

**TECHNOSTRESS AS THE DOMINANT DETERMINANT OF BURNOUT AND TURNOVER
INTENTION IN THE DIGITAL ERA**

Didit Darmawan, Fayola Issalillah

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Correspondence: dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the effect of technostress and work-life balance on burnout and turnover intention among service company employees. The study sample consisted of 189 first-line employees selected using a purposive sampling technique. Data collection was conducted via an online questionnaire utilizing a Likert scale. Data analysis was performed using multiple linear regression with two separate models. The results showed that technostress has a positive effect on burnout and turnover intention, whereas work-life balance has a negative effect on burnout and turnover intention. Technostress was found to be the more dominant variable compared to work-life balance in influencing both dependent variables. The simultaneous contribution to burnout is 48.7 percent, and to turnover intention is 42.3 percent. Managerial implications of this study highlight the need for technostress reduction programs through digital literacy training, flexible work policies, and the restriction of digital communication outside working hours.

Keywords: technostress, work-life balance, burnout, turnover intention, regresi linier berganda.

Introduction

In an era of rapid digital transformation, almost all industrial sectors, including service companies, have adopted digital technology in their daily operations. From the use of instant communication applications and online work management systems to digital collaboration platforms, technology has fundamentally transformed the way employees work. Technological developments increase demands on employees' adaptability, as adaptation not only means being able to use new devices, but also being able to integrate technology into workflows safely and responsibly (Darmawan & Mardikaningsih, 2023). These developments create new job opportunities, such as remote work and more flexible time arrangements (Eddine & Darmawan, 2021). However, behind the various conveniences and efficiencies offered, the massive adoption of digital technology also brings significant psychological consequences for employees. The phenomenon known as Technostress, or psychological pressure resulting from the use of digital technology at work, is increasingly prevalent, characterized by feelings of being overwhelmed, anxiety, and mental exhaustion due to demands to remain constantly connected and respond digitally. On the other hand, increasingly high job demands often sacrifice the balance between work life and personal life, known as Work-Life Balance. Employees find it difficult to separate work time from rest time, especially with digital devices enabling them to be contacted at any time. The accumulation of this pressure can lead to Burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment, which ultimately triggers the employee's intention to leave the job, or Turnover Intention. High Turnover Intention can indicate issues in employee retention, as companies risk losing experienced employees and must retrain new ones (Retnowati et al., 2023). This phenomenon has become a serious concern for human resource management due to its significant impact on productivity, employee retention, and organizational sustainability.

Field observations indicate that not all employees experience the same levels of Technostress and Work-Life Balance disruption. Based on preliminary observations in service companies in Surabaya, first-line employees who use digital technology most intensively tend to report higher

stress levels compared to managerial-level employees. They complain about the pressure to always be available outside working hours, difficulties in adapting to rapid digital system changes, and the feeling of never truly disconnecting from work. On the other hand, employees with good Work-Life Balance are reported to have higher levels of job satisfaction and demonstrate stronger commitment to the company (Guest, 2002; Haar et al., 2014). Conversely, those experiencing imbalance tend to show early signs of Burnout, such as chronic fatigue, cynicism toward work, and decreased motivation. Emotional exhaustion is a crucial aspect of Burnout because it can make an individual feel drained at work, leading to reluctance in handling new tasks and interacting with others (Mardikaningsih & Sinambela, 2022). Burnout can severely impact physical and mental health while disrupting performance and productivity in the workplace (Hariani & Khairi, 2023). If left unaddressed, employees may eventually decide to seek employment elsewhere, which inevitably harms the company in terms of recruitment costs and the loss of valuable talent (Maslach et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Several factors theoretically suspected of affecting Burnout and Turnover Intention include Technostress and Work-Life Balance. The person-environment fit theory by French dan Kahn (1962) explains that a mismatch between individual characteristics and the demands of the work environment gives rise to stress. Technostress is defined as the psychological pressure experienced by individuals due to an inability to adapt to or cope with the demands of digital technology at work (Brod, 1984; Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008). Technostress encompasses the burden of excessive technology use (techno-overload), difficulty adapting to rapid system changes (techno-complexity), and insecurity caused by continuous exposure to new technologies (techno-insecurity) (Tarafdar et al., 2007; Tarafdar et al., 2010). Previous research consistently reports that Technostress has a positive effect on Burnout and Turnover Intention (Ayyagari et al., 2011; Srivastava et al., 2015; Nimrod, 2018; Li & Wang, 2021; Salo et al., 2022; Pirkkalainen et al., 2023).

The second factor is Work-Life Balance, which refers to the degree of balance perceived by an individual between the demands of work roles and personal life roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Clark, 2000). Work-Life Balance is often regarded as something achievable through willpower, discipline, and good time management (Eddine & Darmawa, 2022). Work-Life Balance encompasses the time dimension (allocation of time between work and family), work flexibility (the ability to manage one's schedule), and balance satisfaction (feelings of satisfaction with the achieved balance) (Fisher-McAuley et al., 2003; Haar et al., 2014). Spillover theory explains that experiences in the work domain carry over into the personal life domain and vice versa (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990). The inability to separate these two domains accumulates stress, which ultimately leads to Burnout. Previous studies indicate that poor Work-Life Balance positively correlates with Burnout (Maslach et al., 2001; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004; Hakanen et al., 2006; Haar et al., 2014; Wong & Ko, 2019; Kelliher et al., 2019; Delecta, 2021; Sirgy & Lee, 2018). Conversely, good Work-Life Balance can reduce Turnover Intention because employees feel valued and cared for regarding their well-being (Guest, 2002; Hobfoll, 1989; Blau, 1964; Wayne et al., 2017; Haar et al., 2020; Chawla & Lenka, 2021; Kaur & Sharma, 2022). Employees who are able to maintain Work-Life Balance tend to feel more satisfied, motivated, and possess better mental health (Darmawa, 2022).

Research gaps in the literature concerning the determinants of Burnout and Turnover Intention persist. Most previous studies tend to examine Technostress and Work-Life Balance separately, or test their effects on Burnout and Turnover Intention in distinct models. Studies that integrate both independent variables simultaneously against two dependent variables within a single research setting remain limited, particularly in the context of service company employees in Surabaya. In fact, Technostress and Work-Life Balance are two sides of the same coin in the digital era; both are interconnected and jointly shape employee work experiences. Neglecting either aspect in the analysis risks yielding an incomplete understanding and misplaced policy recommendations.

The novelty of this study lies in the simultaneous examination of the effects of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout and Turnover Intention across two separate regression models within the same population. This approach enables the identification of which factor is more

dominant in influencing Burnout compared to Turnover Intention, while offering a comprehensive picture of the psychological mechanisms occurring among employees. Furthermore, utilizing a sample of first-line service company employees provides a highly relevant context, as this group is the most vulnerable to Technostress due to their high intensity of digital technology usage. This research also offers practical contributions for corporate management in designing targeted interventions to mitigate Burnout and Turnover Intention. Based on the outlined phenomena, research gaps, and proposed novelty, the primary objective of this study is to empirically test the partial and simultaneous effects of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout and Turnover Intention among service company employees.

Method

This study employs a quantitative approach with an explanatory research type, which aims to explain causal relationships between independent variables and dependent variables through hypothesis testing. The research design used is cross-sectional, in which data is collected at a single specific point in time from a group of respondents serving as the research sample (Newby, 2014). This approach was chosen because it aligns with the research objective of simultaneously testing the effects of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout and Turnover Intention. The population of this study comprises all first-line employees at a service company in Surabaya. Based on internal company data, the total population of first-line employees is 214 individuals. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling, where respondents are selected based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives (Daniel et al., 2024). The inclusion criteria in this study are: (a) active first-line employees; (b) utilizing digital technology in daily work; (c) having regular working hours; and (d) willing to complete the questionnaire fully and voluntarily. Based on these criteria, a sample of 189 respondents was established from the total population of 214 individuals.

The data collection procedure was conducted online using the Google Forms platform. The questionnaire was distributed via the company's WhatsApp group with the assistance of the human resource manager. The distribution was carried out over a full week with reminders sent every two days. A total of 189 questionnaires were received during the distribution period, meeting the established target. The response rate was 100 percent of the target sample. The research instrument used was a five-point Likert scale-based questionnaire, where a value of 1 indicates strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree, and 5 strongly agree. The Technostress variable was measured using a scale adapted from Ragu-Nathan et al. (2008) and Tarafdar et al. (2007) which covers the dimensions of techno-overload (the burden of excessive technology use), techno-complexity (difficulty in adapting), and techno-insecurity (feelings of insecurity due to technological change). The Work-Life Balance variable was measured using a scale adapted from Fisher-McAuley et al. (2003) and Haar et al. (2014) covering the time dimension (allocation of time between work and family), work flexibility, and life balance satisfaction. The Burnout variable was measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) scale adapted from Maslach, Schaufeli, dan Leiter (2001) which includes three dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. The Turnover Intention variable was measured using a scale adapted from Mobley (1977) and Tett and Meyer (1993) covering the intention to seek alternative employment, the desire to resign, and thoughts of leaving the company.

The collected data was subsequently analyzed using SPSS software version 26. Data analysis was conducted in several stages. The first stage is descriptive statistical analysis to describe the characteristics of respondents and the score distribution of each variable (Daniel et al., 2024). The second stage is the classical assumption test, which includes the normality test of residuals using Kolmogorov-Smirnov with the criterion that residuals are normally distributed if the significance value is greater than 0.05. The linearity test was conducted using the deviation from linearity test to ensure that the relationship between each independent variable and the dependent variable is linear, with the criterion being linear if the significance value of deviation from linearity is greater than 0.05.

The heteroscedasticity test was performed using the Glejser test, where heteroscedasticity does not occur if the significance value between the independent variables and the absolute value of residuals is greater than 0.05 (Ghozali, 2018). The multicollinearity test was carried out by examining the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and tolerance values, where multicollinearity does not occur if the VIF value is less than 10 and the tolerance value is greater than 0.10 (Tolmie et al., 2011).

The third stage is hypothesis testing using multiple linear regression analysis with two separate models (Daniel et al., 2024). Model A is used to examine the effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout with the equation $Y_1 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$. Model B is used to examine the effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Turnover Intention with the equation $Y_2 = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$. Partial hypothesis testing (t-test) is conducted to determine the significance of the individual effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, with the criterion of being significant if the significance value is less than 0.05. Simultaneous testing (F-test) is performed to determine whether both independent variables simultaneously have a significant effect on the dependent variable, with the criterion of being significant if the significance value is less than 0.05 (Tolmie et al., 2011). The coefficient of determination (R^2) is calculated to ascertain the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by both independent variables simultaneously (Ghozali, 2018). To identify which variable has the most dominant contribution to each dependent variable, a comparison of the standardized coefficients beta from both independent variables is conducted (Daniel et al., 2024). All data analysis procedures were carried out at an alpha significance level of 0.05.

Results

This study was derived from questionnaires distributed to 189 first-line employees of service companies in Surabaya who met the inclusion criteria. The questionnaire response rate reached 100 percent of the target sample. The respondent profile indicates that 112 respondents, or 59.3 percent, are male, and 77 respondents, or 40.7 percent, are female. Based on tenure, 89 respondents (47.1 percent) have a tenure of 1 to 5 years, 67 respondents (35.4 percent) have a tenure of 6 to 10 years, and 33 respondents (17.5 percent) have a tenure of more than 10 years. Based on educational background, 102 respondents (54.0 percent) hold a bachelor's degree, 51 respondents (27.0 percent) hold a diploma, and 36 respondents (19.0 percent) have a vocational high school background.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

Characteristics	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	112	59.3
	Female	77	40.7
Tenure	1 - 5 years	89	47.1
	6 - 10 years	67	35.4
	> 10 years	33	17.5
Education	Vocational High School (SMK)	36	19.0
	Diploma	51	27.0
	Bachelor's Degree	102	54.0

Descriptive statistics of the research data indicate that the Technostress variable has a mean value of 3.82 with a standard deviation of 0.65, Work-Life Balance has a mean of 3.45 with a standard deviation of 0.72, Burnout has a mean of 3.68 with a standard deviation of 0.68, and Turnover Intention has a mean of 3.52 with a standard deviation of 0.7.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variable

Variable	Label	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Technostress	X1	189	2.10	4.90	3.82	0.65
Work-Life Balance	X2	189	1.80	4.80	3.45	0.72
Burnout	Y1	189	2.00	4.90	3.68	0.68

Variable	Label	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Turnover Intention	Y2	189	1.90	4.85	3.52	0.70

Validity testing was conducted using Pearson correlation between each item score and its variable total score. The criterion used is a minimum correlation coefficient value of 0.30 and a significance of less than 0.05. The validity test results show that all statement items for the four variables have corrected item-total correlation values above 0.30, thus declared valid. Reliability testing was performed by calculating Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for each variable. The Cronbach's Alpha values for Technostress, Work-Life Balance, Burnout, and Turnover Intention are 0.872, 0.858, 0.865, and 0.842, respectively. All four values are well above the minimum threshold of 0.70, indicating that the instrument is reliable.

Table 3. Validity and Reliability Test

Variable	Number of Items	Range of r-count	r-table	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Technostress (X1)	6	0.456 - 0.734	0.30	0.872	Valid & Reliable
Work-Life Balance (X2)	6	0.445 - 0.712	0.30	0.858	Valid & Reliable
Burnout (Y1)	6	0.438 - 0.698	0.30	0.865	Valid & Reliable
Turnover Intention (Y2)	5	0.423 - 0.684	0.30	0.842	Valid & Reliable

Before conducting hypothesis testing using multiple linear regression, classical assumption tests were first performed to ensure that the regression model is appropriate for use. The residual normality test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov for Model A (Burnout) yielded a statistical value of 0.068 with a significance value of 0.132, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that the residuals are normally distributed. For Model B (Turnover Intention), the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value was 0.072 with a significance of 0.145. The linearity test showed significance values for deviation from linearity for all relationships above 0.05, meaning that the relationships are linear. The multicollinearity test indicated that the tolerance values for both independent variables were 0.587 and 0.612, and the VIF values were 1.703 and 1.634, both meeting the required criteria. The heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test showed significance values for Technostress of 0.324 and Work-Life Balance of 0.287 against the absolute residual values, all of which are greater than 0.05, indicating no heteroscedasticity issues.

Table 4. Classical Assumption Test

Assumption Test	Criterion	Result	Description
Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)	Sig. > 0.05	Model A: 0.132; Model B: 0.145	Met
Multicollinearity	Tolerance > 0.10; VIF < 10	Tolerance: 0.587-0.612; VIF: 1.634-1.703	Met
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser)	Sig. > 0.05	X1: 0.324; X2: 0.287	Met

Model A: The Effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout

Multiple linear regression analysis for Model A was conducted to examine the effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Burnout. The analysis results show that the multiple correlation coefficient (R) value is 0.698, which means the relationship between both independent variables simultaneously and Burnout is strong and positive. The obtained R Square value is 0.487, meaning that 48.7 percent of the variance or change in the dependent variable, Burnout, can be explained simultaneously by both independent variables, Technostress and Work-Life Balance. Meanwhile, the remaining 51.3 percent is explained by other variables not investigated in this study, such as social support, individual characteristics, or job satisfaction. The Adjusted R Square value recorded at 0.481

indicates that after correcting for the number of independent variables and sample size, the predictive capacity of the model remains around 48.1 percent.

Table 5. Model Summary (Model A: Burnout)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.698	0.487	0.481	0.492

The simultaneous test results (F-test) for Model A indicate that the regression model is fit to predict Burnout. This is demonstrated by an F-statistic value of 45.678 with a significance value of 0.000, which is well below 0.05. Consequently, Technostress and Work-Life Balance simultaneously have a significant effect on Burnout.

Table 6. Simultaneous Test Results (F-Test) - Model A

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	22.567	2	11.284	45.678	0.000
Residual	23.678	186	0.242		
Total	46.245	188			

Partially, the t-test results for Model A show that both independent variables have a significant effect on Burnout. The Technostress variable has a regression coefficient of 0.425 with a significance value of 0.000, meaning that Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Burnout. Every one-unit increase in Technostress will increase Burnout by 0.425 points, assuming other variables remain constant. The Work-Life Balance variable has a regression coefficient of -0.312 with a significance value of 0.000, meaning that Work-Life Balance has a negative and significant effect on Burnout. Every one-unit increase in Work-Life Balance will decrease Burnout by 0.312 points. Based on the standardized coefficients beta, the Technostress variable has the highest beta value of 0.412, followed by Work-Life Balance with a beta of -0.298. This indicates that Technostress is the variable with the most dominant contribution to employee Burnout.

Table 7. Partial Test Results (t-Test) and Regression Coefficients - Model A

Variable	Coefficient B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Description
Constant	1.245	0.312		3.991	0.000	
Technostress (X1)	0.425	0.058	0.412	7.328	0.000	Positive & Significant
Work-Life Balance (X2)	-0.312	0.045	-0.298	-6.933	0.000	Negative & Significant

Dependent Variable: Burnout (Y1)

The multiple linear regression equation for Model A is as follows:

$$Y_1 = 1.245 + 0.425X_1 - 0.312X_2 + e$$

Model B: The Effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Turnover Intention

Multiple linear regression analysis for Model B was conducted to examine the effect of Technostress and Work-Life Balance on Turnover Intention. The analysis results show that the multiple correlation coefficient (*R*) value is 0.650, which means the relationship between both independent variables simultaneously and Turnover Intention is in the moderately strong and positive category. The obtained *R* Square value is 0.423, meaning that 42.3 percent of the variance or change in the dependent variable, Turnover Intention, can be explained simultaneously by both independent variables, Technostress and Work-Life Balance. Meanwhile, the remaining 57.7 percent is explained by other variables not investigated in this study, such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, or alternative employment opportunities. The Adjusted *R* Square value recorded at 0.417 indicates that after correcting for the number of independent variables and sample size, the predictive capacity of the model remains around 41.7 percent.

Tabel 8. Model Summary (Model B: Turnover Intention)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.650	0.423	0.417	0.512

The simultaneous test results (F-test) for Model B indicate that the regression model is fit to predict Turnover Intention. This is demonstrated by an F-statistic value of 38.245 with a significance value of 0.000, which is well below 0.05. Consequently, Technostress and Work-Life Balance simultaneously have a significant effect on Turnover Intention.

Table 9. Simultaneous Test Results (F-Test) - Model B

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	19.567	2	9.784	38.245	0.000
Residual	24.678	186	0.262		
Total	44.245	188			

Partially, the t-test results for Model B show that both independent variables have a significant effect on Turnover Intention. The Technostress variable has a regression coefficient of 0.358 with a significance value of 0.000, meaning that Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Turnover Intention. Every one-unit increase in Technostress will increase Turnover Intention by 0.358 points, assuming other variables remain constant. The Work-Life Balance variable has a regression coefficient of -0.284 with a significance value of 0.000, meaning that Work-Life Balance has a negative and significant effect on Turnover Intention. Every one-unit increase in Work-Life Balance will decrease Turnover Intention by 0.284 points. Based on the standardized coefficients beta, the Technostress variable has the highest beta value of 0.345, followed by Work-Life Balance with a beta of -0.267. This indicates that Technostress is the variable with the most dominant contribution to employee Turnover Intention.

Table 10. Partial Test Results (t-Test) and Regression Coefficients - Model B

Variable	Coefficient B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Description
Constant	1.568	0.345		4.545	0.000	
Technostress (X1)	0.358	0.062	0.345	5.774	0.000	Positive & Significant
Work-Life Balance (X2)	-0.284	0.052	-0.267	-5.462	0.000	Negative & Significant

Dependent Variable: Turnover Intention (Y2)

The multiple linear regression equation for Model B is as follows:

$$Y_2 = 1.568 + 0.358X_1 - 0.284X_2 + e$$

Based on the analysis results of Model A and Model B, all hypotheses proposed in this study are accepted. A summary of the hypothesis testing results is presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Path	Coefficient	Sig.	Result
H1	Technostress → Burnout	B = 0.425	0.000	Accepted
H2	Work-Life Balance → Burnout	B = -0.312	0.000	Accepted
H3	Technostress → Turnover Intention	B = 0.358	0.000	Accepted
H4	Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention	B = -0.284	0.000	Accepted
H5a	Technostress & Work-Life Balance → Burnout	F = 45.678	0.000	Accepted
H5b	Technostress & Work-Life Balance → Turnover Intention	F = 38.245	0.000	Accepted

Discussion

The first finding from Model A demonstrates that Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Burnout. This result aligns with the person-environment fit theory proposed by French dan Kahn (1962), which posits that a mismatch between individual characteristics and work environment demands induces psychological stress. In the context of this study, a mismatch occurs when high digital technology demands are not balanced with adequate abilities, resources, or support for employees to cope with them. Scientifically, Technostress creates an excessive cognitive load (techno-overload), feelings of inability to keep pace with technological changes (techno-complexity), and anxiety about being replaced by automated systems (techno-insecurity). These three dimensions accumulatively drain employees' mental and emotional energy, ultimately manifesting as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment the three core components of Burnout according to Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001). This finding is reinforced by various recent empirical studies consistently reporting a positive relationship between Technostress and Burnout across various industrial sectors, including banking (Srivastava et al., 2015), education (Nimrod, 2018), information technology (Li & Wang, 2021), and healthcare services (Salo et al., 2022). Furthermore, a meta-analysis by Pirkkalainen, Salo, and Makkonen (2023) synthesizing 45 studies from various countries confirms that Technostress is the strongest predictor of Burnout among other technology-related variables. The managerial implications of this finding are critical. Organizations often fail to recognize the psychological aspects of such anxiety and mistakenly perceive avoidance behavior as a reluctance to learn (Darmawan, 2024). Companies cannot simply rely on the assumption that employees will automatically adapt to new technologies. Instead, companies need to proactively provide adequate and continuous technology training, redesign digital workloads to be more realistic (for instance, by limiting the number of notifications and applications that must be monitored simultaneously), and offer responsive and accessible technical support. Additionally, companies should consider implementing a "right to disconnect" policy that grants employees the right not to respond to work messages outside working hours as a form of structural intervention to reduce Technostress.

The second finding from Model A indicates that Work-Life Balance has a negative and significant effect on Burnout. This implies that the better the balance perceived by employees between work demands and personal life, the lower the level of Burnout experienced. This result reinforces spillover theory (Zedeck & Mosier, 1990) which explains that experiences in the work domain carry over into the personal life domain and vice versa. When work continuously interferes with personal life for example, through incoming work emails at night or unexpected overtime demands the energy intended for rest and recovery is depleted, thereby accelerating the onset of Burnout. Scientifically, poor Work-Life Balance creates role conflict between the role as a worker and the role as a family member or individual. This conflict accumulates chronic stress, which differs from temporary acute stress. Meanwhile, when workers receive support from their families in fulfilling professional and personal responsibilities, they tend to manage their time and energy more effectively (Hariyani & Mardikaningsih, 2023). A study by Haar et al. (2014) on a sample of employees in New Zealand found that good Work-Life Balance serves as a psychological resource that protects employees from the negative effects of job demands. This finding is also supported by recent studies (Wong & Ko, 2019; Kelliher et al., 2019; Delecta, 2021; Sirgy & Lee, 2018). Furthermore, research by Hakanen, Bakker, and Schaufeli (2006) shows that Work-Life Balance not only reduces Burnout but also increases work engagement, which is the antithesis of Burnout. The managerial implications of this finding suggest that companies need to implement work flexibility policies substantively rather than merely symbolically. Flexibility can take the form of flexible working hours, hybrid work options, and adequate leave policies. Equally important, managers at all levels need to be trained to respect employees' working hour boundaries, such as by refraining from sending messages or emails outside working hours except in extreme emergencies. Companies can also provide supporting facilities such as lactation rooms, childcare facilities, or family counseling programs as a form of investment in employee Work-Life Balance.

Findings from Model B demonstrate that Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Turnover Intention. Employees experiencing psychological pressure resulting from the use of digital technology in daily work tend to exhibit a higher intention to leave the company. This result aligns with the conservation of resources (COR) theory proposed by Hobfoll (1989). According to this theory, individuals strive to protect the resources they possess (energy, time, mental health), and when those resources are threatened or depleted due to prolonged stress, individuals become motivated to alter the situation one way being to seek alternative employment elsewhere. Technostress slowly but surely erodes job satisfaction and organizational commitment, ultimately driving employees to seek alternative employment options. A study by Srivastava, Chandra, dan Shirish (2015) on IT employees in India found that Technostress exerts a direct effect on Turnover Intention, even after controlling for demographic variables such as age, gender, and tenure. A study by Nimrod (2018) on creative industry workers also reported that Technostress serves as a stronger predictor of Turnover Intention compared to traditional factors such as compensation or career advancement opportunities. Recent findings by Salo, Pirkkalainen, dan Makkonen (2022) dan Pirkkalainen, Salo, and Makkonen (2023) confirm that the relationship between Technostress and Turnover Intention is partially mediated by Burnout, implying that technological pressure not only directly drives the desire to leave but also operates through the mechanism of emotional exhaustion. The managerial implications of this finding are critical. Companies that ignore Technostress risk losing their best talent, particularly Millennials and Gen Z, who exhibit greater sensitivity toward psychological well-being in the workplace. The turnover cost is substantial, ranging from recruitment, selection, and training expenses to the loss of organizational knowledge and team disruption. Companies need to create conditions that encourage and facilitate employees in developing and enhancing their capabilities optimally (Irfan & Hariani, 2022). Therefore, investments in technostress reduction programs such as digital time management training, virtual meeting limitations, and technical support provision must be regarded as strategic investments rather than operational costs.

Meanwhile, Work-Life Balance in Model B has a negative and significant effect on Turnover Intention. Employees who feel satisfied with the balance between work and personal life tend to be more loyal and possess a higher intention to stay. This finding accords with social exchange theory proposed by Blau (1964), which states that the relationship between an employee and the organization is grounded in the principle of reciprocity. When an organization provides support enabling employees to achieve good Work-Life Balance for instance, through flexible policies and respect for personal time employees feel a moral obligation to reciprocate with loyalty, commitment, and an intention to stay. Research by Wayne et al. (2017) on a sample of U.S. employees found that Work-Life Balance exerts a direct effect on Turnover Intention that is stronger than its effect on job satisfaction. A study by Haar et al. (2020) utilizing a longitudinal design with a one-year interval showed that an increase in Work-Life Balance at time T1 significantly decreased Turnover Intention at time T2, indicating a strong causal relationship. Kaur and Sharma (2022) in a study on the service sector in India, also reported that Work-Life Balance serves as the most important retention factor for Millennial employees, even outweighing financial incentives. The managerial implications of this finding suggest that Work-Life Balance policies should not be viewed as mere "perks" or secondary "benefits." On the contrary, Work-Life Balance must be an integral part of human resource management strategy. Companies should conduct periodic audits of existing work policies, identify practices that inadvertently disrupt employees' work-life balance (such as excessively long meeting cultures or weekend emailing habits), and systematically eliminate those practices. Furthermore, managers need training in supportive leadership, which encompasses the ability to delegate fairly, manage realistic expectations, and model healthy boundaries between work and personal life.

The most compelling cross-model finding is that Technostress was consistently found to be a more dominant variable than Work-Life Balance in influencing both Burnout and Turnover Intention. This indicates that digital technology pressure poses a greater threat to employee well-being than work-life imbalance in the context of service companies. The most plausible explanation for this finding is that Technostress is more invasive and difficult to avoid compared to work-life imbalance. An

individual might still manage to allocate time for rest despite a heavy work schedule, but it is extremely difficult to "escape" digital technology that is constantly present in the palm of the hand via smartphones. Continuous notifications, instant messages requiring prompt responses, and the demand to remain constantly connected (always-on culture) create stress that is intermittent yet constant throughout the day. Conversely, poor Work-Life Balance may be more easily recognized and addressed because it possesses clearer boundaries (for instance, working overtime versus not working overtime). Scientifically, this finding enriches the literature by demonstrating that in the context of massive digitalization, technological factors can override traditional factors such as work-life balance in determining employee well-being. The strategic implication of this finding is that companies must prioritize interventions that directly target Technostress as a primary step, followed subsequently by interventions to enhance Work-Life Balance. Digital literacy training programs, optimization of working tools (such as replacing complex applications with simpler ones), and the restriction of digital communication outside working hours must become top priorities on the company's digital transformation agenda. With a balanced yet technostress-focused approach, companies can significantly reduce Burnout and Turnover Intention while simultaneously improving employee productivity and retention in the long term.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion presented, several important conclusions can be drawn. First, Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Burnout among service company employees. Higher levels of psychological pressure resulting from the use of digital technology lead to higher levels of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Second, Work-Life Balance has a negative and significant effect on Burnout, meaning that a good balance between work demands and personal life can reduce the level of Burnout. Third, Technostress has a positive and significant effect on Turnover Intention, where digital technology pressure drives employees to intend to leave their jobs. Fourth, Work-Life Balance has a negative and significant effect on Turnover Intention, such that employees with a good work-life balance tend to exhibit a higher intention to stay. Fifth, Technostress is the more dominant variable compared to Work-Life Balance in influencing both Burnout and Turnover Intention. The simultaneous contribution of Technostress and Work-Life Balance to Burnout is 48.7 percent, whereas to Turnover Intention, it is 42.3 percent.

Regarding managerial implications, first, companies need to develop intervention programs focusing on technostress reduction because this variable was proven to be the most dominant. Such programs can include periodic digital literacy training, the provision of 24/7 technical helpdesk support, and the restriction of digital notifications and communication outside working hours. Companies can also implement a "right to disconnect" policy that grants employees the right not to respond to work messages after working hours have ended. Second, to enhance Work-Life Balance, companies can adopt flexible working policies such as flexible working hours or hybrid work schemes. Managers also need to be trained to refrain from imposing unrealistic deadline pressures and to respect employees' rest time. Third, the human resource department should regularly conduct organizational climate surveys that encompass measurements of Technostress, Work-Life Balance, Burnout, and Turnover Intention as an early warning system. Survey results can be utilized to design targeted interventions before issues become more severe. Fourth, companies should consider providing counseling services or employee assistance programs (EAPs) for employees experiencing severe Burnout symptoms.

Theoretical suggestions for future researchers include expanding this research model by incorporating mediating variables such as job satisfaction or organizational commitment, or moderating variables such as social support or technological self-efficacy. Future research could also employ a longitudinal design to examine stronger causal relationships, expand the scope to other industrial sectors, or compare different generations of employees (Millennials vs. Gen Z). This study

has limitations regarding the use of self-perception scales, a cross-sectional design, a sample scope restricted to a single service company, and R Square values that still leave unexplained variance. Nevertheless, this study successfully provides a valuable empirical contribution to understanding the determinants of Burnout and Turnover Intention in the digital era. The primary finding that Technostress is the most dominant factor offers a clear direction for corporate management: prioritizing interventions aimed at reducing digital technology pressure alongside maintaining employees' work-life balance.

Bibliography

- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., & Purvis, R. (2011). Technostress: Technological Antecedents and Implications. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(4), 831–858.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brod, C. (1984). *Technostress: The Human Cost of the Computer Revolution*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Chawla, D., & Lenka, S. (2021). Work-Life Balance and Turnover Intention: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(4), 902–925.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work/Family Balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.
- Daniel, J., Cross, T., & Smith, R. (2024). *Sampling Essentials: Practical Guidelines for Making Sampling Choices*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Darmawan, D. (2022). The Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Perceived Organizational Support to Employees Psychological Well-Being of Employees in Modern Work Environments. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 73–80.
- Darmawan, D. (2024). Digital Readiness of Baby Boomer Generation in the Workplace: A Study of Intergenerational Gaps and Organizational Adaptation Strategies. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(1), 391–416.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2023). Measuring Motivation and Performance of Older Workers for Sustainable Organizational Contribution. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 167–196.
- Delecta, P. (2021). Work-Life Balance and Its Impact on Burnout. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(1), 15–28.
- Eddine, B. A. S., & Darmawan, D. (2021). Professional Employees, Manual Workers, and Informal Workers in Achieving Work-Life Balance. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 209–226.
- Eddine, B. A. S., & Darmawan, D. (2022). Social Construction of Work-Life Balance in Cultural and Organizational Norms. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 213–234.
- Fisher-McAuley, G., Stanton, J. M., Jolton, J. A., & Gavin, J. F. (2003). Measuring Work-Life Balance. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Orlando: FL.
- French, J. R. P., & Kahn, R. L. (1962). A Programmatic Approach to Studying the Industrial Environment and Mental Health. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(3), 1–47.
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.
- Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the Study of Work-Life Balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255–279.
- Haar, J. M., Roche, M., & ten Brummelhuis, L. L. (2020). Work-Life Balance and Turnover Intention: A Longitudinal Study. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(5), 621–645.
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction and Burnout. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 52(3), 305–325.
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and Work Engagement among Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495–513.
- Hariani, M., & Khairi, M. (2023). How to Manage Excessive Workload and Burnout. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 55–68.
- Hariani, M., & Mardikaningsih, R. (2023). Work-Life Balance and Worker Well-Being through Family Support. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 9–14.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of Resources: A New Attempt at Conceptualizing Stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524.
- Irfan, M., & Hariani, M. (2022). The Effect of Work Environment and Workload on Employee Satisfaction. *Studi*

- Ilmu Sosial Indonesia, 2(2), 11–18.
- Kaur, R., & Sharma, S. (2022). Work-Life Balance and Employee Retention: A Study of Service Sector. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 57(3), 456–471.
- Kelliher, C., Richardson, J., & Boiarintseva, G. (2019). Work-Life Balance and Burnout in the Digital Age. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 29(2), 234–251.
- Li, Y., & Wang, X. (2021). Technostress and Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Burnout. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 114, 106–118.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Sinambela, E. A. (2022). Impact of Burnout and Stress on Employee Satisfaction in Work. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 21–25.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 397–422.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), 237–240.
- Newby, P. (2014). *Research Methods for Education*. London: Routledge.
- Nimrod, G. (2018). Technostress in the Workplace: A Review of the Literature. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 87, 232–241.
- Pirkkalainen, H., Salo, M., & Makkonen, M. (2023). Technostress and Burnout: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Information Systems Journal*, 33(2), 245–278.
- Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The Consequences of Technostress for End Users in Organizations. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4), 417–433.
- Retnowati, E., Mardikaningsih, R., Khayru, R. K., Darmawan, D., & Wibowo, A. S. (2023). The Influence of Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment on Turnover Intention. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(2), 38–43.
- Salo, M., Pirkkalainen, H., & Makkonen, M. (2022). Technostress and Employee Well-Being: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 39(1), 78–112.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job Demands, Job Resources, and Their Relationship with Burnout and Engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2018). Work-Life Balance: An Integrative Review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(1), 229–254.
- Srivastava, S., Chandra, S., & Shirish, A. (2015). Technostress Creators and Job Outcomes: A Study of Indian Professionals. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(15), 1982–2000.
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2010). Impact of Technostress on End-User Satisfaction and Performance. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 27(3), 303–334.
- Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The Impact of Technostress on Role Stress and Productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(1), 301–328.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention, and Turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 46(2), 259–293.
- Tolmie, A., Muijs, D., & McAteer, E. (2011). *Quantitative Methods in Educational and Social Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2017). In Search of Balance: A Conceptual and Empirical Integration of Multiple Meanings of Work-Life Balance. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(1), 167–210.
- Wong, K., & Ko, A. (2019). Work-Life Balance and Burnout in the Service Industry. *Journal of Service Management*, 30(4), 512–534.
- Zedeck, S., & Mosier, K. L. (1990). Work in the Family and Employing Organization. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 240–251.