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ABSTRACT

This study used the Partial Least Squares (PLS) method to investigate the influence of work-life balance (WLB) on individual well-being (career satisfaction and psychological well-being) among an Open Distance Learning (ODL) university’s staff. Furthermore, the moderating effects of supervisor support and family support on the relationship between WLB and both components of individual well-being were also examined. Data were collected via an online survey, in which 94 academic, academic support, and operational staff working in one of Malaysia’s ODL universities took part. The findings confirmed that the WLB of this institution’s employees influenced their career satisfaction and psychological well-being. Besides that, supervisor support and family support were found not to moderate the relationship between WLB and individual well-being. In addition, the findings have contributed to an improved understanding of the WLB of an ODL university’s staff.

Keywords: Work-life balance; Individual well-being; Supervisor support; Family support.

1. INTRODUCTION

In Malaysia, public and private universities are experiencing an intense growth of student enrolment, course expansion in numerous fields, and a rise in Internet and web-based education (Wan, 2018). This change is due to a variety of drivers, which include demand pressures, a shift in a cultural aspect in which higher education is regarded, financial demands, structural and managerial diversity, and redefining the university mission or emphasis (Ehlenz, 2018). Nevertheless, demanding too much from both the academic and administrative staff can cause uncertainty concerning the management of their work and personal life, and this should be made
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known to each stakeholder including the government, policymakers, university management, and society.

As reported in a study by Goh, Ilies, and Wilson (2015), for those who are interested in work-life quality and its relation to broadening the quality of life, the art of balancing work and personal life has always been a concern. Also, in Galea, Houkes, and De Rijk (2014), the real test and effect on an individual’s satisfaction in his or her work and personal life’s roles are believed to be achieved through striking a balance between a successful career and a content personal or family life. Significant triggers that influence academic and administrative staff who juggle multiple workplace roles, paired with organisational and community pressures are probably deemed as a threat to their state of perceived work-life balance (WLB). Thus, eventually, this will influence their individual well-being, which includes career satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Scholars view career satisfaction as a subjective indicator of career success because it can portray a person’s attitude towards his or her career according to personal appraisals. As stated by Kang, Gatling, and Kim (2015), satisfaction is measured through global career success or via intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of one’s career like pay, promotion, and developmental opportunities. Psychological well-being is combining feeling good and being able to function well. The definition of psychological well-being could be derived based on the overall effectiveness of a person’s psychological functioning (DiRenzo, 2010; Berkman, 1971a, 1971b). Individuals are not required to feel good at all times. Hurtful emotions like disappointment, failure, and sorrow are part of what people experience in their daily life and handling these negative feelings is a vital skill to ensure long-term stability.

Various scholars concur that WLB is imperative due to its association with a person’s psychological well-being and a general sense of harmony in life, indicating a balance between roles at the workplace and family (Direnzo, Greenhaus, & Weer, 2015). Moen et al. (2017) stated that support from both the supervisor and family in the form of positive reinforcements and cooperation when employees face an imbalance between workplace role and role in their family, may inspire them in their work, become more energetic, and empower them to succeed.

Universities compete with each other as a result of globalisation, demographics, technology, accountability, and the latest pedagogical approaches. Such new changes could influence the workload of academic and non-academic staff and the universities’ management and culture. Mazuki et al. (2017) have indicated that the requirement to enhance quality assurance and student support concerns the workload of academic staff, which also includes the struggles they face daily, for example, the large student to staff ratio. On the other hand, administrative staff’s role has widened to a broader scope and an enhanced responsibility comprising quality assurance, provide support for teaching and research, finance and facility management, and master planning (Jung & Shin, 2015).

Open Distance Learning (ODL) institutions are not omitted from experiencing changes in its management and culture. These universities are undergoing medium-scale organisational transformations, which encompass physical and lean resource management restructuring and developing more varied and tailored lifelong learning services for regional and intended worldwide outreach. All these are done to improve and gain advantages, whether competitively or sustainably, to fully capitalise its tagline, i.e. affordability, flexibility, and accessibility.
In the quest of attaining quality programmes such as delivery and learning support, relevant jobholders and systems must be effectively mobilised, regardless of time convenience, which might require working after office hours. For example, the rising demand for online delivery, academic staff-student ratios and student-support, management of many part-time staff (tutors), reasonably high level of digital literacy requirements, and the rise of the 24/7 work culture in support services are requiring ODL institutions to remain competitive. Moreover, the growing demand for accountability, governance, managerialism, and profitability and the pressure to produce research outputs are translated into more workload for both academic and administrative staff.

Hence, employees are highly required to go above and beyond to meet the university’s expectations, which could lead to an imbalance in their WLB. Workers could experience frustration, which would then cause them to become uninspired and disempowered leading to increased absenteeism, high turnover, subpar job performance, and ‘presenteeism’ or being present physically at work but working with less productivity. The Human Resource Department’s statistics have shown an increase in employees’ medical leave (18% in 2015 compared to 15% in 2014) and higher staff turnover (16.2% in 2014 to 20.3% in 2015). On the other hand, a higher retention rate of 59% was noted among administrative staff in comparison to 35% among academic staff with the same tenure. From the academic perspective, Li, Burch, and Lee (2017) have highlighted that when employees are wrestling to maintain composure in dealing with job complexities, a feeling of meaningless might strike. Meanwhile, Allan et al. (2018) has explained that meaningful work could cause eustress that can promote satisfaction, even if the situation is challenging. Eustress presents the level of cognitive appraisal when dealing with situations that can either benefit or enhance staff’s psychological well-being.

Most studies on WLB and well-being have emphasised on work-family conflict and its impact on life satisfaction, physical and mental health, and organisational commitment. There are several studies that investigated university staff’s capability in stabilising and resolving work-life conflicts (Bohle, 2016). Most of the research conducted that focused on ODL universities involved countries like South Africa (Bezuidenhout, 2015) and Namibia (Brown, Lewin, & Shikongo, 2014), while research in Malaysia was conducted based on conventional universities only. Therefore, this present study aimed to fill the research gap in WLB impacting individual well-being, particularly in the context of Malaysian ODL universities. The assumption made was that university employees will have a better WLB if they are highly satisfied with their work and are contented. WLB is attainable when workers feel energetic, are stimulated by their job, and feel happy both at home and work. Therefore, this present study’s objective to examine the relationship between WLB and individual well-being (career satisfaction and psychological well-being) is timely. This research also aimed to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning support from both supervisor and family.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Work-Life Balance (WLB)

WLB may influence the attitude of employees towards their organisation. Deery and Jago (2015) believe that the WLB trend that could have leverage on workers’ well-being and job outcomes can
be probed. Issues pertaining to obtaining and sustaining a WLB have over the years received substantial scrutiny, however, this has not materialised in the higher education sector. WLB is a concept that is complex and can be seen from a ‘work’, ‘life’, and ‘balance’ standpoint (Direnzo, 2010). On the other hand, Ilies et al. (2017) have conceptualised WLB as the point in which an individual is equally engaged and feel fulfilled with their participation as an employee or family member. As such, an individual who has achieved high WLB may display equal investment of time and commitment to both the work and non-work domains. Basińska-Zych and Springer (2017) examined layoff survivors in a high technological organisation and determined that WLB was positively associated with job satisfaction. In another study conducted among police personnel, it was deduced that work-family conflict was significantly related to job satisfaction. Next, Kim (2014), who studied employee satisfaction, HR practices, and commitment, discovered that WLB was linked with organisational commitment and demonstrated that the organisation’s efforts, which helped workers attain a balance between work and home life, was linked to the commitment from all groups of employees.

2.2. Career Satisfaction

Career satisfaction is derived from the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of an individual’s career, which comprises of pay, advancement, and developmental opportunities (Kuvaas et al., 2017). The perceived career satisfaction of workers shows how they feel regarding their career-related roles, accomplishments, and success. A key predictor of career success is career satisfaction, which can be conceptualised as encompassing both extrinsic and intrinsic outcomes and calculated using both objective and subjective indicators (Otto et al., 2017). Objective career success indicates an ‘external perspective that delineates more or less tangible indicators of an individual’s career situation’ including salary, promotion, family structure, and job level. Alternatively, subjective career success is defined as ‘individuals’ feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction with their careers’ and is commonly measured using career satisfaction (Martínez-León, Olmedo-Cifuentes, & Ramón-Llorens, 2018). Subjective measures of career success have become more important (Dahling & Lauricella, 2017) and career satisfaction is one of its crucial predictors, which ultimately is the focus of this study.

2.3. Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being, a subjective concept, has a close relationship with quality of life. Quality of life can be described as a ‘composite measure of physical, mental and social well-being, happiness and satisfaction involving many life situations, such as health, marriage, family, work, finance, education opportunities, self-esteem, creativity and trust in others’ (DiRenzo, 2010). On the other hand, Yap et al. (2017) stated that the key aspect of subjective well-being comprises ‘subjectivity, positive measure and global assessment of all aspects of a person’s life’. Psychological well-being is seen as an amalgamation of feeling satisfied and being able to effectively serve customers. It is conceptualised as the ‘overall effectiveness of an individual’s psychological functioning’ (Rahim, 2017; Berkman, 1971a). Nonetheless, psychological well-being work side by side with negative emotions and may interfere with an individual’s capability to function in his or her everyday life. Warr (1990) has explained that the concept of feeling good includes positive emotions such as happiness and contentment and other emotions like interest, engagement, confidence, and affection. Looking at the psychological perspective, it involves the development of a person’s potential, including setting limitations on his or her life, having a sense
of purpose like working towards goals, and experiencing positive relationships (Kringelbach & Berridge, 2017).

2.4. Supervisor Support

According to Pandey, Schulz, and Camp (2018), supervisor support usually includes showing concern for and motivating workers, supplying important resources, a structured work environment, feedback, opportunities for career advancement, information, and help to cope with work-related stress. Besides, supervisor support could be more crucial to the workers compared to other sources of support due to the supervisor’s position of power and hierarchical standing in the organisation (Sguera et al., 2017). Moreover, Holland, Cooper, and Sheehan (2017) have emphasised on the significance of supervisor support on career satisfaction whilst observing that supervisor support is vital for early career success by raising workers’ self-awareness and personal goal setting. The authors further stated that when supervisors inform workers regarding career advancement opportunities and learn about their career goals, the turnover rate can be lower while performance can be enhanced.

2.5. Family Support

In western countries, family support has become a vital form of social support (Verma, Bhal, & Vrat, 2018). As stated by Kalliath et al. (2018), family support is an important resource that forms feelings such as love, care, etc. Positivity like this aids an employee to more efficiently transfer resources obtained in the family domain to the work domain. Moreover, it could function as an extrinsic motivator since it can present key advice and affective resources, which will assist workers to attain their job goals. Pluut et al. (2018) have reported similar results, whereby they proposed that family support encourages workers, particularly those who belong to collectivistic societies to work harder.

2.6. Underlying Theories

The following subsections discuss the underlying theories that became the foundation for the research framework of this study.

2.6.1. Work-family Border Theory

Work-family border theory has contributed to a better understanding of the work-family interface; nevertheless, it lends itself to validation and expansion since it is new. This theory identifies role centrality as a key factor influencing experiences of work-family balance or conflict (Clark, 2000). However, Clark (2000) has conceptualised this relationship. It is therefore imperative that a clear understanding of the relationships between role centrality, work-family balance, and conflict be empirically established. Moreover, role centrality establishes the extent to which an individual can control his/her experiences of work-family balance or conflict.

2.6.2. Social Exchange Theory

According to the social exchange theory, when one party treats another well, the reciprocity norm obliges the return of favourable treatment (Kurtessis et al., 2017). Furthermore, building on the
norm of reciprocity, it is suggested that employees who perceive a high level of organisational support are more likely to feel an obligation to ‘repay’ the organisation in terms of affective commitment and work-related behaviour (Guest, 2017). That is, employees seek a balance in their exchange relationships with organisations and supervisors by having attitudes and behaviours that are commensurate with the degree of employer commitment to them as individuals.

2.7. Research Framework

Figure 1 illustrates this study’s research framework based on the work-family border theory and social exchange theory, comprising an independent variable (work-life balance), dependent variables (career satisfaction and psychological well-being), and moderating variables (supervisor support and family support).

![Figure 1: Research Framework](image)

2.8. Hypothesis Development

In this research, the hypotheses were formulated according to the research framework depicted in Figure 1. These hypotheses considered past empirical discoveries concerning the relationships among the variables, which were specifically selected to answer the research questions.

2.8.1. WLB and Well-Being

Previous researchers such as Karatepe and Karadas (2015) have highlighted that WLB practices adopted by organisations could increase the level of job/career satisfaction. Also, Shagvaliyeva and Yazdanifard (2014) have suggested that work-life imbalances result in high levels of anxiety,
depression, low quality of life, and reduced work effectiveness. On the other hand, Zheng et al. (2015) have emphasised that organisations’ WLB policies can decrease work and family conflict, which consequently increase job satisfaction. A satisfied employee has been found to be more committed and has a lower intention to leave besides showing high performance that can ultimately affect the bottom line (Karatepe & Karadas, 2015). Thus, WLB practices not only increase job satisfaction but can reduce the overall turnover intention of employees. As such, the following hypotheses were formulated:

**H1:** Work-life balance has a positive influence on career satisfaction

**H2:** Work-life balance has a positive influence on psychological well-being

### 2.8.2 WLB and Well-Being Moderated by Supervisor Support

As mentioned in Kalidass and Bahron (2015), supervisor support is claimed to be very important for subordinate work-related issues, but not all supervisors are supportive of their subordinates all the time. Supervisor support acts as an agent to communicate the organisation’s goals and values to subordinates and evaluate their performance. As stated by Kaldi and Xafakos (2017), subordinates’ organisation rewards, for example, merit pay and skill training, and working condition, like greater autonomy and recognition from upper-level management, are based on supervisor appraisals. Supervisors provide support in the presence of supportive behaviour, for instance, provide information, instrumental aid, and mentoring. Apart from leading to lower work-family conflict, supervisor support can also decrease stress level at work, increase affective organisational commitment, and enhance job satisfaction happiness (Ghazali, Nashuki, & Othman, 2018). Based on these findings, it was hypothesised that:

**H3:** Supervisor support moderates the relationship between work-life balance and career satisfaction

**H4:** Supervisor support moderates the relationship between work-life balance and psychological well-being

### 2.8.3 WLB and Well-Being Moderated by Family Support

According to Bagger and Li (2014), family members can provide instrumental support. For example, a spouse can help by assisting in day-to-day household activities, relieving employees’ household task, helping to take care of their children, and accommodating employees’ work requirement. Thus, employees can focus their time and preserve their energy for work. According to Mauno and Ruokolainen (2017), family support is an important resource that influences both life and job satisfaction. Support from family members comprises listening and sympathising with work-family struggles and offering guidance or recommendations to handle work-family conflict. Such support can also lower employees’ bad experiences and positively impact their lives and job satisfaction. On the other hand, Nielsen et al. (2017) described family support as family members accepting responsibilities to decrease the workload of other family members and is viewed as a vital factor that impacts both life and job satisfaction. Hence, the following hypotheses were formulated:
H5: Family support moderates the relationship between work-life balance and career satisfaction

H6: Family support moderates the relationship between work-life balance and psychological well-being

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Population and Sampling

This study’s population was 216 employees consisting of academic, academic support, and operational staff of a Malaysian ODL university. These staff were subjected to similar internal (company politics, performance management, and supervisor-subordinate relationship) and external (socio-cultural, economic, and technological) conditions.

In this study, purposive sampling was employed. This technique is restricted to a specific category of participants who can contribute information, whereby either they are the only individuals who can do so or conform to certain inclusion criteria set by the study (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). Every variable was measured at the individual level. Roscoe’s (1975) rule of thumb was employed to find out the minimum sample size, whereby a sample size of more than 30 and less than 500 was the most suitable, whereas the minimum sample size should be 30% of the population. Based on this rule, the sample size of 94 (44%) was considered apt for this study.

3.2. Data Collection Procedure

A quantitative method, i.e. questionnaire survey was used to collect data via SurveyMonkey. Along with the questionnaire, a cover letter illuminating the purpose of the study, the steps to complete the questionnaire, guarantee of confidentiality, and voluntary participation information were provided. The contents were organised based on the measures of independent, dependent, and moderating variable items as well as the demographic questions seeking information. Each respondent’s responses were computed and saved. Then, to perform quantitative analysis, the data were downloaded into SPSS 23.0 and Smart PLS M2 Version 3.0. Data collection was performed for three weeks in January 2017.

3.3. Measurement Items

The measures applied in this research were based on past studies with acceptable reliabilities. To measure the five items of WLB, scales developed by Greenhaus et al. (2004) were used. In this study, the coefficient alpha was determined to be 0.899. Career satisfaction was evaluated via the five items developed by Greenhaus et al. (1990), while for psychological well-being it was through the eight-item Index of Psychological Well-being established by Berkman (1971a, 1971b). The coefficient alpha for career satisfaction and psychological well-being was 0.901 and 0.872, respectively. For the moderating variable supervisor support, four items from Zimet et al. (1988) were employed to measure it. The other moderating variable, family support was evaluated via four items adapted from Rhoades et al. (2001). These moderating variables’ Cronbach’s alpha were 0.852 (supervisor support) and 0.893 (family support). Ratings for every variable in this research
were based on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). To better comprehend the samples, this research collected demographic information.

3.4. Data Analysis

Partial Least Squares (PLS) method was applied to analyse the research model. Based on the two-stage analytical procedure suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988), the measurement model (validity and reliability of the measures) was tested first, followed by the structural model (testing the hypothesised relationship). Smart PLS M2 version 3.0 and the two-step analysis approach were employed to perform data analysis. The significance of the path coefficients and loadings from the bootstrapping method (500 resamples) were utilised to find out the significance level for loadings, weights, and path coefficients.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Findings

In this section, respondents' demographic characteristics are presented (see Table 1). From 94 respondents, 72% were females, whereas 28% were males. Most respondents were aged between 35-44 (43%) years. Looking at qualifications, 45% were SPM holders. On the other hand, regarding employee grouping, most were operational staff (49%). Meanwhile, 40% had 4 to 7 years of working experience. For current position, 44% of respondents were in service between 4 to 7 years.

| Demographic characteristic | Category       | Frequency | (%) |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|-----|
| Gender                     | Male           | 26        | 28  |
|                            | Female         | 68        | 72  |
| Age                        | 25–34 years    | 23        | 24  |
|                            | 35–44 years    | 40        | 43  |
|                            | 45–54 years    | 23        | 24  |
|                            | Above 55 years | 8         | 9   |
| Highest level of education | SPM            | 6         | 6   |
|                            | Diploma        | 8         | 9   |
|                            | Bachelor's degree | 42      | 45  |
|                            | Master's degree | 28       | 30  |
|                            | Doctoral degree | 10       | 11  |
| Current position           | Academic       | 27        | 29  |
|                            | Academic support | 22      | 23  |
|                            | Operational    | 45        | 49  |
| Years of working experience| Less than 3 years | 24      | 26  |
|                            | 4 to 7 years   | 38        | 40  |
|                            | 8 to 10 years  | 19        | 20  |
|                            | Above 10 years | 13        | 14  |
|                            | Less than 3 years | 31      | 33  |
4.2. **Assessment of the Measurement Model**

The measurement model employed in this research comprised relationships among the latent variables and their (item) indicators. To test the hypotheses, it was necessary to first establish construct validity for the measurement model prior to evaluating the structural model. Construct validity was performed to determine the degree to which the indicators reflected their underlying constructs (latent variables). The measurement model items must show adequate convergent and discriminant validity as a condition for establishing construct validity. Factor loadings, composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) were utilised to evaluate convergent validity, as suggested by Hair et al. (2012).

4.2.1 **Convergent Validity**

Convergent validity, the extent to which multiple items are employed to measure the same concept, was in agreement. In this study, factor loadings, CR, and AVE were used to evaluate convergent validity (Hair et al., 2012). All the items’ loadings should be 0.50 or higher, or ideally, 0.7 or higher, while items with loadings lower than 0.5 should be removed (Hair et al., 2012). The measurement model’s results revealed that all the items had significant loadings, which ranged from 0.647 to 0.897. All the items in this research were determined to have fulfilled the internal consistency criteria with a CR value higher than 0.7, as proposed by Fornell and Larker (1981). Furthermore, the AVE value of every construct was more than the suggested benchmark value of 0.5 (Fornell & Larker, 1981). Even though the AVE value for psychological well-being (0.525) could be deemed relatively low, the value stayed within the guidelines recommended by Fornell and Larker (see Table 2).

| Construct           | Items  | Loadings | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | Composite Reliability (CR) |
|---------------------|--------|----------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Work-Life Balance   | WLB_1  | 0.819    | 0.712                           | 0.925                      |
|                     | WLB_2  | 0.861    |                                 |                            |
|                     | WLB_3  | 0.839    |                                 |                            |
|                     | WLB_4  | 0.865    |                                 |                            |
| Supervisor Support  | SS_1   | 0.872    | 0.698                           | 0.902                      |
|                     | SS_2   | 0.885    |                                 |                            |
|                     | SS_3   | 0.869    |                                 |                            |
|                     | SS_4   | 0.701    |                                 |                            |
| Family Support      | FS_1   | 0.864    | 0.757                           | 0.926                      |
|                     | FS_2   | 0.873    |                                 |                            |
|                     | FS_3   | 0.856    |                                 |                            |
|                     | FS_4   | 0.886    |                                 |                            |
Construct Items Loadings

Average Variance Extracted (AVE)\(^a\)

Composite Reliability (CR)\(^b\)

| Construct            | Items  | Loadings |                  |                  |
|----------------------|--------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| Career Satisfaction  | CSAT_1 | 0.847    | 0.717            | 0.927            |
|                      | CSAT_2 | 0.891    |                  |                  |
|                      | CSAT_3 | 0.897    |                  |                  |
|                      | CSAT_4 | 0.770    |                  |                  |
|                      | CSAT_5 | 0.823    |                  |                  |
| Psychological Well-Being | PsyWB_1 | 0.647 | 0.525 | 0.897 |
|                      | PsyWB_2 | 0.656 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_3 | 0.689 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_4 | 0.695 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_5 | 0.815 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_6 | 0.798 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_7 | 0.740 |                  |                  |
|                      | PsyWB_8 | 0.768 |                  |                  |

Notes:

\(a\) Average variance extracted (AVE) = \((\text{sum of the square of the factor loadings})/\{(\text{sum of the square of the factor loadings})/\{(\text{sum of the error variances})\}\)

\(b\) Composite reliability (CR) = \((\text{square of the sum of the factor loadings})/\{(\text{square of the sum of the factor loadings})/\{(\text{square of the error variances})\}\)

4.2.2 Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

Discriminant validity of the constructs was measured using cross-loadings, Fornell-Larcker criterion, and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT). HTMT is not a new method but Henseler et al. (2015) have proposed it as a new criterion for Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis. This suggestion was based on their findings that the two other methods lacked in reliability to detect discriminant validity. Their method is based on the multitrait-multimethod matrix and it measures the HTMT of correlations. Discriminant validity lacks if the absolute value of HTMT is higher than the threshold of value 0.85 or 0.90. In this study, all the values were more than 0.85, except for the connection between supervisor support (0.835), family support (0.847), and psychological well-being (0.794). Based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion, a close connection was seen between these three constructs. This might indicate a problem but since it was below the upper threshold of 0.90 and HTMT was regarded as the best criterion and all the cross-loadings were satisfactory as well, the discriminant validity was deemed good enough (see Table 3).

Table 3: Results of Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT)

| Construct          | (1)  | (2)  | (3)  | (4)  | (5)  |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| (1) Work-Life Balance |     | 0.402 | CI.\(0.90\) (0.302, 0.548) | 0.563 | 0.318 |
4.2.3. Common Method Variance

Harman’s single factor order test was performed using SPSS by running an exploratory factor analysis to determine the common method bias. To find out the distinct factors that could explain the majority of the variance in the variables, the unrotated factor solution was examined. From the factor analysis, five factors emerged. However, from the total variance of 65.9%, only 29.3% was accounted for by the factor with the highest variance. Hence, the findings revealed that the first factor accumulated lower than 50% of the total variance explained. Furthermore, there was no indication of whether a single factor emerged from the exploratory factor analysis or a single variable accounted for most of the covariance among items. As such, according to the guideline by Podsakoff et al. (2003), the common method variance (CMV) was not an issue in this study.

4.3. Assessment of the Structural Model

After assessing the measurement model, the structural model was analysed. This model comprised the hypothesised relationships between exogenous and endogenous variables (see Table 4). The two hypotheses testing the relationship between WLB and career satisfaction and WLB and psychological well-being were supported. WLB had a positive influence on career satisfaction ($\beta = 0.116, p < 0.05$). Likewise, WLB also had a positive influence on psychological well-being ($\beta = 0.082, p < 0.05$). These findings provided support for H1 and H2. Another four hypotheses were put forth to determine the moderating effect of supervisor support and family support on the relationship between WLB and individual well-being (career satisfaction and psychological well-being). Nevertheless, none of these hypotheses were supported: H3 ($\beta = -0.087, p > 0.1$), H4 ($\beta = -0.050, p > 0.1$), H5 ($\beta = -0.021, p > 0.1$), and H6 ($\beta = 0.125, p > 0.1$).

| Table 4: Path Coefficient and Hypotheses Testing |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| No              | Relationship    | Path Coefficient ($\beta$) | Std. Error     | t-value         | Decision        |
| H1              | WLB $\rightarrow$ CSAT | 0.116            | 0.053          | 2.182**         | Supported       |
| H2              | WLB $\rightarrow$ PsyWB | 0.082            | 0.049          | 1.676**         | Supported       |
| H3              | WLB*SS $\rightarrow$ CSAT | -0.087           | 0.138          | 0.633           | Not Supported   |
| H4              | WLB*SS $\rightarrow$ PsyWB | -0.050           | 0.168          | 0.301           | Not Supported   |
| H5              | WLB*FS $\rightarrow$ CSAT | -0.021           | 0.103          | 0.208           | Not Supported   |
| H6              | WLB*FS $\rightarrow$ PsyWB | 0.125            | 0.164          | 0.764           | Not Supported   |

Notes: ***$p < .01$ (2.33), **$p < .05$ (1.645), *$p < .1$ (1.28) (based on one-tailed test)
4.4. **Goodness of Fit (GoF) Index**

The Goodness of Fit (GoF) Index is employed to evaluate a model’s overall predictive performance (Tenenhaus et al., 2005). It is a geometric mean of the average communality and average $R^2$ for all the endogenous variables. Based on Wetzels et al. (2009), this research estimated a GoF value of 0.574, which surpassed the cut-off value of 0.36 that could serve as a cut-off value for global validation of PLS models. Thus, the findings implied that the model possessed a large prediction power compared with the baseline value (GoF small = 0.10, GoF medium = 0.25, GoF large = 0.36) (see Table 5).

![Table 5: Goodness of Fit (GoF) Index](image)

| Construct                       | AVE  | $R^2$ |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|
| Work-Life Balance               | 0.712| 0.319 |
| Supervisor Support              | 0.689| 0.301 |
| Family Support                  | 0.757| 0.619 |
| Career Satisfaction             | 0.717| 0.699 |
| Psychological Well-Being        | 0.525| 0.699 |
| **AVERAGE**                     | **0.680** | **0.485** |
| **GoF**                         |      | 0.574 |

*Notes: GoF = Square root of (Average AVE * Average $R^2$) = 0.574*

Even though the $R^2$ values in this study were relatively low, it is common to have $R^2$ values that are less than 50% when predicting human behaviour using models (Stone et al., 2013). This is attributed to the field of study as humans are simply harder to predict than, for example, physical processes. Hence, it is expected that the $R^2$ values are generally low.

5. **CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS**

The present study has examined the relationship between WLB and individual well-being (career satisfaction and psychological well-being). This study also investigated whether supervisor support and family support moderated the relationships between WLB and career satisfaction and WLB and psychological well-being.

This study has revealed that WLB had a positive influence on career satisfaction and psychological well-being. This result concurs with that of Karatepe and Karadas (2015) who reported that WLB practices implemented by organisations can increase job/career satisfaction level. Moreover, Shagvaliyeva and Yazdanifard (2014) have proposed that work-life imbalances cause high levels of anxiety and depression, low quality of life, and decreased work effectiveness. Thus, it can be assumed that the WLB policies of the examined institution managed to lower work and family conflict, which consequently increased job satisfaction. When employees are satisfied, they become more devoted to their job and organisation and have a lower intention to leave besides demonstrating higher performance.
The findings also exposed that supervisor support did not moderate the relationships between WLB and career satisfaction and WLB and psychological well-being. As mentioned by Qureshi and Hamid (2017), supervisors are accountable for their workers’ career, whereby they must allocate time to discuss the matter together to consider the steps to be taken for the sake of the workers’ development. In addition, the supervisors must comprehend the development concept prior to facilitating their workers. When supervisors possess a clear understanding about the development concept, workers’ confidence that their supervisor is qualified and can lead them increases. However, looking at the findings of this study, it is possible to assume that supervisors in this institution have neglected their role in supporting their workers in career development. Besides that, sometimes supervisors are reluctant to offer support to their workers by giving only negative feedback. Such supervisors observe only the negative side of their workers without noting that the workers have performed their task, duties, and responsibilities well. Consequently, the workers feel demotivated, stressed, and have a high intention to leave the organisation.

Similarly, the study has revealed that family support did not moderate the relationships between WLB and career satisfaction and WLB and psychological well-being. This result agrees with those of Aryee et al. (1999) who have investigated the relationship between role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being and the moderating effect of spousal support and coping behaviours. Their study exposed that spousal support was unrelated to WLB. In this study, a likely explanation for this outcome could be due to the respondents being academic, academic support, and operational staff who were exposed to the ODL learning environment, in which the delivery of services requires digital literacy, competencies in Open Education Resource (OER) creation, usage, and delivery, and ability to operate Open Learning Platforms such as modules. This condition requires the respondents to work overtime and as a result, they would communicate less with family members and eventually receive reduced support from them.

Next, results from this research have provided empirical support for the theoretical relationships proposed in the research framework. The theoretical contribution is related to the moderating variables, i.e. supervisor support and family support. The contribution to literature would be that supervisor support and family support did not moderate the relationships between WLB and career satisfaction and WLB and psychological well-being. Future researchers are encouraged to apply a longitudinal approach to examine WLB and employee well-being. Furthermore, this study’s respondents were an ODL university’s workers; thus, research parameters could change if participants from other professional groups from different organisations are recruited. Not only that, future researchers can consider employing a comparative approach to study WLB and employee well-being among academic, academic support, and operational staff from various Malaysian ODL institutions.

In terms of practical contribution, this study proposes that the policymakers of the ODL university pay attention to creating sturdy support systems from the top-down, to set an example to front line supervisors who deal with workers every day. Besides that, providing resources like employee assistance programmes that supervisors can apply by referring workers, conduct sensitivity training for supervisors or teach them how to form an effective yet flexible team environment, could help supervisors build perceived supervisor support with their team. The policymakers of this ODL university are also recommended to establish and reinforce family support policies, which comprise emotional family support and sharing of household chores that can help balance cohesion.
and adaptability amongst family members. In turn, balance in cohesion and adaptability can positively affect work and thus improve employee well-being.

Like any research, this study has some limitations. Because this is a cross-sectional study, the outcome may differ if a qualitative approach was employed. Moreover, the findings could vary if the behaviour of the workers in the ODL university was observed for a longer period.
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