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Abstract
The millennial generation will soon dominate the workforce in Indonesia. This generation has different characteristics from its predecessor. Various studies and surveys have found out that millennial employees have a tendency to switch their jobs within two years if they feel disengaged. Millennial employees are more interested in trying out different jobs before they settle on a career than the previous generation. This could increase the turnover rate of a company. This research strives to study the critical factors for intention to stay of the millennial employees in three company sectors in Indonesia, including oil and gas, airline, and FMCG. The three key factors are employee development, salaries and compensation, and work-life interference. Online surveys were sent to millennial employees from these three company sectors. A multiple regression analysis was then used to predict the relationship among the key factors with the intention to stay. The analysis results revealed that salary and compensation, and employee development had a positive influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay, while work-life interference had a negative influence on intention to stay. The findings of this research are expected to help the human resource departments of these three company sectors and researchers to formulate an appropriate strategy to retain their millennial employees.
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Introduction

In the next coming years, millennial employees will soon replace baby boomers and gen X workforce (Frian & Mulyani, 2018; Arora & Dhole, 2018). Unfortunately, this generation has more intention to leave the companies within the first 2 years as reported by Deloitte Millennial Survey (2018). Many organizations are working to retain their employees as turnover might cause several issues for a company such as generating high turnover cost to recruit, hire, train, and acquire new employees, lowering company productivity and stability, giving a bad motivation for the rest of the employees, and giving a bad image to the company (Frian & Mulyani, 2018).

Referring to the data from the Central Bureau of Statistics in 2018, it is shown that the millennial employees occupy 32% of the total workforce in Indonesia. Dale Carnegie Indonesia (2016) revealed that 60% of the millennial employees intend to quit a company if they feel dissatisfied with the company. It is acknowledged that the millennial generation has different characteristics with the previous generation and hence, the company needs to have a different approach and strategy to retain its millennial employees (Saragih, 2016; Arora & Dhole, 2018).

There have been significant numbers of previous studies that examined the motivation factors of millennial employees to stay in a company. Muslim et al. (2018) identified that job security, salary increase plan, accountability, and working condition positively affected job retention for millennial employees in the oil and gas sector in Malaysia. Frian and Mulyani (2018) analyzed the factors affecting millennial turnover intention in Indonesia. Turnover intention is the opposite notion of staying intention. Frian and Mulyani (2018) discovered that the employee development scheme had a major impact on the employee turnover intention. This finding is opposite with the finding from Johari et al. (2012).

The different perspective might be due to different unit analyses surveyed. Frian and Mulyani (2018) found out that the employees from a large-scale organization and with a higher income demand a better development system so that they can get new knowledge, skills, and competency as required for their future careers. Johari et al. (2012) discovered that the scheme of growth and training has less of an impact on the intention of employees to remain in manufacturing companies. It was due to the dominance of the respondents being secondary school diploma holders, and hence, they only required basic understandings and abilities in their job performance.
Frian and Mulyani (2018) also found that salary had no impact on employee intention to stay. This effect differs from the finding by Muslim et al. (2018). The respondents of the study by Muslim et al. (2018) were derived from oil and gas industry employees. Generally, the oil and gas sector is a mature industry where the system in every oil and gas company has similarities in terms of business processes and organizational behaviour. The employee development towards this industry is minimal and hence, the remaining attractive factor for its employees is a big salary.

The other motivating factor for intention to stay is work-life interference as confirmed by the study finding from Arora and Dhole (2018) and Cheng et al. (2018). However, this factor has not been studied intensively in an Indonesian millennial context and hence, this factor will be further analysed in this research.

This research aims to answer the following research questions.
Do salary and compensation have a significant impact on the intention of millennial employees to remain in a business?
Do employee development and training have a significant impact on the intention of millennial employees to remain in a business?
Does work-life interference have a significant impact on the intention of millennial employees to remain in a business?

More specifically, the two goals in this study are:
To investigate the key factors of intention to stay in a millennial company in three company sectors in Indonesia.
To give insights for the companies on which factors should be attenuated to retain their millennial employees.

This study object will be performed on millennial employees in three Indonesian business industries: oil and gas (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam), airline (Garuda Indonesia), and FMCG (P&G, Nestle, Unilever) in order to attain the goals.

This research paper consists of 5 parts which are the Introduction, Literature Review, Hypothesis Development and Research Method, Results and Discussion, and eventually, the Implications, Limitations, and Recommendations for Future Research.

**Literature Review**

Intention to stay is an intention to work for the current employer and stay longer with their full commitments and their willingness to remain employed (Jauhar, 2016). Johari et al. (2012) defined intention to stay as the intention of the employee to remain working for the current employer for a long-term period and is the reversal concept of turnover intention.
Garcia (2017) found that millennial employees would stay in the company if they were perceived as being valued, respected, and developed for their careers. A company should develop reinforcements and adjustments of human resource management strategies towards the millennial generation as they dominate the workforce and become a company leader soon (Friian & Mulyani, 2018).

Studies conducted by several researchers found out several factors affecting employee intention to stay are salary and compensation (Muslim et al., 2018; Johari et al., 2012), work-life balance (Horng, 2018), work-life interference (Cheng et al., 2018), career development (Kuo et al., 2018), and employee development (Friian & Mulyani, 2018).

In this research, the dependent variable is the intention to stay, whereas the key factors such as salary and compensation, employee development, and work-life interference are the predictor variables. The unit analysis of this research is millennial employees from three company sectors in Indonesia: oil and gas (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam), airline (Garuda Indonesia), and FMCG (P&G, Nestle, Unilever).

**Salary and Compensation**

Salary and compensation itself is defined as a form of reward that a company pays to its employees (Anter & Lapian, 2016). Furthermore, John and Teru (2017) define salary and compensation as monetary benefits that are given to employees both intrinsically and extrinsically. The components of salary and compensation as described by Chepchumba and Kimutai (2017) include basic salary, insurance, medical benefits, travel allowance, and retirement plan benefaction.

Based on Deloitte Millennial Survey (2018), it was shown that rewards/benefits played a significant factor for millennial employees to consider working in a business. This finding is also supported by Muslim et al. (2018) who analysed the leading factors for millennial employees in the oil and gas sector. Salary increase had a significant influence towards employee job retention. The higher the salary was, the higher the millennial employees’ intention to stay in a company was (Muslim et al., 2018). Arora and Dhole (2018) also found that the higher the salary and benefits offered by another company was, the higher the employee intention to leave the current employer would be. In contrast to the previous finding, Friian and Mulyani (2018) discovered that salary and compensation did not have an influence on turnover intention on the millennial generation in Indonesia. Millennial employees seem to value other motivation factors rather than the monetary benefits.
Hence, based on this gap, this research will aim to reconfirm whether salary and compensation affect the millennial employees’ intention to stay in various company sectors in Indonesia. The research hypothesis will be:

**H1:** Salary and compensation have a positive influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay in a company.

### Employee Development

An employee development system is one of the HR strategies to improve the employee skills and competence required to conduct their current or future jobs (Mondi & Noe, as cited in Johari et al., 2018). Development and training is also defined as providing the employees with basic knowledge and skills, so that the employees can meet the company’s standards (Costen & Salazar, 2011). Training and development helps the employees to develop their careers (Chen, 2014). By giving effective training, employee job satisfaction and productivity will also increase. Satisfied and productive employees will increase employee intention to stay in a company and help the company to meet its organizational goals (Chen, 2014; Ali et al., 2015). Frian and Mulyani (2018) studied the millennial generation turnover intention in Indonesia. They found out that a company with a good development system for its employees would reduce the millennial employee turnover intention. This finding is also supported by research conducted by Horng (2018) who studied factors affecting millennial generation retention in the food industry in Malaysia. Horng (2018) concluded that employee development and training has a beneficial impact on employee retention.

However, a different perspective was given by Johari et al. (2012). Johari et al. (2012) studied the factors affecting employee staying intention in a manufacturing business in Malaysia. The results of the research showed that training and growth did not affect the employee intention to remain in the company. The possible causes were the employees surveyed were coming from the manufacturing sector, which only required basic skills and knowledge to perform their jobs. In addition, Johari et al. (2012) found that through the experiences they obtained in each business, millennial employees could acquire training and growth possibilities.

Hence, in order to re-confirm the finding above, a survey will be conducted on millennial employees from various sectors in Indonesia in order to prove the following hypothesis:

**H2:** Training and development has a positive influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay in a company.
Work-Life Interference

Work-life interference is a condition where the employee's professional and personal affairs demands are mutually incompatible, which causes inconvenience in engaging in both work and life roles (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 1997). Ryan et al. (2010) defined work-life interference as a challenge in participating in work and non-work domains. Work interferes with many other life roles that support one’s lifestyle, health, leisure, companionship, household management, romantic relationship, and education (Ryan et al., 2010). Although there are the flexible work practices that are considered as a solution for the long work hours, there is still a growing concern about stress and work-life interference (Fein et al., 2017).

A high level of work-life interference contributes to job discontent and therefore affects the choice of employees to remain in a business (Grzywacz et al., 2006).

Employees’ intention to stay can be strengthened by providing valid reasons for employees’ values for working and living (Flowers & Hughes, 1973). Millennials are unique, essential, and engaged in social and future developments, and they have also grown through regulation and security instruments (Frian & Mulyani, 2018). Family time is a priority for the millennial employees’ for this reason; companies should focus not only on giving flexible hours for millennial employees but also in practices that support work-life interference. The human resources that practice enhancing work-life balance motivate millennial employees and should increase intentions to stay (Calderon, Garcia, & Gallo, 2018).

Creating a happy and healthy work environment to maintain a work-life balance is essential. A work environment that supports millennials’ lifestyles can be one of the factors to have a more productive workforce in the current contemporary era (Kohl, 2018). The culture of a company nowadays that forces its employees to work 24/7 is aligned with the evolution of technology. To be productive and physically and mentally refreshed, employees should separate work and their personal lives. (Zimmerman, 2017).

Boamah and Laschinger (2015) found that work-life interference positively impacts employee turnover intention. They suggested to organizations to promote a family-friendly work environment and flexibility in work schedules to suppress the turnover intention rate.

In Indonesia, there have not been many studies covering work-life interference as a factor affecting millennial employee intention to stay in a company. Hence, this research fills this gap, and the research hypothesis is formulated below.
H3: Work-life interference has a negative influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay in a company. The research model is presented below.
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**Figure 1: Research Theoretical Framework**

From the model shown above, it can be implied that there are two independent variables that have a positive influence and one independent variable that has a negative influence on the intention to stay of millennial employees. These factors will be examined in three main company sectors in Indonesia: oil and gas (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam), airline (Garuda Indonesia), and FMCG (P&G, Nestle, Unilever).

The employee turnover rate has a direct impact not only on company revenue and profitability, but also low workplace morale and a decrease in the service or product quality (Markovich, 2019). Companies need to maintain the turnover rate every year to provide a higher quality workforce that will positively affect the overall company performance.

**Material and Methods**

A quantitative approach is used in this study to assess the relationship between independent variables (salary and compensation, employee development and training, work-life interference) and the dependent variable (intention to stay). The study of intention to stay is a correlational study and a non-contrived study setting with minimal interference of the researchers. The data is collected just once or called as a cross-sectional study.

**Sampling**

The object of this research will be millennial employees from three company businesses in Indonesia, including oil and gas (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam), airline (Garuda Indonesia), and FMCG (P&G, Nestle,
Unilever). These three company sectors are selected as they are categorized as three big industries in Indonesia and they represent both service (airline) and goods industries (oil & gas and FMCG). In addition, it is also found that the turnover rate of the millennial employees in these sectors is quite high (8-10% per year) according to Linkedin Talent Solution (2018). It is worthy to study the factors affecting millennial employee intention to stay in these three company sectors. The unit analysis is the individual employees categorized as the millennial generation in the companies mentioned earlier.

An online questionnaire link will be sent to some online communication groups of each employee (i.e. WhatsApp and Facebook groups). Hence, the communication groups serve as the sampling frame.

The numbers of employees from each company (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam, Garuda Indonesia, Unilever, Nestle, and P&G) are 1885, 16647, 3400, 5922, and 500 respectively. The total number of employees from these sectors is 28354. The proportion of millennial employees is assumed to be similar to the proportion of the Indonesian millennial workforce from the Central Bureau of Statistics which is 32% from the total workforce. Hence, the total number of millennial employees from these companies is 9074 (32% from 28354 employees). For this research, the target sample size based on the population number (~10000) in referring to guidelines from Krejcie and Morgan (1970) is 370 samples.

The sampling design used in this research is convenience sampling which is more commonly used and less costly (Calderon et al., 2018; Frian & Mulyani, 2018).

Table 1 offers a socio-demographic profile of the participating respondents. The sample was dominated by female respondents (61.3%). The majority of the respondents were in the 30-35 age group (50%) and 66% were married. The number of children varied proportionally, and the majority were Bachelor’s Degree graduates with monthly incomes above 20 million IDR. However, the majority were also non-managerial positions and had working experience of more than three years. The percentages of respondents from each company (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam, Garuda, and FMCG) are 41.9%, 36.3%, and 21.8% respectively.
Table 1. Respondents’ Socio-Demographic Profile

|                          | n | %    |
|--------------------------|---|------|
| **Gender:**              |   |      |
| Female                   | 76| 61.3%
| Male                     | 48| 38.7%
| **Age:**                 |   |      |
| 23-29                    | 43| 34.7%
| 30-38                    | 81| 65.3%
| **Marital Status:**      |   |      |
| Married                  | 83| 66.9%
| Single                   | 41| 33.1%
| **Child Status:**        |   |      |
| 0                        | 63| 50.8%
| ≥ 1                      | 61| 49.2%
| **Education level:**     |   |      |
| ≤ Diploma                | 28| 22.6%
| ≥ Bachelor’s Degree      | 96| 77.4%
| **Company Sector:**      |   |      |
| Pertamina Hulu Mahakam   | 52| 41.9%
| Garuda                   | 45| 36.3%
| FMCG                     | 27| 21.8%
| **Position:**            |   |      |
| Managerial               | 23| 18.5%
| Non-Managerial           | 101| 81.5%
| **Monthly Income:**      |   |      |
| < 20 Million IDR         | 47| 37.9%
| > 20 Million IDR         | 77| 62.1%
| **Working Experience:**  |   |      |
| < 1 year                 | 19| 15.3%
| > 3 years                | 105| 84.7%

The total number of respondents is 124, which is only 33.5% from the targeted samples (370). However, based on Hair (2014), the minimum sample size for an exploratory factor analysis is 50. Hence, the total respondents still met the cut off value.

**Data Collection**

The data for the main study was collected from June to July 2019 with online surveys. Several millennial research topics, such as research by Calderon et al. (2018) and Friand and Mulyani (2018) used online
questionnaires. Online questionnaires were selected as they provide more access to people or groups, have faster distribution, and are less costly (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The questionnaire link was distributed to several online employee group chats (i.e. WhatsApp and Facebook), and there were no incentives given to the respondents after completing the surveys.

**Measure**

The measure of each variable is presented below.

**Intention to Stay**
The questionnaire questions addressing millennial employees’ intention to stay were adopted from Kuo et al. (2018). There were three items of intention to stay with five-point Likert scale statements. The scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire items can be found in Appendix A.

**Salary and Compensation**
Salary and compensation questionnaire questions were also adopted from Kuo et al. (2018). There were 18 salary and question items with a five-point Likert scale. No scale items had a reverse score. A Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was used to verify the reliability of each construct, while a factor analysis verified the validity. The questionnaire items for salary and compensation are available in Appendix A.

**Employee Development**
Employee development questionnaire questions were adopted from Johari et al. (2018). There were five items with a five-point Likert scale. The questionnaire items are listed in Appendix A.

**Work-Life Interference**
This work-life interference was adopted from Cheng et al. (2018). There were five items for this variable with a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (almost always) for question numbers 1-4 and a scale ranging from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied) for question no 5. Question number 5 was reverse coded.
The questionnaire questions as adopted from Cheng et al. (2018) are summarized in Appendix A.
In addition to the operational measures above, the respondent profiles were inquired, consisting of gender, age, marital status, etc.
Data Analysis
The responses given by each respondent were averaged and the reliability of each construct was verified by using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, while the construct validity was checked by using a factor analysis (KMO and Bartlett’s test, communalities, and component matrix). In order to observe the relationship between independent variables (salary and compensation, employee development, and work-life interference) and the dependent variable (millenial employees’ intention to stay), a multiple regression analysis was used, and the analysis was conducted using SPSS 24.

The variable definition for this research is shown in the following table.

Table 2. Variable Definition

| Variable | Definition | Variable Name          |
|----------|------------|------------------------|
| DV       | Dependent variable | Intention to Stay INTENTION (INT) |
| IV1      | Independent variable 1 | Salary and compensation SALARY (SAL) |
| IV2      | Independent variable 2 | Employee Development DEVELOPMENT (DEV) |
| IV3      | Independent variable 3 | Work Life Interference WORK INTERFERENCE (WI) |

Results
Validity and Reliability of Measurements
Some instruments such as SAL12 and SAL18 are not valid based on the validity test. Hence, these items are not in the assessment. The validity test results are shown below.
## Table 3. Validity Test Results

| Test and Construct | KMO Result | INT   | SAL   | DEV   | WI    | Component Matrix |
|--------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
|                    | 0.728      | 0.899 | 0.771 | 0.767 |       |                  |
| **Communalities**  |            |       |       |       |       |                  |
| INT1               | 0.748      |       |       |       |       | 0.865            |
| INT2               | 0.809      |       |       |       |       | 0.899            |
| INT3               | 0.773      |       |       |       |       | 0.879            |
| SAL1               | 0.832      |       |       |       |       | 0.776            |
| SAL2               | 0.745      |       |       |       |       | 0.763            |
| SAL3               | 0.543      |       |       |       |       | 0.687            |
| SAL4               | 0.602      |       |       |       |       | 0.728            |
| SAL5               | 0.87       |       |       |       |       | 0.746            |
| SAL6               | 0.755      |       |       |       |       | 0.753            |
| SAL7               | 0.622      |       |       |       |       | 0.736            |
| SAL8               | 0.654      |       |       |       |       | 0.721            |
| SAL9               | 0.624      |       |       |       |       | 0.633            |
| SAL10              | 0.769      |       |       |       |       | 0.789            |
| SAL11              | 0.82       |       |       |       |       | 0.808            |
| SAL13              | 0.566      |       |       |       |       | 0.605            |
| SAL14              | 0.772      |       |       |       |       | 0.744            |
| SAL15              | 0.751      |       |       |       |       | 0.705            |
| SAL16              | 0.524      |       |       |       |       | 0.697            |
| SAL17              | 0.335      |       |       |       |       | 0.549            |
| DEV1               |            | 0.66  |       |       |       | 0.813            |
| DEV2               |            | 0.775 |       |       |       | 0.88             |
| DEV3               |            | 0.75  |       |       |       | 0.866            |
| DEV4               |            | 0.576 |       |       |       | 0.759            |
| DEV5               |            | 0.622 |       |       |       | 0.788            |
| WI1                |            |       | 0.668 |       |       | 0.786            |
| WI2                |            |       | 0.612 |       |       | 0.78             |
| WI3                |            |       | 0.664 |       |       | 0.802            |
| WI4                |            |       | 0.534 |       |       | 0.729            |
| WI5                |            |       | 0.973 |       |       | 0.962            |


Cronbach’s alpha was used to verify the accuracy of the constructs. Cronbach’s alpha values for each variable are INT = 0.856, SAL = 0.936, DEV = 0.879, and WI = 0.707. Cronbach’s alpha usually has a lesser limit of 0.7 (Hair, 2014). All coefficients of the reliability are above the limit, so all the remaining instruments are valid and reliable.

**Hypothesis Testing**

There were three hypotheses proposed in this study. A multiple regression analysis in SPSS version 24 was conducted to test the hypotheses. Hair et al. (2014) proposed that 1.645 with $\alpha = 0.05$ would be the critical t-value for a one-tailed test. The results of the testing are shown in the following table;

| IV        | Standardized coefficients (Beta) | t-test | p-value | Hypothesis testing results |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------|---------|---------------------------|
| SAL (IV1) | 0.368                           | 4.88   | 0       | Supported                 |
| DEV (IV2) | 0.418                           | 5.515  | 0       | Supported                 |
| WI (IV3)  | -0.155                          | -2.311 | 0.023   | Supported                 |
| DV = INT  | R2 = 0.468, F = 35.23, p-value = 0.000 |

From the above table, it is shown that all the hypotheses in this study are supported (all p-values < $\alpha$). It is also shown that among all the independent variables, DEV has the most significant influence towards INT (t-test = 5.515).

The R2 shows that three predictors can explain 46.8% of the variance in the dependent variable, while the other 53.2% were influenced by the variables that were excluded in this research.

**Discussion**

This study tested the relationship between three factors (salary and compensation, employee development, and work-life interference) with intention to stay of millennial employees in three company sectors (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam, Garuda, and FMCG). This study gives insights for the companies on which factors should be attenuated to retain their millennial employees, as this generation will soon dominate the workforce in Indonesia. Multiple linear regression results showed that all hypotheses were supported.
The first factor analyzed was salary and compensation which had a positive influence on intention to stay for millennial employees. This finding is supported by the findings from Kuo et al. (2018), Muslim et al. (2018), and Johari et al. (2012). Millennials perceived salary and compensation as an important factor to fulfill their basic needs and to support their lifestyles (Kuo et al., 2018). A millennial survey conducted by RobertWalters (2017) also mentioned that 25% of millennials will change their current jobs if the pay offered by another company is higher. Hence, it turns out that salary and compensation are still attractive factors for millennial employees to stay in a company.

The second factor analyzed was employee development. Employee development had a positive influence towards intention to stay. This data gives a compatible reason with the findings from Wen et al. (2018), Frian and Mulyani (2018), and Othman and Lembang (2017). In this study, development had the most significant factor among the others. Othman and Lembang (2017) proposed that a possible explanation was that when applying for a new job, millennials regarded training and growth as a method to improve their skills, understanding, and credentials. Employees who have not made enough strides, opportunities for development, and the ability to promote their expertise are most likely to quit their present work (Frian & Mulyani, 2018). Besides that, Deloitte Millenial Survey (2018) suggested that millennials are looking for employers that are able to give them the skills they require to succeed in Industry 4.0.

The last factor reviewed was the work-life interference. It is the inversion concept of work-life balance. The regression results showed that work-life interference negatively influenced millennial employees’ intention to stay. The findings of Wen et al. (2018) and Buzza (2017) also endorsed this research outcome. Millennials are known as being more family-oriented and more flexible compared to the other generations as they hope to “work to live” rather than “live to work” (Wyatt, 2014). According to Wen et al. (2018), having a work-life balance for employees could assist a business to improve the well-being of employees, which in turn contributes to the commitment and productivity of employees. A high level of interference between work and life is associated with work discontent, absenteeism, as well as physical and psychological issues among employees (Boamah & Laschinger, 2015).

In addition to the hypothesis testing above, an independent sample t-test (assuming equal variances) for differences in the mean scores of the socio-demographic respondents was also conducted. It was done to
observe if there was a significant difference of each variable towards the respondent profile. The results are shown below.

Table 5. Significance Test Results of Each Variable and its Demographic Profile

|    | n  | %   | Mean INT | SD INT | Mean SAL | SD SAL | Mean DEV | SD DEV | Mean WI | SD WI |
|----|----|-----|----------|--------|----------|--------|----------|--------|----------|-------|
| Gender |    |     |          |        |          |        |          |        |          |       |
| Female | 7  | 61.3| 3.13     | 0.8    | 3.28     | 0.60   | 3.7      | 0.7    | 3.45     | 0.7   |
|        | 6  |     | 6        | 38     | 7        | 5      | 53       | 35     | 8        | 48    |
| Male   | 4  | 38.7| 3.09     | 0.9    | 2.87     | 0.72   | 3.3      | 0.8    | 3.27     | 0.6   |
|        | 8  |     | 0        | 60     | 1        | 2      | 92       | 66     | 5        | 60    |
|        |    |     | p-value = 0.780 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.000 (significant) |     | p-value = 0.014 (significant) |     | p-value = 0.168 (not significant) |   |
| Age    |    |     |          |        |          |        |          |        |          |       |
| 23-29  | 4  | 34.3| 3.14     | 0.8    | 3.27     | 0.63   | 3.6      | 0.8    | 3.47     | 0.7   |
|        | 3  |     | 7        | 59     | 3        | 0      | 88       | 16     | 0        | 56    |
| 30-38  | 8  | 65.1| 3.10     | 0.9    | 3.04     | 0.69   | 3.5      | 0.8    | 3.34     | 0.6   |
|        | 1  |     | 3        | 02     | 8        | 8      | 73       | 01     | 3        | 98    |
|        |    |     | p-value = 0.791 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.079 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.449 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.352 (not significant) |   |
| Marital Status |    |     |          |        |          |        |          |        |          |       |
| Married | 8  | 66.9| 3.07     | 0.9    | 3.12     | 0.71   | 3.6      | 0.7    | 3.34     | 0.7   |
|        | 3  |     | 6        | 07     | 0        | 5      | 48       | 62     | 0        | 31    |
| Single | 4  | 33.1| 3.20     | 0.8    | 3.13     | 0.61   | 3.5      | 0.8    | 3.48     | 0.6   |
|        | 1  |     | 3        | 40     | 9        | 4      | 41       | 90     | 3        | 90    |
|        |    |     | p-value = 0.454 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.885 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.489 (not significant) |     | p-value = 0.298 (not significant) |   |
| Child Status |    |     |          |        |          |        |          |        |          |       |
### Education Level

|                | < Diploma | > Bachelor's Degree |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Diploma        | 2 8       | 9 6                 |
| 22.6           | 3.53 6    | 2.99 7              |
| 0.5 90         | 3.34 4    | 0.9 20              |
| 3.43 8         | 3.06 3    | 0.72 7              |
| 4.0 36         | 3.4 90    | 0.8 34              |
| 0.5 14         | 3.65 7    | 0.6 84              |
| Company Sector |           |                     |
| Pertamina Hulu Mahakam | 5 2 | 41.9 | 2.90 4 | 0.8 56 | 2.89 3 | 0.68 3 | 3.2 73 | 0.7 89 | 3.20 8 | 0.6 92 |
| Garuda         | 4 5       | 36.3 0              | 3.20 3 | 0.9 22 | 3.20 0 | 0.51 9 | 3.8 40 | 0.7 65 | 3.66 7 | 0.5 83 |
| FMCG           | 2 7       | 21.8 5              | 3.39 1 | 0.7 95 | 3.45 1 | 0.77 1 | 3.8 89 | 0.6 73 | 3.26 7 | 0.8 43 |

### Company Sector

|                | Pertamina VS Garuda | Garuda VS FMCG |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Pertamina Hulu Mahakam | p-value = 0.105 (not significant) | p-value = 0.365 (not significant) |
| Garuda         | p-value = 0.16 (significant) | p-value = 0.020 (significant) |
| FMCG           | p-value = 0.001 (significant) | p-value = 0.147 (not significant) |

| p-value | (significant) | (not significant) | (significant) | (not significant) |
|---------|---------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|
| 0.233   |               |                  | 0.031         |                  |
| 0.788   |               |                  | 0.031         |                  |
| 0.400   |               |                  | 0.023         |                  |
| 0.147   |               |                  | 0.020         |                  |
### Position

|          | Manage rial | Non-Manage rial | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     |
|----------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|          | 2.3         | 1.0             | 0.0087      | 0.0000      | 0.178       | 0.235       |
|          | 3.551       | 3.020           | (significant)| (significant)| (not significant) | (not significant) |
|          | 0.782       | 0.879           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.601       | 3.018           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.551       | 0.663           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.817       | 3.566           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.751       | 0.813           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.226       | 3.424           |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.737       | 0.712           |             |             |             |             |

### Monthly Income

|          | < 20 Million IDR | > 20 Million IDR | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     |
|----------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|          | 4.7              | 7.7              | 0.104       | 0.551       | 0.716       | 0.281       |
|          | 37.9             | 62.1             | (not significant) | (not significant) | (not significant) | (not significant) |
|          | 3.284             | 3.017             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.808             | 0.917             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.173             | 3.097             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.625             | 0.715             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.647             | 3.592             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.869             | 0.768             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.298             | 3.442             |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.767             | 0.686             |             |             |             |             |

### Working Experience

|          | < 1 year | > 3 years | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     | p-value     |
|----------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|          | 1.9      | 1.0       | 0.337       | 0.126       | 0.545       |             |
|          | 15.3     | 84.7      | (not significant) | (not significant) | (not significant) |             |
|          | 3.298     | 3.086     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.761     | 0.903     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.411     | 3.074     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.567     | 0.689     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.874     | 3.566     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.890     | 0.784     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 3.295     | 3.404     |             |             |             |             |
|          | 0.875     | 0.689     |             |             |             |             |
From the table above, it is shown that most of the t-tests showed there were no significant differences of each variable towards its respondent profile. However, a difference was shown in the company sector of Pertamina Hulu Mahakam that millennial employees had a lower intention to stay, perception of development, lower salary and compensation, and work-life interference compared to Garuda and FMCG employees.

Conclusions and Implications
For each company, Human Resources, and other researchers in Indonesia, this research has significant implications. The study indicates that employee development as well as salary and compensation have a positive influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay in three company sectors (Pertamina Hulu Mahakam, Garuda, and FMCG). Companies should provide better and fair pay to retain their millennial employees.
A business should also invest in employee development as a means of reducing employees' probability of feeling the need to seek other employment (Wen et al., 2018) and eventually stay dedicated to the business itself. Since employee development constitutes the most important impact on the millennials’ intention to stay, employee development should therefore be a top priority for these three business industries regardless of how it is done.
Work-life interference, as confirmed by this study, has a negative influence on millennial employees’ intention to stay in the three company sectors. Hence, these companies should support the work-life balance implementation to keep their employees. Companies may improve the work-life balance by encouraging work coaching from senior to younger employees, promoting flexible working arrangements, ensuring the workloads are fairly distributed, offering a family-friendly work environment, promoting an open and collaborative organizational culture, and promoting a healthy lifestyle, art, and others (Kumar & Velmurugan, 2018).

Limitation and Suggestions for Future Research
Several limitations are found in this research. Firstly, the number of respondents could not achieve the target due to time constraints and respondent reluctance to respond to the questionnaire. Secondly, this study only focused on three company sectors, which are Pertamina Hulu Mahakam, Garuda, and FMCG. Hence, it cannot be generalized to other company sector millennial employees. Lastly, this research is restricted
to only three factors where from the R2 value (Table 4), only 46.8 percent of the variance in stay intention can be explained by salary and compensation, employee development, and work-life interference. Other variances of 53.2 percent could be clarified by other factors not included in this research.

For future research, it is suggested to examine intention to stay in broader company sectors and to study other variables that might increase the accuracy of the study such as perceived leadership style, career progression, recognition of individual achievement, and organizational commitment.
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Appendix A. Items Used in Measuring Intention to Stay, Salary and Compensation, Employee Development, Work-Life Interference

Intention to Stay
The questionnaire items related to intention to stay given by Kuo et al. (2018) are as follows (scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).
If I were completely free to choose, I would prefer to continue working in this organization (INT1).
As far as I can see, I would remain in this organization indefinitely (INT2).
I expect to continue working as long as possible in this organization (INT3).

Salary and Compensation
The questionnaire questions related to salary and compensation developed by Kuo et al. (2018) are as follows (scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).
I am satisfied with my take-home pay (SAL1).
I am satisfied with my benefit packages (SAL2).
I am satisfied with my most recent raise (SAL3).
I am satisfied with the influence my supervisor has on my pay (SAL4).
I am satisfied with my current salary (SAL5).
I am satisfied with the amount the company pays toward my benefits (SAL6).
I am satisfied with the raises I have typically received in the past (SAL7).
I am satisfied with the company’s pay structure (SAL8).
I am satisfied with the information the company gives about pay issues of concern to me (SAL9).
I am satisfied with my overall level of pay (SAL10).
I am satisfied with the value of my benefits (SAL11).
I am satisfied with the pay of other jobs in the company (SAL12).
I am satisfied with the consistency of the company’s pay policies (SAL13).
I am satisfied with the size of my current salary (SAL14).
I am satisfied with the number of benefits I receive (SAL15).
I am satisfied with how my raises are determined (SAL16).
I am satisfied with the differences in pay among jobs in the company (SAL17).
I am satisfied with how the company administers pay (SAL18).

Employee Development
The questionnaire items related to employee development given by Kuo et al. (2018) are as follows (scale 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).
I am given opportunities to upgrade my knowledge (DEV1).
I am given opportunities to upgrade my skills (DEV2).
I am given opportunities to upgrade my performance through continuous training (DEV3).
I received necessary training to perform my job well (DEV4).
I am given the opportunity to be involved in activities that promote my professional development (DEV5).

Work-Life Interference
In relation to the balance between your work and the rest of your life, how often does your work (scale 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = every once in a while, 4 = sometimes, 5 = almost always):
Interfere with your responsibilities or activities outside of work (WI1).
Keep you from spending the amount of time you would like with family or friends (WI2).
Interfere with your ability to develop or maintain connections and friendships in your community (WI3).
Thinking about your life in general, how often do you feel rushed or pressed for time (WI4)? (scale 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = every once in a while, 4 = sometimes, 5 = almost always)
Thinking about your life right now, how satisfied are you with the balance between your work and the rest of your life (WI5)? (scale 1 = not at all satisfied, 2 = slightly satisfied, 3 = somewhat satisfied, 4 = satisfied, 5 = very satisfied, reverse coded).