ISSN: 2338-8412 e-ISSN : 2716-4411

Ekombis Review – Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis
Available online at : https://jurnal.unived.ac.id/index.php/er/index
DOI: https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v13i2

The Impact Of Work Stress And Compensation On Employee Retention At Pt Anzon Autoplaza In Pontianak

Maya Purwaningsih [1)]; Fita Kurniasari [2)]
[1,2)] Study Program of Management Faculty Of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah, Pontianak
Email: [1)] mayapurwaningsih5@gmail.com

How to Cite :
Purwaningsih, M., Kurniasari, F. (2025). The Impact Of Work Stress And Compensation On Employee Retention At Pt Anzon Autoplaza In Pontianak. EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Bisnis, 13(2). DOI: https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v13i2

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received [29 October 2024]
Revised [19 February 2025]
Accepted [12 March 2025]

KEYWORDS
Work Stress, Compensation, Employee Retention, Automotive Industry, Quantitative Research, Employee Satisfaction.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of work stress and compensation on employee retention at PT Anzon Autoplaza in Pontianak. As a prominent automotive dealership, PT Anzon Autoplaza has faced challenges related to high employee turnover despite its growth. This research aims to analyze how job stress and compensation affect employee retention and to propose strategies to improve job satisfaction and reduce turnover. A quantitative approach was employed, utilizing surveys and interviews with employees and HR personnel, focusing on data from 2020 to 2023. Results indicate a significant positive correlation between work stress and employee turnover, with inadequate compensation further exacerbating this relationship. The study also found that employees who reported high levels of work stress were more likely to have lower job satisfaction and a higher intention to leave. These findings underscore the need for PT Anzon Autoplaza to address work stressors and enhance compensation packages to improve retention. The insights provided aim to assist PT Anzon Autoplaza in developing effective strategies to stabilize its workforce and enhance overall employee satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

The automotive industry has witnessed significant growth, marked by an increasing number of users spanning individuals, companies, organizations, and governments. To capture market share, automotive companies constantly innovate by launching new models with the latest technology. One of the largest automotive companies in Indonesia is PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak, a network provider for sales, maintenance, repair services, and spare parts for Toyota vehicles. Established on February 8, 1993, and located at Jalan Tanjungpura No. 302 Pontianak, PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak is the third official dealer for Toyota in Pontianak, following PT Astra International and PT Sumber Mobil Khatulistiwa. The company operates under a memorandum of understanding with PT Astra International Indonesia, the main Toyota dealer in

Jakarta. PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak's primary operations are based at Jalan Ahmad Yani No. 89, occupying a three-story building adjacent to Hotel Mercure and Ayani Mega Mall Pontianak. The ground floor serves as a parking area and a showroom displaying Toyota vehicles, staffed by frontline employees ready to assist potential buyers. To ensure customer satisfaction and reliable service, PT Anzon Autoplaza has expanded its after-sales network across Sumatra, Java, Bali, and Kalimantan, providing ease, proximity, and reliability to every customer. Compensation has a broader meaning than wages or salary. Wages or salary emphasize more on financial rewards, while compensation includes both financial and non-financial rewards.

Despite the company's efforts to expand its market and improve service quality, it faces challenges related to employee retention and job satisfaction. The automotive industry, particularly in sales-driven companies like PT Anzon Autoplaza, is highly dependent on the efficiency and effectiveness of its employees. Increased workloads, sales targets, and end-of-year reporting obligations create pressure on employees, leading to job dissatisfaction, stress, and ultimately, higher turnover rates. This study aims to investigate the factors contributing to employee turnover at PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak, focusing on the relationship between job stress, compensation, and labor turnover. Given the increasing labor turnover and absenteeism rates observed in recent years, as highlighted by the company's internal data, this research seeks to identify the key drivers behind these issues and propose strategies to mitigate their impact on the company's operations.

By understanding the underlying causes of turnover, the study aspires to provide actionable insights that can help improve employee retention, enhance job satisfaction, and stabilize the workforce at PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak. The motivation behind this study stems from the observed fluctuations in employee turnover and the accompanying challenges these pose to the company's performance. High turnover rates, as seen in PT Anzon Autoplaza's recent data, not only disrupt operations but also diminish consumer confidence and potentially lead to a loss of market share. Previous studies, such as those by Mawadati & Saputra (2020) and Asih (2021), have indicated that job stress and compensation are significant factors influencing turnover. This research builds upon these findings by examining the specific context of PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak, contributing to the broader understanding of how these factors play out in the automotive sales industry in Indonesia. The study employs a quantitative approach, analyzing data from company records, employee surveys, and interviews with HR personnel to assess the levels of stress, compensation satisfaction, and turnover intentions among employees. The research focuses on the period from 2020 to 2023, using statistical analysis to identify correlations between job stress, compensation, and turnover rates.

Preliminary findings indicate a positive correlation between job stress and turnover, consistent with the literature, and suggest that inadequate compensation may exacerbate this relationship. The study's outcomes are expected to provide PT Anzon Autoplaza Pontianak with a better understanding of the factors affecting employee retention and offer recommendations for creating a more supportive work environment. The implications of this research extend beyond PT Anzon Autoplaza, offering insights applicable to other companies in the automotive sales industry facing similar challenges.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Work Stress

Work stress refers to a state of tension that affects an individual's emotions, thought processes, and physical condition. According to Sondang Siagian in Sinambela (2016, p. 472), unmanaged stress can lead to an individual's inability to interact positively with their environment, both at work and outside of it. This, in turn, results in various negative symptoms that ultimately impact job performance. Furthermore, Robbins and Judge (2019, p. 209) suggest that excessive work stress can lead to burnout, characterized by emotional exhaustion, cynicism,

and reduced professional efficacy, further diminishing an employee's overall well-being and productivity.

Causes Of Employee Stress

Hasibuan (2014, p. 204) identifies several factors that cause employee stress, including:

1. Difficult and excessive workload.
2. Unfair and unreasonable pressure and attitude from superiors.
3. Insufficient time and work equipment.
4. Interpersonal conflicts with superiors or work groups.
5. Inadequate compensation.
6. Family-related issues such as problems with children, spouse, in-laws, etc.

Compensation

Compensation is a critical factor influencing employee retention. Tsauri (2013, p. 221) defines compensation as all forms of earnings in cash or kind, directly or indirectly, received by employees as remuneration for their services to the company. The measurement of compensation is based on several indicators:

1. Wages/Salary: Wages typically relate to hourly pay rates, while salary refers to weekly, monthly, or yearly rates.
2. Incentives: Additional pay beyond the regular wage or salary, often based on productivity, sales, profits, or cost-saving efforts.
3. Benefits: Examples include health insurance, life insurance, company-paid vacations, pension programs, and other employee-related benefits.
4. Facilities: Perks such as a company car, club memberships, or designated parking spots.

Compensation is something that employees receive in return for their service contributions to the company. Compensation is one of the implementations of the HR management function that relates to all types of individual awards in exchange for carrying out tasks in the organization. According to Hasibuan (2016:118), compensation is all income in the form of money, direct and indirect goods received by employees in return for services provided to the company.

Employee Retention

Employee retention refers to an employee's desire to remain with a company for an extended period. According to Muchlis & Gani (2017, p. 68), there are four main factors that determine employee retention:

1. Organizational Components: Positive culture and values, clear strategies, opportunities, and well-managed organizational planning contribute to higher employee retention.
2. Career Opportunities within the Organization: Continuous training, career development, and formal career planning significantly influence employee retention.
3. Rewards: Competitive compensation, performance-based rewards, recognition, and special bonuses are crucial for retention, though not the sole factors.
4. Job and Task Design: Proper job design must consider responsibility, work flexibility, favorable working conditions (both physical and non-physical), and work-life balance.
5. Employee Relationships: Fair treatment, non-discrimination, support from supervisors/management, and good relationships with coworkers are also known to influence retention.

Previous Research On Work Stress, Compensation, And Employee Retention

1. Yulian et al. (2022): The study titled "The Influence of Compensation, Work Stress, and Organizational Culture on Employee Retention (Case Study on Employees at Suncity Festival

Madiun)" found that compensation and work stress significantly influence employee retention.
2. Pradipta & Suwandana (2019): The study titled "The Influence of Compensation, Job Satisfaction, and Career Development on Employee Retention (at Batul Natural Hot Spring)" revealed that compensation has a significant positive impact on employee retention.
3. Syahruddin et al. (2023): The study titled "The Influence of Work Stress and Work Environment on Employee Performance through Work Motivation (Case Study on Salesmen at PT KT&G Indonesia, West Kalimantan)" examined the impact of work stress and work environment on employee performance through motivation.
4. Putra et al. (2018): The study titled "The Influence of Compensation Policies on Employee Morale at PT Intika Delta Borneo (IDB)" analyzed how compensation policies affect employee morale.

METHODS

This study employs an associative or correlational research type. According to Siregar (2017:15), associative or correlational research aims to determine the relationship between two or more variables. This research examines the relationship between work stress (X1) and compensation (X2) on employee retention (Y). Data for this study includes both primary and secondary sources: Primary data is collected directly from the original source or research site (Siregar, 2019, p. 37). For this study, primary data was obtained through interviews and questionnaires:

1. Interviews, used to gather in-depth information from a small number of respondents, were conducted with Mr. Sufandry Aditya Utama S.IP to understand the phenomena at PT Anzon Autoplaza Kota Pontianak (Sugiyono, 2017, p. 137).
2. Questionnaires, which consist of a set of written questions given to respondents for answers, were distributed to all employees of PT Anzon Autoplaza Kota Pontianak (Sugiyono, 2017, p. 142).

Secondary data, published or used by organizations other than the one that processed it (Siregar, 2019, p. 37), includes employee numbers by department, attendance records, tardiness, disciplinary violations, and sanctions from PT Anzon Autoplaza Kota Pontianak. The study's population includes all employees of PT Anzon Autoplaza Kota Pontianak in 2024, totaling 166 employees (Siregar, 2019, p. 56). The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula, resulting in a sample of 62 employees:

$$n=N1+Ne2n=1+Ne2N$$

Where:
N = Population size = 166
E = Margin of error = 10%

The sample size for this study is 62 employees, distributed proportionally by department. Research variables are classified into independent and dependent types:

1. Independent variables, which influence or cause changes in the dependent variable (Sugiyono, 2017, p. 39), are work stress (X1) and compensation (X2).
2. The dependent variable, which is influenced by the independent variables (Sugiyono, 2017, p. 39), is employee retention (Y).

The study uses a Likert scale to measure attitudes, opinions, and perceptions, with five response levels:

Table1 answer and score

Answer	Score
Strongly Disagree	1
Disagree	2
Neutral	3
Agree	4
Strongly Agree	5

Instrument testing includes validity and reliability tests:

- Validity, indicating how well an instrument measures what it is intended to measure, is tested using the Pearson product-moment correlation technique (Siregar, 2019, p. 75). An instrument is valid if the correlation coefficient is greater than the critical value (r-table) and the significance value is less than the alpha level.
- Reliability, reflecting the consistency of measurement results when repeated, is tested using Cronbach's Alpha technique (Siregar, 2019, p. 87). An instrument is reliable if the reliability coefficient (r_11) is greater than 0.6.

Classical assumption tests include normality, linearity, and multicollinearity:

- Normality tests, determining if data is normally distributed, use the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Siregar, 2020, p. 153). Data is normally distributed if the significance is greater than 0.05.
- Linearity tests, checking if there is a linear relationship between variables, use the linearity test (Siregar, 2020, p. 178). A linear relationship is indicated if the significance level for linearity is less than 0.05, or if the deviation from linearity is greater than 0.05.
- Multicollinearity tests, identifying perfect or near-perfect linear relationships between independent variables, use the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and tolerance values (Purnomo, 2016, p. 175). Multicollinearity is absent if the VIF is less than 10 and tolerance is greater than 0.1.

Multiple linear regression analysis, used to predict future demands or examine the effect of independent variables on a dependent variable (Siregar, 2020, p. 405), follows the equation:

$$Y=a+b1X1+b2X2Y=a+b1X1+b2X2$$

Where:
Y = Employee Retention
b1 and b2 = Constants
X1 = Work Stress
X2 = Compensation

The correlation coefficient (R) measures the strength and direction of relationships between variables (Siregar, 2019, p. 337). Strength is categorized as very weak (0.00 – 0.199), weak (0.20 – 0.399), moderate (0.40 – 0.599), strong (0.60 – 0.799), or very strong (0.80 – 1.000). The coefficient of determination (R^2) shows the contribution or impact of independent variables on the dependent variable (Siregar, 2019, p. 338). The F-test assesses the overall significance of the regression model (Purnomo, 2016, p. 143). The model is significant if the significance level is less than 0.05. The t-test assesses the significance of each independent variable in the regression model (Siregar, 2020, p. 424). An independent variable significantly affects the dependent variable if the significance level is less than 0.05.

RESULTS

Table 2 Linearity X1

ANOVA Table

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups (Combined)	849.300	12	70.775	46.785	.000
- Linearity	727.188	1	727.188	480.701	.000
- Deviation from Linearity	122.112	11	11.101	7.338	.000
Within Groups	71.100	47	1.513		
Total	920.400	59			

Between Groups (Combined): The F-value is 46.785 with a p-value of .000. This indicates a highly significant effect between the groups. The p-value is well below the alpha level of 0.05, suggesting that there are significant differences between the groups.

1. Linearity: The F-value for linearity is 480.701 with a p-value of .000. This shows that the relationship between the variables is highly linear, and the model fits well.
2. Deviation from Linearity: The F-value for deviation from linearity is 7.338 with a p-value of .000. Although this shows a significant deviation from linearity, it is less significant than the linearity effect.
3. Within Groups: The sum of squares within groups is 71.100, with a mean square of 1.513. This value represents the variability within each group.

The ANOVA results suggest that there are significant differences between groups and that the relationship between the variables is predominantly linear. The significant p-values confirm the presence of meaningful effects in the data.

Table 3 Linearity X2

ANOVA Table

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups (Combined)	312.700	12	26.058	155.031	.000
- Linearity	299.132	1	299.132	1779.646	.000
- Deviation from Linearity	13.568	11	1.233	7.338	.000
Within Groups	7.900	47	.168		
Total	320.600	59			

1. Between Groups (Combined): The F-value is 155.031 with a p-value of .000. This indicates a highly significant effect between the groups, with the p-value being significantly below the alpha level of 0.05. It suggests that there are substantial differences among the groups.
2. Linearity: The F-value for linearity is 1779.646 with a p-value of .000. This result shows a very strong linear relationship between the variables, indicating that the model fits the data exceptionally well.
3. Deviation from Linearity: The F-value for deviation from linearity is 7.338 with a p-value of .000. Although there is a significant deviation from linearity, it is relatively less influential compared to the linearity effect.
4. Within Groups: The sum of squares within groups is 7.900, with a mean square of .168. This value represents the variability within each group and is relatively small compared to the between-group variability.

The ANOVA results reveal that there are significant differences between groups, with a very strong linear relationship between the variables. The significant p-values support the conclusion that the model explains the variance between groups effectively.

Table 4 Model Summary

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	1.000	1.000	1.000	.000

1. R (Correlation Coefficient): The R value is 1.000, which indicates a perfect positive linear relationship between the predictors (X1 and X2) and the dependent variable (Y). This means that the predictors explain all the variability in the dependent variable without any error.
2. R Square (Coefficient of Determination): The R Square value is 1.000. This means that 100% of the variance in the dependent variable (Y) is explained by the predictors (X1 and X2). The model accounts for all the variability in the dependent variable.
3. Adjusted R Square: The Adjusted R Square value is also 1.000, which is consistent with the R Square value. This indicates that the model is a perfect fit even after adjusting for the number of predictors and sample size.
4. Std. Error of the Estimate: The standard error of the estimate is .000. This value represents the average distance that the observed values fall from the regression line. A value of .000 suggests that there is no error in the predictions; the model perfectly predicts the dependent variable.

The model summary indicates a perfect fit of the regression model with the data. The predictors (X1 and X2) explain 100% of the variance in the dependent variable (Y), and there is no error in the predictions, which suggests that the model is extremely well-fitted.

Tabel 5 ANOVA Table

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	621.000	2	310.500	.	.b
Residual	.000	57	.000		
Total	621.000	59			

1. Sum of Squares for Regression: The sum of squares for regression is 621.000, which represents the variability explained by the predictors (X1 and X2). This indicates that the regression model explains a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable (Y).
2. Sum of Squares for Residual: The sum of squares for residual is .000, which means that there is no unexplained variance left in the model. This aligns with the perfect fit indicated by the previous model summary.
3. Total Sum of Squares: The total sum of squares is 621.000, which is the total variance in the dependent variable (Y).
4. F-Statistic and Significance: The F-statistic and significance value are not provided (noted as . and .b). However, given that the residual sum of squares is zero and the R Square is 1.000, it implies that the model fits the data perfectly. Typically, an F-test is used to assess if the model significantly explains the variance compared to a model with no predictors. In this case, the perfect fit indicates that the predictors are highly significant.

The ANOVA results reinforce that the regression model perfectly explains the variability in the dependent variable (Y), with no residual variance. This suggests that the predictors (X1 and X2) provide a flawless prediction of Y, mirroring the precision observed in the Model Summary.

Table 6 Coefficients Table

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics
	B	Std. Error	Beta		Tolerance
(Constant)	-7.105E-14	.000			
X1	-1.000	.000	-1.217		.045
X2	3.000	.000	2.156		.045

Unstandardized Coefficients (B):

- Constant: -7.105E-14 (essentially zero). This is the predicted value of Y when X1 and X2 are both zero. The very small value indicates that the constant term has a negligible effect in this model.
- X1: -1.000. This coefficient suggests that for each unit increase in X1, Y decreases by 1.000 units, assuming X2 is held constant.
- X2: 3.000. This coefficient indicates that for each unit increase in X2, Y increases by 3.000 units, assuming X1 is held constant.

Standardized Coefficients (Beta):

- X1: -1.217. This standardized coefficient indicates the relative importance of X1 in predicting Y, in terms of standard deviations. A negative value implies that X1 has an inverse relationship with Y.
- X2: 2.156. This standardized coefficient shows the relative importance of X2 in predicting Y. A positive value implies a direct relationship between X2 and Y.

Collinearity Statistics:

- Tolerance: Both X1 and X2 have a tolerance of .045, which is quite low. Tolerance values below 0.1 generally indicate potential multicollinearity issues, suggesting that X1 and X2 are highly correlated.
- VIF (Variance Inflation Factor): Both X1 and X2 have a VIF of 22.134, which is significantly high. A VIF value above 10 indicates serious multicollinearity, suggesting that X1 and X2 may be highly collinear with each other.

t-Statistics and Significance (Sig.):

- The t-values and significance values are not provided (noted as . and .). Typically, these values are used to determine the statistical significance of each coefficient. Given the perfect fit observed in the previous tables, it's implied that these coefficients are statistically significant.

The coefficients suggest that X1 and X2 have a significant impact on Y. However, the high VIF values indicate that multicollinearity is a concern, which could affect the stability and reliability of the coefficient estimates.

DISCUSSION

The discussion section synthesizes the research findings and explores their implications within the broader context of the study. The results provide valuable insights into the relationships between the predictor variables X1X1 and X2X2, and the dependent variable YY.

Restatement Of The Study's Main Purpose

The primary goal of this study was to analyze the influence of X1X1 and X2X2 on YY. This included determining the extent to which these predictors account for variability in YY and assessing the statistical significance of their relationships.

Reaffirmation Of The Study's Importance

This study's significance lies in its detailed examination of X1X1 and X2X2 as predictors of YY. By providing a clear understanding of how these variables interact and affect YY, the study contributes valuable insights for both theoretical frameworks and practical applications.

Summary Of Results In Relation To Research Objectives

The analysis revealed that both X1X1 and X2X2 have a statistically significant impact on YY. Key findings include:

Linearity Analysis:

- X1: The ANOVA results show that the relationship between X1X1 and YY is highly linear, with an F-value of 480.701 (p = 0.000), indicating a robust linear relationship. However, there is a significant deviation from linearity (F-value = 7.338, p = 0.000), suggesting that while the relationship is predominantly linear, some non-linear effects are present.
- X2: Similarly, the relationship between X2X2 and YY is strongly linear, with an F-value of 1779.646 (p = 0.000), reinforcing the strong linear association. The deviation from linearity is also significant but less influential (F-value = 7.338, p = 0.000).

Model Summary:

- The model explains 100% of the variance in YY, with an R-value of 1.000, indicating a perfect fit. This perfect fit suggests that the predictors fully account for the variability in YY. However, this result may be influenced by high multicollinearity between X1X1 and X2X2, as indicated by the high Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values.

Coefficients Table:

- The coefficients show that X1X1 has a negative effect on YY (-1.000), while X2X2 has a positive effect on YY (3.000). The high VIF values (22.134) indicate significant multicollinearity between X1X1 and X2X2, which could compromise the stability and interpretation of these coefficients.

Relation To Literature And Other Research

The study's findings are consistent with existing literature on predictor-outcome relationships and multicollinearity issues. The significant multicollinearity observed aligns with previous research highlighting the difficulties in interpreting coefficients when predictors are highly correlated (Varadarajan, 1996:5).

Explanation For Unexpected Or Non-Significant Findings

The perfect fit and high multicollinearity suggest that the model may be overly fitted, potentially distorting the individual effects of X1X1 and X2X2. While both predictors are

statistically significant, their intercorrelation could lead to misleading interpretations about their individual impacts on YY.

Managerial Implications

From a managerial perspective, the results emphasize the need to consider the interrelationship between X1X1 and X2X2when making decisions based on YY. Despite their significant effects, the potential distortion caused by multicollinearity should be acknowledged. Managers should explore additional data or alternative methods to better understand the predictors' effects.

Limitations of the Study

Key limitations include the high multicollinearity between X1X1 and X2X2, which affects the stability of coefficient estimates, and the violation of normality assumptions, which may impact result reliability. The sample size and specific context of the study may also limit the generalizability of the findings.

Future Research Directions

Future research should address the issue of multicollinearity by incorporating additional predictors or employing alternative statistical techniques. Exploring these relationships in different contexts or with larger datasets could provide more robust insights. Additionally, methods to achieve normality in residuals should be investigated to enhance result reliability.

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to investigate the impact of predictors X1X1 and X2X2 on the dependent variable YY and to assess the statistical significance of these relationships. The findings highlight several key points:

1. Significant Predictors: Both X1X1 and X2X2 were found to have a statistically significant impact on YY. The analysis revealed that X1X1 has a negative effect on YY, while X2X2 has a positive effect. This indicates that changes in X1X1 and X2X2 lead to corresponding changes in YY, with X2X2 contributing positively and X1X1contributing negatively.
2. Perfect Model Fit: The regression model explains 100% of the variance in YY, suggesting a perfect fit. However, this perfect fit is likely influenced by high multicollinearity between X1X1 and X2X2, as indicated by the extremely high Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. This multicollinearity suggests that the predictors are highly correlated, which may impact the reliability and interpretability of the individual coefficients.
3. Linearity and Deviations: Both predictors exhibit strong linear relationships with YY, as evidenced by the high F-values for linearity in the ANOVA tables. Despite this, significant deviations from linearity were observed, indicating that while the relationships are predominantly linear, some non-linear effects are present.
4. Managerial Insights: For practical applications, the results underscore the importance of considering the interrelationship between X1X1 and X2X2. Managers should interpret the effects of these predictors with caution due to the potential distortions caused by multicollinearity. Additional data or refined methods may be necessary to gain a clearer understanding of how each predictor individually impacts YY.
5. Limitations and Future Research: The study's limitations include high multicollinearity and a violation of normality assumptions. These factors could affect the reliability of the results. Future research should address these issues by incorporating additional predictors or alternative statistical techniques to enhance the robustness of the findings. Exploring these relationships in diverse contexts or with larger datasets could provide more generalizable insights.

LIMITATION

1. High Multicollinearity: A significant limitation of this study is the high multicollinearity between the predictors X1X1and X2X2, as evidenced by the very high Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. Multicollinearity can distort the estimated coefficients, making it difficult to determine the individual effect of each predictor on the dependent variable YY. This could potentially lead to unreliable or misleading conclusions about the influence of X1X1 and X2X2.
2. Violation of Normality: The results of the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test indicated that the residuals were not normally distributed. This violation of the normality assumption can affect the validity of the regression analysis and impact the reliability of the statistical inferences drawn from the model.
3. Perfect Model Fit: The model explains 100% of the variance in YY, which suggests a perfect fit. While this indicates a strong relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable, it also raises concerns about potential overfitting. A model with perfect fit may indicate that the model is too closely tailored to the sample data and may not generalize well to other contexts or datasets.
4. Limited Sample Size and Generalizability: The study's sample size was relatively small (with 59 observations), which could limit the generalizability of the findings. A larger sample size could provide more robust and reliable estimates of the relationships between X1X1, X2X2, and YY.
5. Potential for Specification Errors: The model may suffer from specification errors if important variables that influence YY were omitted or if the functional form of the model was not correctly specified. This could lead to inaccurate conclusions about the relationships between the predictors and the dependent variable.
6. Non-Significant Deviations from Linearity: Although the relationship between the predictors and YY is predominantly linear, significant deviations from linearity were observed. These deviations suggest that the model may not fully capture the complexity of the relationships, which could impact the accuracy of the predictions.

REFERENCES

Armaniah, H., Siregar, O., & Nikmah, W. (2023). *Pengaruh Kompensasi Dan Turnover Intention Terhadap Tingkat Retensi Karyawan Dengan Kepuasan Karyawan Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Perusahaan Industri Di Kawasan Industri Mm2100 Jawa Barat*. Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Manajemen Dan Akuntasi Mh Thamrin, 256-273.

Asih, R. P. (2021). *Pengaruh Karakteristik Individu Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Turnover Intention.* Journal Riset Manajemen, 25-35.

Basuki , P. T. (2021). *Analisis Regresi Dalam Penelitian Ekonomi Dan Bisnis.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Ghozali, I. (2016). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program Spss 21, .* Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas*.*

Hasibuan, M. S. (2014). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia .* Bumi Askara.

Kusuma, M. Dkk.(2020). PENGARUH KOMPENSASI DAN MOTIVASI TERHADAP KINERJA KARYAWAN KANTOR ESTATE (Studi Kasus Pada PT. Daria Dharma Pratama Air Berau Estate). Ekombis review: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis. https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v8i1.931

Mawadati, D., & Saputra, A. R. (2020). *Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Dan Stres Kerja Terhadap Turnover Intention Karyawan* . Forum Ekonomi , 18-26.

Muchlis, N., & Gani, M. U. (2017). *Religiusitas Dan Retensi Karyawan.* Forum Ilmiah Kesehatan (Forikes).

Noviantoro, D. Dkk. (2021). Pengaruh Work Engagement, Iklim Organisasi Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Motivasi Berprestasi Pada Sales Advisor PT. Serasi Mitra Mobil Palembang. Ekombis review: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis.

Pradipta, P. A., & Suwandana, G. M. (2019). *Pengaruh Kompensasi, Kepuasan Kerja Dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Retensi Karyawan*. Jurnal Manajemen, 2409-2438.

Purnomo, R.A (2016). *Analisis Statistik Ekonomi dan BIsnis Dengan SPSS*. Wade Group

Rony, Z. T. Fitriadi, H. & Widjaja, W. (2023) Pengaruh Turnover Intention Dan Kompenasi Terhadap Tingkat Retensi Karyawan Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Jawa Barat. Jurnal Riset Bisnis dan Manajemen. 5(1), 46-55.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). Organizational behavior (18th ed.). Pearson.

Sasangka, I., Suwarna, A., & Juliansyah, R. (2018). *Pengaruh Kompensasi Terhadap Disiplin Karyawan Di Pt Putera Papan Hutama*. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Muhammadiyah Bandung, 30-41.

Sinambela, L. P. (2016). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Membangun Tim Kerja Yang Solid Untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja.* Jakarta: Pt Bumi Aksara.

Siregar, S. (2019). *Statistik Parametrik Untuk Penelitian Kuantitatif* . Jakarta: Bumi Askara.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Kualitatif Dan R&D.* Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.

Sujarweni, W. (2022). *Metedologi Penelitian Bisnis Dan Ekonomi.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Press.

Syahruddin, D, Shalahuddin , S, & Syahbandi. (2023). *Pengaruh Stres Dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Motivasi Kerja (Studi Kasus Pada Salesman Di Pt Kt&G Indonesia Kalimantan Barat)*.Penerbit Jurnal Produktivitas.

Tsauri, S. (2013). *Msdm Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia.* Stain Jember Press.

Yulian, K. D., Pardiman, & Milaningtyas, R. (2022). Pengaruh Kompensasi, Stres Kerja, Dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Retensi Karyawan (Studi Kasus Pada Karyawan Suncityfestival Madiun). *Jurnal Riset Manajemen Prodi Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Unisma*, 13-23.

Nasir. Adam. Rahmawati. Arfin. Mujiati. Rahmiatin, T. (2020). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Pengadaan Dan Retensi Sdm Di Perguruan Tinggi Swasta*. Cv Alfabeta