

The Effects of Behaviour-Based and Cognition-Based Interventions on Work-Life Balance Outcomes among Workforce in Indonesia

Shimaditya Nuraeni ^{1*}, Utomo Sarjono Putro ², Henndy Ginting ³, Jonathan Jusuf ⁴

^{1,2,3,4} School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Work-life balance has become increasingly important within the changing employment environment. However, evidence on how employees actively regulate the boundary between their professional and personal roles continues to be shaped largely by studies from Global North and office-based settings. This study investigates the influence of behaviour-based and cognition-based personal interventions on the three dimensions of work-life balance outcomes: work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related. Adopting a quantitative, cross-sectional, and explanatory approach, data were gathered through a self-administered online survey from 427 employees representing various industries across Indonesia. Multiple linear regression models were then estimated, corresponding to each outcome dimension. The results showed that all models were statistically significant and that both intervention types were statistically significant to predict the three outcome domains. Behaviour-based interventions produce the strongest effect, particularly for work-related outcomes ($\beta = 0.635$) and stress-related outcomes ($\beta = 0.625$). Cognition-based intervention also contributes significantly, with their largest effect found for nonwork-related outcomes ($\beta = 0.340$). The work-related outcomes model has the strongest explanatory power with an adjusted R^2 of 0.809. Overall, the findings indicate that behavioural and cognitive interventions operate as complementary mechanisms and broaden the relevance of previous studies' findings of personal-intervention framework in the wider multisector workforce in Indonesia.

KEYWORDS: work-life balance, behaviour-based intervention, cognition-based intervention, employee well-being, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

The modern world of work is characterized by rising work pressure, longer working hours, and the emergence of “hustle culture” that emphasizes constant high productivity (Wong et al., 2019). At the same time, digital transformation and the rapid adoption of artificial-intelligence-based technology have accelerated in how, where, and when work is performed. It drives an expanding workplace flexibility and remote work while simultaneously introducing new source of job insecurity through automation and organizational restructuring (Epizitone & Moyanne, 2026; Fu & Zhang, 2026). These shifts raise the psychological demand placed on the employees and the task for maintaining a sustainable boundary between work and personal life (Chan et al., 2023). Global evidence indicates that these pressures are eroding employee well-being. Almost half of the employees worldwide experience a great deal of stress (Gallup, 2023), marking a record high and reflecting the growing psychological burden associated with modern work conditions (Gallup, 2024). As these demands accumulate over time, everyday stress can escalate into emotional exhaustion and burnout (Hobfoll, 1989; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

In parallel, flexible working arrangement (FWA) –such as remote work, hybrid work, work from home/ anywhere, and formal flexible working policies– have expanded rapidly (Chan et al., 2023). Particularly after COVID-19 (Chan et al., 2023) and partly influenced by the preferences of the younger generation (Deloitte, 2024). The Deloitte’s Gen Z and Millennial Survey (Deloitte, 2024), which covered more than 22,000 respondents across 44 countries, shows that work-life balance is the most important factor in selecting an employer, often outweighing salary considerations. It indicates that flexibility in when and where work is done is a growing priority. Flexibility itself is not uniformly beneficial (Kossek et al., 2023). By dissolving temporal and spatial boundaries, it increases the overlap between work and nonwork domain and potentially intensify the psychological strain (Clark, 2000).

In Indonesia, FWAs have moved beyond the private sector into public administration. Through Presidential Regulation No. 21 of 2023 on the working days and hours of government agencies and civil servants (ASN), introduced flexibility of work locations and/or time as a formal basis for FWA implementations. This signals a national-level transformation of work patterns. However, the FWA does not necessarily translate into improved well-being (Asropi et al., 2022). In some cases, it may weaken work-life



boundaries. Therefore, identifying factors that enable employees to manage competing work and life demands has become an urgent practical concern.

Sirgy & Lee's (2018) integrative review offers a relevant theoretical foundation for understanding work-life balance (WLB). Their framework defines WLB through individual's engagement in both work and nonwork domains, as well as the minimization of conflict between these roles. It also identifies the consequences of WLB across work-related, nonwork-related, and stress related outcomes. From this perspective, individuals are not merely shaped by organizational conditions, but they actively use personal interventions to regulate the interface between work and nonwork domain. Moreover, the study also classifies these strategies into two interrelated categories. First, the behaviour-based interventions which refer to observable actions, such as managing time, distributing resources, establishing priorities, and organizing roles, which align with the role theory (Kahn et al., 1964) and time-management approaches. Second, the cognition-based interventions, in contrast, refer to mental strategies, such as separating or integrating roles using value-based compensation, adopting a whole-life perspective, and reinterpreting demands which are consistent with the transactional model of stress and cognitive appraisal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In this study, WLB is not positioned as the main variable of interest, but as the broader contextual foundation through which these personal interventions influence employee outcomes.

Although WLB has been widely studied, there are three gaps that motivate this study. First, much of the existing evidence and validated conceptual frameworks are largely derived from Global North context (Thilagavathy & Geetha, 2023), whereas Global South setting are in the early stage of growing, not to mention underexplored. This is important because the effectiveness of boundary-management strategies may vary depending on cultural norms (Ollier-Malaterre & Foucreault, 2017), institutional arrangements (Björk-Fant, Bolander, & Forsman, 2023), industrial conditions, and leadership practices (Kossek et al., 2023). Second, studies that address personal strategies often treat WLB as the primary outcome, rather than examining how behaviour-based and cognition-based interventions jointly influence a wider range of work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related outcomes. Third, most closely related study in Indonesia, develop and tested by Puspitarini & Nuraeni (2024), focused only on university lecturers. Since academic work in Indonesia shaped by Tri dharma responsibilities, it may differ substantially from the demands in other sector, thus the applicability of its findings to broader industrial context remains limited.

Therefore, this research aims to investigate how behaviour-based and cognition-based personal interventions affect work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related outcomes among Indonesian employees. In doing so, it evaluates the extent to which the personal-intervention model can be generalized across sectors and cultural context within a Global South. Particularly, this study has two research questions: (1) How do behaviour-based interventions affect employees' work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related outcomes? And (2) How do cognition-based interventions affect those same outcomes? By expanding the empirical focus beyond a single occupational group, this study seeks to generate more broadly applicable evidence on the role of personal strategies in managing the demands of contemporary work, while also offering practical implications for human resource development in emerging economy.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional, and explanatory survey design grounded in a positivist paradigm. Two independent variables, Behaviour-Based Intervention (X1) and Cognition-Based Intervention (X2), were tested for their effects on the three dependent variables: Work-Related outcomes (Y1), Nonwork-Related outcomes (Y2), and Stress-Related outcomes (Y3).

Population and Sample

The target population comprises working adults employed across multiple industry sectors in Indonesia (e.g. manufacturing, services, finance, technology, public administrations, healthcare, and education). Respondents are eligible if they are currently employed, aged 18 years or older, and have a minimum tenure of 6 months in their current role. Following Hair et al. (2024) to ensure generalizability and stable estimate, 15 to 20 observations for every variable should be collected. Based on the framework of the study, at least the sample size should be 100. From 482 responses collected, 30 samples were removed due to the duplicate response, and 25 extreme outliers (based on the Z-score and Mahalanobis distance) were removed following assumption testing, resulting in a final analytic sample of 427 respondents.

Data Collection and Measurement

Data were collected through a self-administered online questionnaire distributed digitally. Using convenience sampling, the questionnaire was distributed using online survey platform, school networks, and collaboration with Indonesian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

All constructs in the questionnaire were measured using a 10-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 10 (Strongly Agree), adapted from established instruments in the work-family boundary literature (e.g. Kossek & Lautsch, 2012; Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). Behaviour-Based Interventions (X1) were measured with 11 items and Cognition-based Interventions (X2) were measured with 9 items. For the dependent variables, Work-Related outcomes (Y1), Nonwork-Related outcomes (Y2), and Stress-Related outcomes (Y3) were each measured with 4 items. But after the pilot test, the dependent variables of Nonwork-Related outcomes (Y2) and Stress-Related outcomes (Y3) were measured with 2 items. The questionnaire also captured sociodemographic and employment information, including age, gender, income, marital status, and type of work arrangement.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed using JASP (version 0.19.10). Descriptive statistics summarised respondent demographics. Instrument validity was assessed using Spearman's rank bivariate item-total correlation (critical $r = 0.0813$, $df = 580$, $\alpha = 0.05$) and reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha with a threshold of >0.70 for high reliability (Hair et al., 2024). Classical assumptions test – Kolmogorov -Smirnov normality testing, multicollinearity testing (Tolerance > 0.10 , VIF <10), and Glejser heteroscedasticity testing– were conducted prior to hypothesis testing. Three separate multiple linear regression models were then estimated, one for each outcome variable (Y1, Y2, Y3), each regressed on X1 and X2. Hypotheses were tested using partial t-test and simultaneous F-test at $\alpha = 0.05$, with the coefficient of determination (R^2) used to assess model explanatory power. The general regression model for all the three hypotheses formulated as follows:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + e \quad (\text{Equation})$$

where:

Y = dependent variable

α = intercept (constant)

β_1, β_2 = unstandardized regression coefficient

e = error term (residual)

RESULTS

Instrument Quality

Before conducting hypothesis testing, the quality of the questionnaire was examined using two complementary procedure, internal-consistency reliability testing and item validity testing. Reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha, all variables exceeded the threshold of 0.7. No items removed from the questionnaire due to the lower result of Cronbach's α if certain items dropped. These results confirm that the research instrument had a high level of internal consistency (Table 1). While the item validity was evaluated through Spearman's bivariate item-total correlation, where the score of each item was correlated with the total score of its respective construct. An item was considered valid when its *calculated p-value* was greater than the *critical p-value* at the 5% significance level using two-tailed test. Based on the final sample of $n = 427$ respondents, all the items are valid and significant (Table 2).

Table 1. Result of the Instrument Reliability Test

Variable	Point estimate	95% CI lower bound	95% CI upper bound
Behavior-Based (X1)	0.936	0.926	0.944
Cognition-Based (X2)	0.885	0.868	0.901
Work-related Outcomes (Y1)	0.872	0.849	0.891

Variable	Point estimate	95% CI lower bound	95% CI upper bound
Nonwork-related Outcomes (Y2)	0.700	0.638	0.752
Stress-related Outcomes (Y3)	0.799	0.758	0.834

Table 2. Results of the Instrument Validity Test (n = 427, $p = 0.095$)

Variable	Item	ρ -count	Result
Behavior-Based (X1)	X1.1	0.795	Valid
	X1.2	0.801	Valid
	X1.3	0.822	Valid
	X1.4	0.806	Valid
	X1.5	0.845	Valid
	X1.6	0.756	Valid
	X1.7	0.778	Valid
	X1.8	0.799	Valid
	X1.9	0.785	Valid
	X1.10	0.783	Valid
	X1.11	0.815	Valid
Cognition-Based (X2)	X2.1	0.846	Valid
	X2.2	0.852	Valid
	X2.3	0.838	Valid
	X2.4	0.775	Valid
	X2.5	0.822	Valid
	X2.6	0.711	Valid
	X2.7	0.712	Valid
	X2.8	0.715	Valid
	X2.9	0.807	Valid
Nonwork-related Outcome (Y2)	Y2.1	0.903	Valid
	Y2.2	0.888	Valid
Work-related Outcome (Y1)	Y1.1	0.884	Valid
	Y1.2	0.897	Valid
	Y1.3	0.890	Valid
	Y1.4	0.840	Valid
Stress-related Outcome (Y3)	Y3.1	0.931	Valid
	Y3.2	0.908	Valid

Respondent Profile

Of the 427 respondents, the majority were relatively young (28% under 25 years; 27.3% aged between 26–30 years) and were fairly balance by gender (53.5% female, 46.5% male). Most respondents were permanent employees (66.1%) working in the private sector (63.8%), with entry-level staff comprising 40.6% of the sample. Onsite work remains dominant arrangement (62.7%), followed by formal Flexible Working Arrangements (25.1%) and hybrid/ remote work (12.2%). A summary of key respondent characteristics is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Respondents Characteristics (n = 427)

Characteristics	Category	N	%
Age	< 25 years	120	28%
	26 – 30 years	115	27%
	31 – 35 years	64	15%
Employment Status	Permanent	282	66%
	Contract	55	13%
	Entrepreneur/ Business Owner	47	11%

Characteristics	Category	N	%
	36 – 45 years	85	20%
	> 45 years	43	10%
Gender	Male	201	47%
	Female	227	53%
Industry Sector	Energy, Mining & Manufacturing	38	8.9%
	Finance & Banking	41	9.6%
	IT and Telecommunication	39	9%
	Education & Training	31	7.3%
	Health & Pharmacy	32	7.5%
	Trade and Retail	60	14%
	Transportation & Logistics	39	9%
	Government/ Public Sector	34	8%
	Professionals / Experts	32	7.5%
	Tourisms	26	6.1%
	Agroindustry	27	6.3%
	NGO / Social	29	6.8%
Marital Status	Single	209	49%
	Married	218	51%
Length of Work	< 1 year	60	14%
	1 – 3 years	162	38%
	4 – 6 years	107	25%
	> 7 years	98	23%

Characteristics	Category	N	%
Work Arrangements	Freelancer/ Part-Time	43	10%
	Flexible Working Arrangement	107	25%
	Full Onsite	269	63%
Province	Hybrid/ Fully Remote	51	12%
	Bali	4	1%
	Banten	34	8%
	DI Yogyakarta	17	4%
	DK Jakarta	81	19%
	West Java	85	20%
	Central Java	51	12%
	East Java	55	13%
	South Kalimantan	4	1%
	Centre Kalimantan	4	1%
	East Kalimantan	4	1%
	Riau Islands	8	2%
	Lampung	4	1%
	NAD	21	5%
	Riau	13	3%
	South Sulawesi	8	2%
	West Sumatera	4	1%
	South Sumatera	8	2%
	North Sumatera	17	4%

Classical Assumptions

Prior to hypotheses testing, all models were examined to determine whether the assumptions underlying ordinary least squares regression were adequately met. These assessments covered residual normality, homoscedasticity, independence of errors, and multicollinearity between Behaviour-Based Interventions and Cognition-Based Interventions.

For Model 1, residual normality was evaluated using the Shapiro-Wilk test and graphical inspection of the histogram and Q-Q plot. Although the Shapiro-Wilk result indicated a statistically significant deviation from normality ($W = 0.975, p < .001$), the residual showed slight negative skewness (-0.360) and a slight negative kurtosis (-0.366) with mean close to zero. The histogram

remained broadly bell-shaped and Q-Q plot followed the reference line and considered sufficiently close to normal for practical interpretation of the regression model. The Durbin Watson statistic was close to 2 ($d = 2.197$) and the autocorrelation coefficient was small ($r = -0.100$), suggesting only weak negative autocorrelation despite the marginally significant result ($p = .042$). Multicollinearity was not a problem, as both predictors had acceptable tolerance and VIF values (Tolerance = 0.463; VIF = 2.158). These figures were well within commonly accepted threshold of tolerance above 0.10 and VIF below 5 or 10.

For Model 2, residual histogram was broadly bell-shaped, although it displayed slight negative skewness, while the Q-Q plot showed that most observations followed the reference line with some data at the lower and upper tails. The residual-versus-predicted plot did not reveal a pronounced curved or funnel-shaped pattern, indicating that the assumptions of linearity and homoscedasticity were reasonably satisfied. The Durbin-Watson statistic was close to 2 ($d = 1.872$), and autocorrelation coefficient was small ($r = 0.060$) and non-significant ($p = .182$), supporting the independence of residuals. Multicollinearity was also not a concern, as both predictors produced acceptable tolerance VIF values (Tolerance = 0.463; VIF = 2.158), which were within the commonly accepted thresholds of tolerance above 0.10 and VIF below 5 or 10.

In Model 3, the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated a statistically significant deviation from normality ($W = 0.967$, $p < .001$). Nevertheless, the residuals were centred near zero ($M \approx 0$, $SD = 1.654$) and displayed moderate negative skewness ($-.628$) with only mild positive kurtosis (.434). The histogram remained broadly bell-shaped, and most observations in the Q-Q plot followed the reference line, although some deviations were evident in the tails. Despite those, the residual distribution was regarded as sufficiently close to normal for practical regression interpretation due to the large number of samples. The linearity and homoscedasticity were reasonably satisfied. Residual independence was supported by a Durbin-Watson statistics close to 2 ($d = 1.959$), a negligible autocorrelation coefficient ($r = 0.020$) and non-significant result ($p = .671$). Multicollinearity was likewise not problematic, as both predictors had acceptable tolerance and VIF values (Tolerance = .463; VIF = 2.158).

Regression Results

The regression analysis examined the effects of behaviour-based and cognition-based interventions could predict three dimensions of work-life outcomes among Indonesian workforces. Three ordinary least squares regression models were established to estimate work-related outcomes, nonwork-related outcomes, and stress-related outcome. The detail result of the model presented in the Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of Multiple Linear Regression Results

Variables	Coeff (β)	SE	t	p-value	Description
<i>Model 1: Y1 – Work-Related Outcomes</i>					
Constant	0.430	0.800	0.537	0.591	Not significant
Behaviour-based (X1)	0.635	0.012	20.430	< 0.001	Significant
Cognition-based (X2)	0.324	0.012	10.390	< 0.001	Significant
F = 900.579 ($p < 0.001$); R = 0.900; $R^2 = 0.809$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.809$					
<i>Model 2: Y2 – Nonwork-Related Outcomes</i>					
Constant	2.650	0.599	4.424	< 0.001	Significant
Behaviour-based (X1)	0.482	0.009	10.547	< 0.001	Significant
Cognition-based (X2)	0.340	0.009	7.442	< 0.001	Significant
F = 303.770 ($p < 0.001$); R = 0.767; $R^2 = 0.589$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.587$					

Variables	Coeff (β)	SE	t	p-value	Description
<i>Model 3: Y3 – Stress-Related Outcomes</i>					
Constant	–0.611	0.624	–0.980	0.328	Not significant
Behaviour-based (X1)	0.625	0.010	14.623	< 0.001	Significant
Cognition-based (X2)	0.221	0.010	5.179	< 0.001	Significant
F = 379.293 ($p < 0.001$); R = 0.801; $R^2 = 0.641$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.640$					

All the regression models were statistically significant. Model 1 yielded the strongest explanatory power among three models. It explained 80.9% of the variance in Work-Related Outcomes with $F_{(2,424)} = 900.579, p < 0.001$. Behaviour-based interventions were the stronger positive predictor ($\beta = 0.635, t = 20.430, p < 0.001$), while cognition-based interventions also produced a significant positive contribution ($\beta = 0.324, t = 10.390, p < 0.001$). The non-significant constant does not affect the conclusion regarding the significance of the two predictors.

Model 2 explain 58.9% of the variance in nonwork-related outcomes with $F_{(2,424)} = 303.770, p < 0.001$. Similar with Model 1, the behaviour-based interventions emerged as the stronger predictor ($\beta = 0.482, t = 10.547, p < 0.001$), followed by cognition-based interventions ($\beta = 0.340, t = 7.442, p < 0.001$). These results indicate that both practical behaviour strategies and cognitive adjustment contributed meaningfully to employee's outcome outside the work domain.

Model 3 examined stress-related outcomes and yielded a statistically significant result $F_{(2,424)} = 379.293, p < 0.001$, with R = 0.801; $R^2 = 0.641$; and adjusted $R^2 = 0.640$. The behaviour-based interventions also showed a strong positive contribution ($\beta = 0.625, t = 14.623, p < 0.001$), whereas cognition-based interventions had a smaller but still significant effect ($\beta = 0.221, t = 5.179, p < 0.001$). Overall, behaviour-based interventions consistently emerged as the stronger predictor across all three models with particularly substantial effects on work-related and stress-related outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The three-dimension models demonstrate that behaviour-based and cognition-based interventions jointly contribute to work-life outcomes among Indonesian workforce, although their relative contributions differ across the three outcome domains. The overall pattern supports the personal-intervention framework developed by Lee & Sirgy (2018) which distinguishes concrete behavioural strategies from cognitive strategies used to manage relationship among life domains. The significance of both predictors indicates that these approaches should be understood as complementary rather than competing mechanism.

For work-related outcomes, concrete actions (e.g. scheduling, task prioritization, boundary communication, and management of conflicting role demands) may directly help employees maintain their functioning within the work domain. Kreiner et al (2009) similarly found that employees use behavioural, temporal, physical, and communicative boundary-work tactics to negotiate demands between work and home. Moreover Gravador & Teng-Calleja (2018) reported that proactive work-life balance crafting behaviors, particularly protecting personal time and working efficiently, were associated with work-life balance and subjective wellbeing. The study support the present findings that observable actions may provide a more immediate mechanism for managing work-related demands than cognitive adjustment alone.

Both intervention types also significantly predicted nonwork-related outcomes. The result is consistent with Barber & Jenkins (2014) study that said creating boundaries around work-related technology was relevant to psychological detachment and sleep. However, the difference between the behavioural and cognitive coefficients was smaller in this model than the work-related and stress-related models. This suggests that cognitive strategies may be particularly relevant to nonwork life because employees must not only leave the workplace physically but also redirect their attention away from unfinished work and occupational concerns. The significant contribution of cognition-based intervention also is consistent with research highlighting the importance of mindfulness, psychological detachment, and cognitive-emotional segmentation (Michaelides et al., 2024).

For stress-related outcomes, behaviour-based interventions similarly showed a strong relationship with stress-related outcomes, whereas the contribution of cognition-based interventions was smaller but remained statistically significant. The pattern



indicates that cognitive regulation alone may not be sufficient when employees remain continuously exposed to work demands. Observable actions such as ending work at certain time, reducing after-hours communication, taking recovery breaks, and separating work from recovery spaces that may be required to interrupt the accumulation of strain. This corresponds with the stressor-detachment model (Sonentag & Fritz, 2014).

Apart from the significant results for all three models, the use of self-reported data may also introduce common-method bias and social desirability effects. Future studies could employ another method or approach to overcome this limitation and examine how behavioural and cognitive interventions influence employee outcomes over time. The research could also compare occupational groups, organizational settings, and cultural contexts to determine whether the relative strength of these interventions varies across different working conditions.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how behaviour-based and cognition-based personal interventions influence work-related, nonwork-related, and stress-related outcomes among 427 employees across multiple industry sectors in Indonesia. All three regression models were statistically significant, and both intervention types emerged as significant positive predictors across every outcome domain, confirming that the two strategies operate as complementary rather than substitutable mechanisms. Behaviour-based interventions consistently showed the stronger influence, particularly on work-related outcomes and stress-related outcomes, suggesting that concrete, observable actions such as scheduling, prioritization, and boundary communication provide the most direct route to managing performance and psychological strain. Cognition-based interventions contributed a smaller but consistently significant effect across all three domains and were comparatively more influential for nonwork-related outcomes, indicating that redirecting attention away from work remains meaningful for personal and family well-being.

These findings extend Sirgy and Lee's (2018) personal-intervention framework beyond the single-occupation context established by Puspitarini & Nuraeni (2024) among Indonesian lecturers, demonstrating that the framework holds across a broader, multi-sector Indonesian workforce and offering evidence of its applicability within a Global South setting. Practically, the results suggest that organisations seeking to support employee well-being should prioritise concrete behavioural boundary-management practices as the primary lever, complemented by cognitive-skill development to fully support employees' nonwork domain.

REFERENCES

1. Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in A Day's Work: Boundaries and Micro Role Transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491. doi:10.5465/amr.2000.3363315
2. Asropi, Silitonga, M., & Indriyani, D. (2022). How can I Connect? the Link between Flexible Work Arrangements and Inter-organizational Networks (Case study: Indonesian Civil Service). *Jurnal Borneo Administrator*, 18(1), 1-16. doi:<https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v18i1.1011>
3. Bakker, A., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. doi:10.1037/ocp0000056
4. Barber, L., & Jenkins, J. (2014). Creating technological boundaries to protect bedtime: examining work-home boundary management, psychological detachment and sleep. *Stress Health*, 30(3), 259-264. doi:10.1002/smi.2536
5. Björk-Fant, J., Bolander, P., & Forsman, A. (2023). Work-life balance and work engagement across the European workforce: A comparative analysis of welfare states. *European Journal of Public Health*, 33(3), 430-434. doi:<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1093/eurpub/ckad046>
6. Chan, X., Shang, S., Brough, P., Wilkinson, A., & Lu, C.-q. (2023). Work, life and COVID-19: a rapid review and practical recommendations for the post-pandemic workplace. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resource*, 61, 257-276. doi:10.1111/1744-7941.12355
7. Clark, S. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747-770. doi:10.1177/0018726700536001
8. Deloitte. (2024). *Gen Z and Millennial Survey Report*. New York: Deloitte.
9. Epizitone, A., & Moyane, S. (2026). Reimagining Traditional Workspaces Through Digitalization and Hybrid Perspective: A Systematic Review. *Informatics*, 13(4), 46. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics13040046>



10. Fu, W., & Zhang, H. (2026). The impact of artificial intelligence application on employees' job insecurity: the moderating roles of self-efficacy and transformational leadership. *Frontiers Psychology*, 17, 1786588. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1786588
11. Gallup. (2023). *State of the Global Workplace: The Voice of the World's Employee*. Gallup.
12. Gallup. (2024). *State of the Global Workplace: The Voice of the World's Employees*. Gallup.
13. Gravador, L., & Teng-Calleja, M. (2018). Work-life balance crafting behaviors: An empirical study. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 786-804. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-05-2016-0112
14. Greenhaus, J., & Powell, G.N. (2006). When Work and Families Are Allies: A Theory of Work-Family Enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 72-92.
15. Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2024). *Multivariate Data Analysis (9th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
16. Hobfoll, S. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
17. Kahn, R., Wolfe, D., Quinn, R., Snoek, J., & Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational stress: studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
18. Kossek, E., & Lautsch, B. (2012, April 25). Work-family boundary management styles in organizations: A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 2(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386611436264
19. Kossek, E., Perrigino, M., & Lautsch, B. (2023). Work-Life Flexibility Policies From a Boundary Control and Implementation Perspective: A Review and Research Framework. *Journal of Management*, 49(6), 2026-2108. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063221140354
20. Kreiner, G., Hollensbe, E., & Sheep, M. (2009). Balancing Borders and Bridges: Negotiating the Work-Home Interface via Boundary Work Tactics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 704-730. doi:https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43669916
21. Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer.
22. Lee, D.-J., & Sirgy, M. (2018). What Do People Do to Achieve Work-Life Balance? A Formative Conceptualization to Help Develop a Metric for Large-Scale Quality-of-Life Surveys. *Social Indicators Research*, 771-791. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1673-6
23. Michaelides, G., Niven, K., Wood, S., & Inceoglu, I. (2024). A dual-process model of the effect of boundary segmentation on work-nonwork conflict. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 97(4), 1502-1525. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12526
24. Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Home and Work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.
25. Ollier-Malaterre, A., & Foucreault, A. (2017). Cross-national work-life research: Cultural and structural impacts for individuals and organizations. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 111-136.
26. Puspitarini, M., & Nuraeni, S. (2024, August 08). Analyzing the Impact of Personal Interventions on the Consequences of Work-Life Balance for Lecturers Pursuing Doctoral Degrees in Indonesia. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 07(08), 6297-6310. doi:https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V7-i8-43
27. Sirgy, M., & Lee, D.-J. (2018). Work-life Balance: an Integrative Review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(1), 229-254. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-017-9509-8
28. Sonentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2014). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72-S103. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924
29. Thilagavathy, S., & Geetha, S. (2023). Work-life balance - a systematic review. *VILAKSHAN - XIMB Journal of Management*, 20(0), 258-276. doi:10.1108/XJM-10-2020-0186
30. Wong, K., Chan, A., & Ngan, S. (2019). The Effect of Long Working Hours and Overtime on Occupational Health: A Meta-Analysis of Evidence from 1998 to 2018. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(12), 2102. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16122102

Cite this Article: Nuraeni, S., Putro, U.S., Ginting, H., Jusuf, J. (2026). *The Effects of Behaviour-Based and Cognition-Based Interventions on Work-Life Balance Outcomes among Workforce in Indonesia*. *International Journal of Current Science Research and Review*, 9(8), pp. 4239-4247. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V9-i8-02>