




Exploring How Work-Life Balance and Meaningful Work Predict Employee Retention




Nur Aisyah. Binti Zulkifli¹, Syarifah. Maisarah^{2*}, Nayelli. Muñoz³

¹ Department of Health Psychology, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

² Faculty of Social Sciences & Liberal Arts, Department of Psychology, UCSI University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

³ Faculty of Health Sciences, Private University of the North, Lima, Peru

* Corresponding author email address: symaisarah@ucsiuniversity.edu.my

E d i t o r	R e v i e w e r s
Şennur Tutarel Kışlak  Department of Psychology/Faculty of Language, History and Geography, University of Ankara, Ankara, Turkey kislak@ankara.edu.tr	Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar  Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Kamdin. Parsakia  Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The paragraph beginning with “Meaningful work has become one of the central constructs...” would benefit from clarifying the distinction between “meaningful work” and “job satisfaction” to avoid conceptual overlap and enhance theoretical precision.

In the sentence “This reflects a broader shift in employment paradigms where personal fulfillment and existential engagement are integrated into career planning,” the phrase “existential engagement” is evocative but vague. Consider defining it or citing a specific framework.

The paragraph discussing the mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior (paragraph 3 of the introduction) should clarify whether this variable was included in the present study’s design or is only referenced for context.

The final paragraph of the introduction states, “Yet, research tailored to this context remains limited.” While this justifies the study, the article could better highlight the specific cultural and economic characteristics of the Malaysian context that warrant separate analysis.

The sentence “The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality yielded non-significant results...” could benefit from reporting the actual test statistics (e.g., D-values), not just the p-values, for full statistical transparency.

In Table 2, the authors provide Pearson correlations, but the narrative could benefit from explicitly addressing the moderate effect size interpretations according to Cohen's criteria to contextualize the results.

The sentence “These mechanisms appear particularly relevant in the Malaysian context...” should be strengthened with evidence or examples from Malaysian HR practices or sociocultural dimensions (e.g., Hofstede’s cultural dimensions).

The sentence “Interestingly, the regression analysis in this study revealed...” would be more rigorous if the authors reported the percentage difference in β weights to quantify the “slightly stronger” predictive power of meaningful work.

The paragraph stating, “This study’s findings are also reinforced by research conducted in various service sectors...” could benefit from a more critical synthesis. Are the effects of meaningful work consistent across sectors, or do some sectors respond more strongly?

The limitations section mentions self-report bias and cultural specificity but omits discussion on potential sampling bias, especially regarding industry representation or geographic concentration within Malaysia.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

Under “Measures,” the section on Employee Retention cites Kyndt et al. (2009) but does not report the Cronbach’s alpha obtained in the current sample. Including this value would support internal reliability claims.

In the “Work-Life Balance” subsection, the authors mention convergent and discriminant validity but do not report actual validity coefficients or studies validating the scale in Malaysian samples. This weakens the psychometric justification.

The description of the WAMI tool under “Meaningful Work” is thorough but could be improved by including the Cronbach’s alpha values for each subscale in the current dataset, enhancing transparency regarding scale reliability.

The regression results in Table 3 are well-reported, but the authors should consider including confidence intervals for the R^2 value to communicate the precision of the model’s explanatory power.

The sentence “The constant value ($B = 1.32$, $p < .001$) also reached statistical significance...” should include a brief interpretation of what this constant represents in real-world terms, which would enhance accessibility.

In the Discussion section, the authors state, “The significant correlation between meaningful work and employee retention supports the growing body of literature...” This should be nuanced with mention of causality limitations due to the cross-sectional design.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.