.603**	.592**	.399**	.631**	.461**	.819**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y4	Pearson Correlation	.583**	.498**	.615**	1	.630**	.453**	.649**	.577**	.706**	.562**	.838**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y5	Pearson Correlation	.468**	.476**	.623**	.630**	1	.482**	.519**	.403**	.532**	.468**	.746**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y6	Pearson Correlation	.518**	.706**	.603**	.453**	.482**	1	.439**	.391**	.405**	.445**	.732**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y7	Pearson Correlation	.565**	.480**	.592**	.649**	.519**	.439**	1	.371**	.672**	.437**	.760**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y8	Pearson Correlation	.472**	.414**	.399**	.577**	.403**	.391**	.371**	1	.446**	.377**	.646**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y9	Pearson Correlation	.461**	.401**	.631**	.706**	.532**	.405**	.672**	.446**	1	.446**	.763**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001	<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Y10	Pearson Correlation	.416**	.571**	.461**	.562**	.468**	.445**	.437**	.377**	.446**	1	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001		<.001
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92
Retensi	Pearson Correlation	.724**	.780**	.819**	.838**	.746**	.732**	.760**	.646**	.763**	.682**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	
	N	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92	92

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

Figure 3. Results of the validity test of the Retention (y) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	92	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.865	10

Figure 4. Results of reliability testing for the work life balance (x1) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	92	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.870	10

Figure 5. Results of reliability testing for the employee engagement (x2) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	92	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	92	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.913	10

Figure 6. Results of reliability testing for the retention (y) variable

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

			Work Life Balance	Employee Engagement	Retensi
N			92	92	92
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean		36.01	39.58	37.43
	Std. Deviation		6.357	5.671	6.469
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		.111	.084	.094
	Positive		.064	.057	.085
	Negative		-.111	-.084	-.094
Test Statistic			.111	.084	.094
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)[c]			.007	.115	.042
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)[d]	Sig.		.008	.107	.043
	99% Confidence Interval	Lower Bound	.005	.099	.037
		Upper Bound	.010	.115	.048

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.
d. Lilliefors' method based on 10000 Monte Carlo samples with starting seed 2000000.

Figure 7. Results of Normality Test

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	Collinearity Statistics VIF
1	(Constant)	-2.935	2.311		-1.270	.208		
	Work Life Balance	.387	.067	.380	5.763	<.001	.567	1.764
	Employee Engagement	.668	.075	.586	8.875	<.001	.567	1.764

a. Dependent Variable: Retensi

Figure 8. Results of Multicollinearity Test

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	Collinearity Statistics VIF
1	(Constant)	5.464	1.404		3.892	<.001		
	Work Life Balance	-.074	.041	-.246	-1.818	.072	.567	1.764
	Employee Engagement	-.011	.046	-.034	-.251	.802	.567	1.764

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Figure 9. Results of Heteroscedasticity Test

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.883[a]	.780	.775	3.066

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement, Work Life Balance

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2972.022	2	1486.011	158.089	<.001[b]
	Residual	836.586	89	9.400		
	Total	3808.609	91			

a. Dependent Variable: Retensi
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement, Work Life Balance

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-2.935	2.311		-1.270	.208
	Work Life Balance	.387	.067	.380	5.763	<.001
	Employee Engagement	.668	.075	.586	8.875	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Retensi

Figure 10. Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-2.935	2.311		-1.270	.208
	Work Life Balance	.387	.067	.380	5.763	<.001
	Employee Engagement	.668	.075	.586	8.875	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Retensi

Figure 11. Results of "T" Test (partial)

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2972.022	2	1486.011	158.089	<.001[b]
	Residual	836.586	89	9.400		
	Total	3808.609	91			

a. Dependent Variable: Retensi

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Engagement, Work Life Balance

Figure 12. Results of "F" Test (Simultaneous)

Source: Secondary data processed, 2025

DISCUSSION

The results of the validity test for the Work-Life Balance (X1) variable from all questionnaire items yielded a significance value of 0.05 or less, indicating that all questions were considered valid (figure 1). The results of the validity test for the Employee Engagement (X2) variable from all questionnaire items yielded a significance value of 0.05. This finding indicates that all questions were deemed valid (figure 2). The results of the validity test for the Retention (Y) variable from all questions yielded a significance value of ≤ 0.05, indicating that all questions were deemed valid (figure 3).

The reliability test results for the work-life balance variable (X1) demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.865, indicating that the variable possesses adequate reliability, given that $0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ (figure 4). The reliability test results for the employee engagement variable (X2) demonstrated a

Cronbach's alpha of 0.870, indicating that the variable possesses adequate reliability, given that $0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9$ (figure 5). The reliability test results for the Retention (Y) variable demonstrated a Cronbach's alpha of 0.913, indicating that the variable possesses high reliability, as evidenced by the requirement that $\alpha \geq 0.9$ (figure 6).

The results of the normality test, as illustrated in figure 7, demonstrate that Work-life balance possesses a significance value of 0.007, which is less than 0.05. Employee Engagement exhibits a significance value of 0.115, which is greater than 0.05. Similarly, Retention demonstrates a significance value of 0.42, which is greater than 0.05. In the case of variable X1, the data does not follow a normal distribution, as evidenced by a significance value of 0.007, which is less than 0.05. However, for variables X2 and Y, the data is normally distributed, with a significance value of 0.115 for X2 and 0.42 for Y, both of which are greater than 0.05.

The findings of the multicollinearity test of the two independent variables, work-life balance and employee engagement, on the dependent variable retention demonstrate a collinearity tolerance value of 0.567, where the general limit is < 0.10, indicating that there are no indications of multicollinearity between the two independent variables. Concurrently, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for the two independent variables is 1.764, which is well below 10, indicating that multicollinearity is also not a concern (figure 8). The outcomes of the heteroscedasticity assessment for the two independent variables, work-life balance and employee engagement, exhibited significance values of 0.072 and 0.802, respectively. Both values were greater than 0.05, indicating that there was no evidence of heteroscedasticity in the two independent variables (figure 9).

The results of multiple linear regression analysis (Figure 10) demonstrate the efficacy of the proposed model. The R value is 0.883, which is close to 1. This indicates a very strong correlation between work-life balance and employee engagement on teacher retention. The R Square value is 0.780, indicating that 78% of the influence on teacher retention is attributed to work-life balance and employee engagement, while the remaining 22% is influenced by other variables. The adjusted R Square value is 0.775, indicating that the work-life balance and employee engagement variables influence teacher retention by 77.5%, while the remaining 22.5% is influenced by other variables. The standard error of estimate is 3.066, indicating that the margin of error in predicting teacher retention is 3.066. The F-statistic, which is a measure of the variability in the data, is 158.089, and the significance level is less than 0.001. This indicates that the variables work-life balance and employee engagement have a significant influence on teacher retention. The regression equation is

thus: Y = -2.935 + 0.387X1 + 0.668X2 + □. The correlation coefficient between teacher retention and work-life balance (β_1) and employee engagement (β_2) is represented by the following equation: $R\_t = \beta_1 \times W\_L + \beta_2 \times E\_E - R\_t$. Assuming that employee engagement remains constant, a 1-point increase in work-life balance has been demonstrated to result in a 0.387-point increase in teacher retention. Similarly, under the same conditions, a 1-point increase in employee engagement has been shown to lead to a 0.668-point increase in teacher retention. Conversely, if work-life balance remains constant, a 1-point increase in employee engagement has been shown to result in a 0.668-point increase in teacher retention.

The findings of the analysis suggest that work-life balance exerts a substantial influence on teacher retention. This phenomenon aligns with the principles of the Work-Family Boundary Theory (Clark, 2000), which posits that individuals must establish boundaries between their professional and personal lives to mitigate role conflicts. Within the context of Nurul Fikri Boarding School, teachers are obligated to maintain constant physical and emotional presence in the school environment. The provision of flexible work policies and adequate rest time by the organization is conducive to a better work-life balance for teachers, which in turn increases their intention to stay.

A substantial impact was also identified on the part of employee engagement. These findings lend support to the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), which posits that heightened emotional and motivational engagement among employees will foster an increased propensity to remain in the organization. Empirical evidence has demonstrated that educators who feel listened to, engaged in the decision-making process, and provided with opportunities for professional growth exhibit heightened levels of commitment to their institution.

The regression model indicates that work-life balance and employee engagement collectively account for 78% of the variance in teacher retention (R Square = 0.780). Consequently, both factors emerge as pivotal in the formulation of teacher retention strategies. Job Embeddedness Theory (Mitchell et al., 2001) posits that employees' decisions to remain in their current positions are influenced by factors such as social attachment, value compatibility, and sacrifice. Teachers who maintain a healthy work-life balance and feel engaged in their profession may regard the prospect of leaving the school environment as a significant sacrifice. In consideration of the empirical results and supporting theories, the strategies that can be implemented by boarding school administrators include the following:

1. The following text will explore the ways in which work life balance can be strengthened.

   - The reallocation of teachers' workloads constitutes a pivotal aspect of the pedagogical approach.
   - The provision of structured leave and rest periods is imperative.
   - The provision of psychological support in conjunction with relaxation facilities is imperative.

2. Improving Employee Engagement:

   - The involvement of teachers in the formulation of school policy is a subject that warrants further examination.
   - The provision of professional training and development constitutes a fundamental aspect of the program.
   - It is imperative to acknowledge the significance of recognizing performance and loyalty.

5. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that work-life balance has a positive and significant partial effect on teacher retention. This finding suggests a positive correlation between teachers' perceived balance between work and personal life and their desire to remain at the boarding school. Organizational support in managing workloads, providing flexibility, and paying attention to teacher well-being are crucial factors in improving retention.

The findings of this study demonstrate that employee engagement exerts a positive and significant partial influence on teacher retention. Teachers who experience a high degree of emotional, cognitive, and motivational engagement in their work have been shown to exhibit high levels of job satisfaction and a strong desire to remain in their positions. Teacher involvement in decision-making, self-development, and organizational support plays a major role in building this attachment.

Concurrently, Work-Life Balance and Employee Engagement have a substantial impact on teacher retention, accounting for 78% of the retention variable. Consequently, these two factors emerge as the predominant determinants of the efficacy of teacher retention strategies within the context

of boarding school environments, characterized by substantial workloads and a profound level of engagement between teachers and students.

These findings lend support to extant theoretical frameworks such as the Work-Family Border Theory (Clark, 2000), the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), and the Job Embeddedness Theory (Mitchell et al., 2001). These theories collectively underscore the significance of work-life balance, work engagement, and emotional attachment in diminishing turnover and fostering teacher loyalty.

In light of the study's findings and the conclusions derived, the following recommendations are put forth for future research: the incorporation of additional variables that may also influence retention, including transformational leadership, organizational culture, and overall job satisfaction. The expansion of the sample scope to encompass a more extensive array of boarding schools across diverse geographical regions has the potential to yield more comprehensive generalizations regarding the observed results.

6. REFERENCES

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328.

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

Ghozali, I. (2018). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Handoko, T. H. (2014). Manajemen Personalia dan Sumberdaya Manusia. Yogyakarta: BPFE.

Hasibuan, M. S. P. (2016). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Mangkunegara, A. A. A. P. (2015). Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Perusahaan. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablynski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 44(6), 1102–1121.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). Organizational Behavior (17th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta.