



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Exploring the Link between Neuroticism and Work–Life Balance in High-Pressure Banking Jobs

Leni Maszura^{1*}, M. Fikri Jaka Pratama², Yulia Nanda Safitri³

Published online: 09 October 2025

Abstract: The banking sector is characterized by high work pressure, long working hours, and demanding performance targets, making it one of the most vulnerable industries to occupational stress and work–life imbalance. While organizational factors such as workload, supervisor support, and company policies are recognized as critical determinants of work–life balance (WLB), studies focusing on dispositional factors, particularly personality traits, remain limited. Neuroticism, as one of the Big Five personality dimensions, is strongly associated with emotional instability, anxiety, and rumination, which may hinder employees' ability to manage competing role demands effectively. This study aims to examine the relationship between neuroticism and WLB among banking employees in Indonesia, where cultural values and organizational contexts may shape employees' experiences differently than in Western settings. Using a quantitative correlational design, data were collected from 234 banking employees through purposive sampling. Neuroticism was measured using the Big Five Inventory, while WLB was assessed with the Work–Life Balance Scale. Pearson's correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between neuroticism and WLB ($r = -.210$, $p < .001$, 95% CI $[-.320, -.090]$), with a small-to-moderate effect size. These findings are consistent with global literature linking neuroticism to poor work–family outcomes, while also highlighting contextual factors that may buffer or intensify this relationship. Theoretically, this study contributes by extending the scope of WLB research to include personality-based determinants in a Southeast Asian context. Practically, the results suggest that banking organizations should design interventions such as stress management training, resilience-building programs, and flexible work arrangements to support employees with high neuroticism profiles.

Keywords: Neuroticism; Work–life balance; Banking sector; Personality traits; Employee well-being

Abstrak: Sektor perbankan dikenal memiliki karakteristik pekerjaan dengan tekanan tinggi, jam kerja yang panjang, serta tuntutan target yang ketat. Kondisi tersebut seringkali menimbulkan risiko stres kerja dan mengurangi kesempatan karyawan untuk menyeimbangkan peran antara pekerjaan dan kehidupan pribadi. Work-life balance tercapai ketika seseorang mampu memenuhi tuntutan dari kedua ranah tersebut secara proporsional. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan neuroticism dengan work-life balance pada karyawan perbankan. Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah pekerja di sektor perbankan yang berjumlah 234 orang. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian kuantitatif dengan pendekatan korelasional, pengukuran variabel dilakukan menggunakan skala big-five personality dan skala-work life balance dengan format likert. Data yang diperoleh kemudian dianalisis menggunakan pearson product moment correlation. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa neuroticism berhubungan negatif secara signifikan dengan work-life balance ($r = -.210$, $p < .001$, 95% CI $[-.320, -.090]$) artinya semakin tinggi neuroticism, semakin rendah work-life balance dan sebaliknya semakin rendah neuroticism maka semakin tinggi work-life balance. Implikasi praktis dari penelitian ini adalah pentingnya organisasi perbankan menyediakan dukungan kerja yang memadai serta mengembangkan kebijakan work-life balance terutama bagi karyawan dengan profil neuroticism lebih tinggi.

Kata Kunci: Neurotisme; Work-life balance; Perbankan; ciri-ciri kepribadian; dan kesejahteraan karyawan

^{1*, 2, 3} Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Malikussaleh

**) corresponding author*

Leni Maszura

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Malikussaleh
Email: lenimaszura@unimal.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary workplace, the pursuit of work–life balance (WLB) has emerged as a central issue for employees across industries, particularly in high-pressure environments such as banking. WLB is often defined as an individual's perceived level of involvement and satisfaction in balancing work, family, and personal roles (Poulose & Sudarsan, 2014). However, more comprehensive perspectives view WLB as a multidimensional construct

encompassing not only the division of time and energy between work and family, but also the integration of health, leisure, and personal development (Kalliath & Brough, 2008). An imbalance in these domains has consistently been linked to higher stress levels, reduced job satisfaction, diminished well-being, and impaired productivity (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011; Haar et al., 2014).

Within the banking sector, the challenge of maintaining WLB is intensified due to long working hours, strict regulatory requirements, and demanding performance targets. Employees in this sector are frequently exposed to excessive workloads, emotional demands from client interactions, and organizational pressure to achieve results under tight deadlines (Giorgi et al., 2017). Recent empirical evidence indicates that banking employees are vulnerable to occupational stress and burnout, with prolonged working hours being associated with higher levels of both outcomes (Vinod & Ambatipudi, 2024). Studies in Indonesia indicate that banking employees experience high levels of job stress. For instance, research by Muis et al. (2021) found a significant relationship between workload and stress among employees at Bank BNI Makassar. Furthermore, Suhartini et al. (2023) reported that work–family conflict contributed to stress among female banking employees. These findings reinforce that work–life balance (WLB) is a critical issue in the Indonesian banking sector.

While organizational factors such as supervisor support, workload, and company policies are widely recognized as key determinants of work–life balance (WLB) (Kossek et al., 2011), research on dispositional factors, particularly personality traits, remains comparatively limited. Personality traits shape the way individuals perceive stress, evaluate challenges, and cope with competing demands from multiple roles. The Big Five model has consistently demonstrated explanatory power in predicting work-related outcomes, with neuroticism emerging as a particularly influential trait. Individuals high in neuroticism tend to exhibit heightened emotional instability, frequent anxiety, and excessive rumination, which may significantly hinder their capacity to manage the demands of work and personal life effectively (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2010). Empirical studies have further demonstrated that neurotic employees often report lower well-being, reduced job satisfaction, and greater work–family conflict compared to their counterparts with lower neuroticism (Judge et al., 2002; Michel et al., 2011; Ilies et al., 2015).

The relationship between neuroticism and WLB can be comprehensively explained through several theoretical perspectives. The Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) suggests that individuals high in neuroticism are more likely to appraise work demands as threatening and rely on maladaptive coping strategies such as avoidance or rumination, thereby worsening role conflict and imbalance. The Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) expands this explanation by asserting that individuals with high neuroticism tend to experience faster depletion of essential resources—such as energy, social support, and emotional resilience—leaving them more susceptible to chronic stress and work–family conflict. Likewise, the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017) positions neuroticism as a personal vulnerability factor that exacerbates the negative consequences of excessive job demands, amplifying emotional exhaustion and further undermining WLB.

Recent research supports these perspectives, demonstrating that employees high in neuroticism are more prone to rumination and difficulties with psychological detachment from work during non-work hours (Sonnentag

& Fritz, 2015; Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). Advances in technology, such as the expectation of constant connectivity, intensify this vulnerability. For instance, employees with higher neurotic tendencies may struggle disproportionately with after-hours work facilitated by information and communication technologies, which can perpetuate work–family conflict and compromise their well-being (Santos et al., 2023). Moreover, cross-cultural evidence highlights that the expression of neuroticism may interact with contextual factors such as collectivist cultural norms or hierarchical work environments, which can magnify or buffer its impact on WLB (Hofstede, 2001).

Taken together, these insights suggest that neuroticism operates not only as a dispositional predictor of work–life balance but also as a vulnerability factor that interacts with organizational structures and cultural contexts. Understanding this interplay is critical in high-pressure sectors such as banking, where employees are frequently exposed to demanding workloads, performance targets, and emotional pressures (Giorgi et al., 2017; Vinod & Ambatipudi, 2024). Thus, integrating dispositional and contextual perspectives provides a more holistic framework for explaining variations in employees' WLB and highlights the need for organizations to consider personality differences in developing supportive policies and interventions.

Although international studies have consistently linked neuroticism with outcomes such as job stress, burnout, and reduced life satisfaction (Judge et al., 2002; Michel et al., 2011; Ilies et al., 2015), research explicitly focusing on the direct relationship between neuroticism and WLB remains scarce. Moreover, most existing studies are concentrated in Western contexts, whereas empirical evidence from Indonesia and other Southeast Asian countries is still minimal. Given the cultural differences in work values, social expectations, and organizational practices, it is crucial to investigate this relationship in the Indonesian banking sector, where collectivist norms and hierarchical organizational cultures may shape employees' work–life experiences differently (Hofstede, 2001).

Based on these considerations, the research problem of this study can be formulated as follows: Does neuroticism significantly relate to work–life balance among employees in the banking sector? The objective of this study is to examine the relationship between neuroticism and WLB among banking employees in Indonesia. In line with the theoretical and empirical foundations, the study hypothesizes that there is a significant negative relationship between neuroticism and work–life balance.

The contributions of this study are twofold. Theoretically, it addresses a critical research gap by highlighting the role of personality traits—particularly neuroticism—in predicting WLB, thereby extending the scope of WLB research beyond organizational determinants. Practically, the findings are expected to inform banking organizations in designing adaptive human resource strategies, including stress management training, emotional regulation interventions, and flexible work arrangements tailored to employees' dispositional profiles. These efforts may not only improve employee well-being but also enhance organizational sustainability and performance.

METHODS

This study adopted a quantitative research design with a correlational approach, which is suitable for examining

the statistical association between two or more variables without manipulating them. As emphasized by Creswell and Creswell (2018), the correlational method is particularly appropriate when the objective is to determine whether a relationship exists between constructs—in this case, neuroticism and work–life balance (WLB)—among banking employees. By using this approach, the study aimed to identify the strength and direction of the relationship while ensuring methodological rigor.

Participants

The participants consisted of 234 employees currently working in the banking sector across different divisions and job roles. To ensure relevant representation, a purposive sampling technique was employed. This non-probability sampling method allowed the selection of participants based on predetermined criteria that aligned with the research objectives. Specifically, the inclusion criteria were: (1) being an active banking employee, and (2) having a minimum tenure of one year. These criteria were set to ensure that respondents had adequate exposure to organizational routines and stressors inherent in the banking environment, thereby making their perceptions of WLB and personality more meaningful. Demographic information was collected to provide further detail, including age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, and job position. Such information is critical for understanding the diversity of the sample and for exploring potential subgroup variations.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical standards were upheld throughout the research process. All participants were informed about the objectives of the study, the voluntary nature of their involvement, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Informed consent was obtained from each participant before data collection began. To maintain confidentiality, responses were anonymized and used solely for academic purposes. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by an institutional research ethics committee, ensuring compliance with established ethical guidelines for social science research.

Instruments

Two standardized psychological instruments were utilized to measure the study variables. The first was the Work–Life Balance Scale developed by Hayman (2005), based on the conceptual framework of Fisher et al. (2009). The scale originally consisted of 15 items rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 5 (“strongly agree”). Following item analysis, one item was removed due to a low discrimination index ($r_{ix} < .30$). The final 14-item version demonstrated strong internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of .867, indicating high reliability. Validity was supported through prior applications of the scale in various cultural contexts, and construct validity was confirmed via factor analysis in earlier studies.

The second instrument was the Neuroticism subscale of the Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by John and Srivastava (1999) and adapted for the Indonesian context by Ramdhani (2012). This subscale comprised eight items on a four-point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree,” 4 = “strongly agree”). Item analysis revealed that one item failed to meet the acceptable discrimination threshold and

was excluded, leaving seven items. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the remaining items was .748, which is considered satisfactory for psychological constructs. Previous research has demonstrated both the convergent and discriminant validity of the BFI neuroticism subscale in predicting work-related outcomes, further supporting its suitability for this study.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected during a three-month period in 2023 using a structured questionnaire. The survey was administered in both online and paper-based formats to accommodate accessibility for participants across different bank branches. Respondents received clear instructions, and the survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Research assistants were available to clarify queries and ensure that data collection adhered to ethical and methodological standards. The dual-mode administration minimized sampling bias and facilitated broader participation.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, frequencies, and percentages) were first computed to summarize demographic characteristics and scale distributions. Prior to hypothesis testing, assumption checks for normality and linearity were performed. The normality of data was examined using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and skewness–kurtosis indices, while scatterplots were inspected to assess linearity between neuroticism and WLB.

For hypothesis testing, Pearson’s product–moment correlation was employed to examine the relationship between neuroticism and WLB. This statistical method is appropriate for identifying linear relationships between continuous variables measured at the interval level. Results were reported with the correlation coefficient (r), significance level (p), and 95% confidence intervals. In addition, effect size interpretation followed Cohen’s (1988) guidelines to contextualize the strength of the observed relationship. Exploratory subgroup analyses were also considered to examine potential demographic differences, such as gender or marital status, although these were not the primary focus of the study.

RESULTS OF STUDY

Following the data collection process, a comprehensive descriptive analysis was conducted to illustrate the distribution of participants based on their demographic characteristics. As shown in Table 1, the participants in this study comprised 234 banking employees, with a majority being female (54.7%) and slightly more than half being married (53.4%). This demographic composition reflects the gendered nature of employment in the banking sector in Indonesia, where women increasingly occupy roles in service-oriented divisions. Such demographic information is essential for contextualizing the findings and considering potential differences across subgroups.

The distribution of work–life balance (WLB) scores revealed that nearly half of the respondents were categorized at a moderate level (49.6%), followed closely by those at a high level (48.7%), while only a small minority

(1.7%) fell into the low category. These findings suggest that although most employees are able to manage their work and personal roles relatively well, they still face challenges that prevent them from achieving optimal balance. Table 2 compares the hypothetical and empirical mean scores of WLB and neuroticism. The empirical mean for WLB ($M = 50.33$, $SD = 7.67$) was substantially higher than the hypothetical mean ($M = 42$, $SD = 9.3$), indicating that, overall, employees reported better balance than theoretically expected. Similarly, the empirical mean of neuroticism ($M = 19.26$, $SD = 3.50$) was above the hypothetical midpoint, reflecting a relatively elevated level of neurotic tendencies among participants.

Table 1. Overview of Participants Demographics (N= 234)

Demographics	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	106	45.3
	Female	128	54.7
Marital Status	Married	125	53.4
	Unmarried	109	46.6
Work–Life Balance	Low	4	1.7
	Medium	116	49.6
	High	114	48.7
Neuroticism	Low	40	17.1
	High	145	62.2
	Unclassified	49	20.9

Table 2. Comparison of Hypothetical and Empirical Mean Scores of Work–Life Balance

Variable	Hypothetical Data				Empirical Data			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Work-life balance	14	70	42	9.3	30	68	50.33	7.67
Neuroticism	7	28	17.5	3.5	10	28	19.26	3.5

To further analyze neuroticism, scores were categorized into high and low levels using Azwar's (2021) formula based on standard deviation. The results showed that a majority of respondents (62.2%) fell into the high neuroticism category, 17.1% into the low category, while 20.9% could not be clearly classified into either category and were placed in the "unclassified" group. This unclassified group represents individuals with scores that fell around the cutoff thresholds, where measurement error could lead to ambiguous categorization. Such cases highlight the inherent limitations of categorical grouping, particularly when using psychometric scales where individual differences may lie along a continuum rather than discrete categories. Future research should consider employing latent class analysis or mixture modeling to better capture such intermediate profiles.

The results of hypothesis testing are presented in Table 3. Pearson's correlation analysis revealed a significant negative relationship between neuroticism and work–life balance ($r = -.210$, $p = .001$, 95% CI $[-.320, -.090]$). According to Cohen's (1988) guidelines, this correlation reflects a small-to-moderate effect size, suggesting that while the relationship is statistically significant, neuroticism accounts for a modest proportion of variance in WLB. In practical terms, this indicates that employees with higher neuroticism scores tend to perceive lower levels of balance between their work and personal lives.

Table 3. Results of Hypothesis Testing

Variabel	Pearson Correlation (<i>r</i>)	Sig.
Work-Life Balance	-.210**	.001
Neuroticism		

To enrich the analysis, subgroup comparisons were conducted to explore whether demographic variables influenced the relationship between neuroticism and WLB. Independent sample t-tests indicated no statistically significant difference in WLB between male and female employees ($t = -1.21$, $p > .05$), suggesting that gender did not moderate the relationship. However, descriptive

comparisons revealed that unmarried employees reported slightly higher WLB scores than married employees, a finding consistent with prior research linking family responsibilities to increased work–family conflict (Allen et al., 2000; Haar et al., 2014). These exploratory results underscore the importance of considering demographic characteristics in future studies, even if they were not the primary focus of this investigation.

In summary, the results demonstrate that neuroticism is significantly and negatively associated with WLB among banking employees in Indonesia. The predominance of high neuroticism scores among participants, combined with the concentration of WLB scores in the moderate range, indicates that dispositional vulnerabilities contribute to difficulties in balancing professional and personal demands. While the effect size is modest, the findings are consistent with existing literature and underscore the practical importance of developing organizational interventions aimed at supporting employees with high neurotic tendencies. It is important to note, however, that the correlational design limits causal inference; therefore, longitudinal studies are needed to clarify the directionality of this relationship.

DISCUSSION

The present study found a significant negative correlation between neuroticism and work–life balance (WLB) among banking employees in Indonesia ($r = -.210$, $p < .001$). This result indicates that individuals with higher levels of neuroticism are more likely to report difficulties in balancing their professional and personal roles, while those with lower neuroticism scores demonstrate better role integration. Although the correlation was statistically significant, the effect size was small to moderate, suggesting that neuroticism alone does not fully explain variations in WLB. Instead, other factors—such as organizational support, coping resources, and social expectations—likely play a complementary role. This aligns with prior research demonstrating that dispositional traits influence stress perceptions but interact with contextual and situational factors to shape overall work–life outcomes (Judge et al., 2002; Michel et al., 2011; Ilies et al., 2015).

The modest strength of the observed correlation underscores the complexity of WLB as a multidimensional construct. While neuroticism predisposes individuals to negative emotions such as worry, rumination, and anxiety (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 2010), its impact may be mitigated by personal or organizational resources. For example, employees with supportive supervisors or flexible work arrangements may buffer the detrimental effects of neurotic tendencies (Allen et al., 2000; Kossek et al., 2011). The relatively weak association observed in this study may also reflect the collectivist orientation of Indonesian culture, where family and community ties serve as protective factors, reducing the extent to which personality traits directly determine WLB (Hofstede, 2001).

The findings are theoretically consistent with the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which suggests that individuals high in neuroticism are more likely to appraise work demands as threatening and to engage in maladaptive coping strategies, thereby undermining balance between roles. The Conservation of Resources (COR) Theory (Hobfoll, 1989) further explains that neurotic individuals are prone to rapid depletion of psychological and social resources, making them more vulnerable to work–family conflict. From the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017), neuroticism is considered a vulnerability factor that magnifies the strain of high job demands—common in banking environments characterized by long working hours, regulatory pressures, and strict performance targets (Giorgi et al., 2017). Together, these frameworks emphasize that personality factors interact with organizational and cultural contexts in shaping WLB.

An important contribution of this study lies in its Indonesian context. The banking sector in Indonesia often requires long workdays, client-facing roles with high emotional demands, and adherence to strict compliance requirements. Within such a context, employees high in neuroticism may struggle more acutely with stress and role conflict, as they are predisposed to perceive job stressors as overwhelming. Cross-cultural comparisons also reveal similar patterns. For instance, studies in Western countries have reported that neuroticism predicts greater work–family conflict (Allen et al., 2012), while research in Asia shows that collectivist values may buffer this effect by providing employees with family and community support systems (Haar et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2010). These comparisons suggest that while the negative role of neuroticism is universal, its intensity may vary depending on cultural and organizational settings.

The findings also open avenues for exploring potential mediating and moderating variables. For example, social support, coping strategies, and leadership styles may moderate the relationship between neuroticism and WLB, either by amplifying or reducing its effects. Similarly, factors such as work engagement and psychological detachment from work may mediate this relationship (Sonnetag & Fritz, 2015; Wendsche & Lohmann-Haislah, 2017). Understanding these mechanisms is important for developing targeted interventions.

From a practical standpoint, the results emphasize the need for banking organizations to recognize personality differences when designing WLB policies. Employees high in neuroticism may benefit from emotional regulation training, resilience workshops, and counseling services that help them manage stress and negative emotions more effectively (Boyce & French, 2010). Moreover, personalized HR practices—such as flexible work scheduling, supervisor support programs, and the promotion of recovery

strategies—can serve as protective measures against the negative effects of high neuroticism (Santos et al., 2023). These strategies not only enhance employee well-being but also contribute to organizational outcomes by reducing burnout, improving productivity, and fostering positive employer branding (Carnevale & Hatak, 2020).

In summary, the study confirms that neuroticism is a significant dispositional factor influencing WLB, though its effect is modest in size and shaped by contextual factors. This underscores the importance of integrating dispositional and environmental perspectives when addressing employee well-being. Future research should consider longitudinal designs, broader industry samples, and the role of mediators and moderators to provide a more nuanced understanding of how personality traits interact with organizational and cultural contexts in shaping work–life balance.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite the meaningful contributions of this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study employed a cross-sectional correlational design, which restricts the ability to draw causal inferences between neuroticism and work–life balance (WLB). Although significant associations were identified, the directionality of these relationships cannot be determined. Future research should adopt longitudinal or experimental designs to examine the temporal dynamics and potential causal pathways linking personality traits with WLB outcomes.

Second, the research relied exclusively on self-report measures, which are subject to common method bias, social desirability effects, and perceptual distortions. Employees high in neuroticism may, for instance, report lower WLB due to their heightened tendency toward negative affectivity rather than actual work–family conflict. To address this limitation, future studies could incorporate multi-source data collection methods, such as supervisor ratings, peer assessments, or objective organizational indicators of work hours and performance.

Third, the sample was drawn solely from banking sector employees in Indonesia, limiting the generalizability of findings to other industries and cultural contexts. Banking has unique stressors—such as regulatory compliance, performance targets, and customer interaction—that may not be present in other sectors. Future research should expand the scope to include employees from diverse industries, such as healthcare, education, or technology, as well as cross-cultural comparative studies to determine whether the observed patterns hold in different organizational and cultural environments.

Fourth, while this study highlighted the role of neuroticism, other personality traits within the Big Five framework (e.g., conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion, openness to experience) were not included in the analysis. Since personality traits often interact in predicting outcomes, future research should examine these traits simultaneously, potentially using multivariate approaches such as structural equation modeling or latent class analysis to capture complex interrelationships.

Finally, this study did not account for potential moderating or mediating factors, such as coping strategies, social support, leadership style, or psychological detachment from work. These factors may explain why the correlation between neuroticism and WLB was relatively weak, as they either buffer or amplify the effects of personality. Future research should integrate these variables into theoretical models to provide a more nuanced

understanding of how dispositional and contextual factors jointly shape WLB.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study demonstrated a significant negative relationship between neuroticism and work–life balance (WLB) among employees in the Indonesian banking sector. Employees with higher neuroticism scores tended to report lower levels of WLB, reflecting greater difficulties in managing competing work and personal demands. Although the observed correlation was statistically significant, the effect size was small to moderate, indicating that neuroticism is an important but not exclusive factor influencing WLB. These findings affirm the role of dispositional vulnerabilities in shaping employee well-being, while also highlighting the interplay with organizational and cultural contexts.

From a theoretical perspective, this study extends existing literature by emphasizing the relevance of personality traits—specifically neuroticism—in predicting WLB, an area of research that has been dominated by organizational determinants. Integrating perspectives from the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping, the Conservation of Resources Theory, and the Job Demands–Resources Model, the study provides a framework to understand how neuroticism interacts with job demands and available resources to influence employee balance between work and life.

From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that banking organizations should recognize personality differences when designing work–life policies. Employees high in neuroticism may benefit from targeted interventions such as stress management training, resilience-building workshops, and emotional regulation programs. In addition, organizational strategies—such as flexible work arrangements, supervisor support systems, and policies that promote psychological detachment from work—can help buffer the adverse effects of high neuroticism and foster healthier work–life integration.

Overall, this study contributes to advancing knowledge on the dispositional determinants of work–life balance in high-pressure occupational contexts. By integrating both personality and organizational perspectives, it provides valuable insights for theory development and practical guidance for organizations striving to enhance employee well-being and organizational performance.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics Approval And Consent To Participate

This study did not involve any experiments on humans or animals that required ethical approval. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection.

Consent For Publication

Not applicable. This study does not include any individual participant data (such as images, videos, or identifiable information).

Availability Of Data And Materials

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Conflicts Of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

Funding

No specific funding was received for this study.

Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Technology.

Artificial intelligence-assisted technologies were not used in the research, analysis, or drafting of this manuscript. The manuscript was written solely by the authors.

Authors' contributions.

Author 1 conceptualized and designed the study, Author 3 was responsible for data collection and field administration, Author 2 conducted statistical analysis and interpretation of the findings, All authors contributed to drafting the manuscript, provided critical revisions, and approved the final version for submission. Author 1 served as the corresponding author, responsible for communication with the journal, editors, and reviewers during the publication process, as well as acting as the primary contact for readers regarding additional information related to this research.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Leni Maszura holds a Professional Master's degree in Psychology (Magister Psikologi Profesi) from University of North Sumatra with research interests in personality, employee well-being, and the application of positive psychology in organizational settings. As a psychologist, she specializes in employee recruitment and selection practices. She is currently a lecturer at Universitas Malikussaleh and is beginning to develop research in the field of industrial and organizational psychology.

M. Fikri Jaka Pratama holds a bachelor's degree in psychology and a master's degree in industrial and organizational psychology from the University of Medan Area. He is currently a lecturer in the Psychology Program at the Faculty of Medicine, Malikussaleh University, and is responsible for teaching courses in industrial and organizational psychology, consumer psychology, organizational management, and psychology of conflict and peace.

Yulia Nanda Safitri earned her bachelor's and master's degrees in psychology from Medan Area University and is now a lecturer in the psychology program at the Faculty of Medicine, Malikussaleh University. She is typically responsible for teaching business psychology and entrepreneurship, child and adolescent development, adult and elderly development, and the code of ethics in psychology.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.5.2.278>
- Allen, T. D., Johnson, R. C., Kiburz, K. M., & Shockley, K. M. (2012). Work–family conflict and flexible work arrangements: Deconstructing flexibility. *Personnel*

- Psychology*, 65(2), 345–376.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x>
- Azwar, S. (2021). *Penyusunan skala psikologi* (Edisi terbaru). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Boyes, M. E., & French, D. J. (2010). *Neuroticism, stress, and coping in the context of an anagram-solving task*. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(5), 380–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.04.001>
- Carnevale, J. B., & Hatak, I. (2020). Employee adjustment and well-being in the era of COVID-19: Implications for human resource management. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 183–187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.037>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI)*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed). SAGE Publications.
- Fisher, G. G., Bulger, C. A., & Smith, C. S. (2009). *Beyond work and family: A measure of work/nonwork interference and enhancement*. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(4), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016737>
- Giorgi, G., Arcangeli, G., Perminienė, M., Lorini, C., Ariza-Montes, A., Fiz-Perez, J., & Mucci, N. (2017). Work-related stress in the banking sector: A review of incidence, correlated factors, and major consequences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 2166. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02166>
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165–183). American Psychological Association.
- Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work–life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(3), 361–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.08.010>
- Hayman, J. (2005). Psychometric assessment of an instrument designed to measure work–life balance. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 85–91. <https://espace.curtin.edu.au/bitstream/handle/20.500.11937/46385/46365.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Ilies, R., Aw, S. S. Y., & Pluut, H. (2015). Intraindividual models of employee well-being: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6), 827–838. [10.1080/1359432X.2015.1071422](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2015.1071422)
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530–541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.530>
- Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work–life balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 14(3), 323–327. <https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.837.14.3.323>
- Kossek, E. E., Baltes, B. B., & Matthews, R. A. (2011). How work–family research can finally have an impact in organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 4(3), 352–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2011.01353.x>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
- Lu, L., Cooper, C. L., Kao, S. F., Chang, T. T., Allen, T. D., Lapiere, L. M., O' Driscoll, M. P., Poelmans, S., Sanchez, J. I., & Spector, P. E. (2010). Cross-cultural differences on work-to-family conflict and role satisfaction: A Taiwanese–British comparison. *Human Resource Management*, 49(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20334>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2010). The Five-Factor Theory of personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 159–181). Guilford Press.
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Muis, M., Wahyu, A., Mallapiang, F., Darwis, A. M., Thamrin, Y., & Rezkiyah, N. (2021). The determinant of work stress on bank employees in Makassar, Indonesia. *Gaceta sanitaria*, 35 Suppl 2, S428–S431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2021.10.068>
- Poulose, S., & Sudarsan, N. (2014). Work life balance: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 3(2), 1–17. <https://www.managementjournal.info/index.php/IJAME/article/view/324>

- Ramdhani, N. (2013). Adaptasi Bahasa dan Budaya dari Skala Kepribadian Big Five. *Jurnal Psikologi: Indonesian Journal of Psychology*, 39(2), 189-205. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.6986>
- Santos, A., Neves, P., & Costa, P. (2023). Information and communication technologies-assisted after-hours work: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of the relationships with work-family/life management variables. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1101191. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1101191>
- Suhartini, E., Nurnadjamuddin, M., Mapparenta, & Suriyanti. (2023). Investigations of work-life balance and stress for working women in the Indonesian banking sector. *Global Business and Finance Review*, 28(6), 159–169. <https://doi.org/10.17549/gbfr.2023.28.6.159>
- Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2015). Recovery from job stress: The stressor-detachment model as an integrative framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(S1), S72–S103. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1924>
- Vinod, G., & Ambatipudi, S. (2024). Burnout, stress, and their correlates among bank employees of South India: A cross-sectional study. *Annals of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 36, e22. <https://doi.org/10.35371/aoem.2024.36.e22>
- Wendsche, J., & Lohmann-Haislah, A. (2017). A meta-analysis on antecedents and outcomes of detachment from work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 2072. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02072>

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Correspondence All inquiries and requests for additional materials should be directed to the Corresponding Author.

Publisher's Note Utan Kayu Publishing maintains a neutral stance regarding territorial claims depicted in published maps and does not endorse or reject the institutional affiliations stated by the authors.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0), which permits others to share, adapt, and redistribute the material in any medium or format, even for commercial purposes, provided appropriate credit is given to the original author(s) and the source, a link to the license is provided, and any changes made are indicated. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2025