

The Impact of Work from Home to Work Life-Balance and Its Implication to Employee Happiness

Johanna Gracelia Elnanto¹, Lieli Suharti^{2*}

^{1,2} Faculty of Economics and Business, Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received April 10, 2021

Revised April 13, 2021

Accepted June 11, 2021

Available online August 25, 2021

Keywords:

Employee Happiness, Work-From Home, Work Life Balance



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright © 2021 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

ABSTRACT

Working from home was an increasing phenomenon to prevent the spread of COVID-19. Although WFH has been expendable well documented, there are still limited studies related to the subject of life balance, happiness and organizational support. This study aimed to figure out the influence of work from home on work-life balance, work-life balance on happiness, and the moderating role of organizational supports towards work from home and work-life balances. The respondents used in this research were the 94 lecturers. The study was done in a quantitative method through cross-sectional data and non-probability sampling method. The analysis model used was Path Analysis, Moderated Regression Analysis and Simple Regression test. The result of this research indicates that WFH has positive effects on WLB and WLB has positive effects on employee happiness. The testing done on moderating effect appeared that organizational support does not moderate the effects of WFH on WLB. Apart from that, theoretical and practical implications were also given in this research. The finding of this study also can be used as managerial practice for any institution and employees to be more aware of their life balances and well-being during the pandemic. For organization, this study can be beneficial to enhance several aspects in making the employees happier. This study also indicates that homeworking could become good alternatives that mutually benefit for both organizations and employees, including flexible work and improving work-life balance.

1. INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of 2020, Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) became a major issue in the world. The virus was originally discovered in Wuhan, China and began to spread throughout other countries. Many significant aspects of human life including health, politics, economy, and security have been changed due to the virus (Mustajab et al., 2020). Recently, the pandemic caused a major shift in organizations. Many countries have made emergency measures including the prohibition of public gatherings and the closing of public places to prevent further spreading (Hamouche, 2020). Large numbers of employees are encouraged to work remotely from home, thus reducing the possibility of virus transmission while gathering in a room. In Indonesia, physical distancing has also been implemented. For instance, educational institutions such as schools and universities began to do distance learning. The government has instructed the day off for schools and campuses in Indonesia, but the teaching and learning activities should not be stopped (Zaharah et al., 2020). During the presence of COVID-19, the concept of Work From Home (WFH) has become one alternative approach for any organizations (Mustajab et al., 2020). WFH can be defined as the concept of work that does not require the employee to go back and forth to central workplaces. Homeworking is a settlement where employees' job-related tasks are carried out at home by using electronic media as tools for communication (Beauregard et al., 2013). WFH has been sufficiently studied in past research. Previous study reported a significant positive effect of WFH on employees' work efforts (Rupietta & Beckmann, 2016). Another existing study analyzed the impact of WFH on employees' productivity and found positive implications related to the variables (Liang et al., 2015; Mustajab et al., 2020). Meanwhile, telecommuting has been linked as well with employee task and contextual performance (Gajendran et al., 2015).

The notion of Work-Life Balance (WLB) has been associated along with the phenomenon of WFH, although there is still limited research to be found. Homeworking is one way to combine both work and

*Corresponding author.

E-mail: Lieli.suharti@uksw.edu

life, thus improving WLB. Previous study identified three words that cover the concept of WLB i.e., work (career and ambition), life (health, family and spiritual growth) and balance (work satisfaction and less conflict at home) (Punia & Kamboj, 2013). WLB is considered crucial since the lack of barriers in work and life can result in new threats. Moreover, high amounts of conflicts found in work and family demands can create high turnover and less job satisfaction at work, lower life satisfaction and high divorce rates at home, and increasing stress for the individuals (Thompson & Prottas, 2006).

The influence of work on the employee's life and well-being needs to be addressed. Employee happiness has been associated with the outcomes of both work and individual life. Various research has been conducted to measure happiness at the workplace. However, most of the studies still focus on job satisfaction rather than measuring employee happiness (van der Meer & Wielers, 2013). The physical and mental of employees well-being is vital to determine the success of the company (Bataineh, 2019). Happy employees are likely more committed and show high performance at work (Othman et al., 2018). The concept of employee happiness at the workplace is still not widely studied despite its importance for organizations (Joo & Lee, 2017). The current virus outbreak has caused a new challenge to the organization. Former employees who usually spent time at the workplace, now need to adjust to new surroundings through working remotely. Additionally, some difficulties such as the inability to separate work and private life could arise. Thus, the organizations have a new role to assist and organize their employees to cope with the new work environment. The term perceived organizational support (POS) has been introduced as a factor that contributes to WLB aside from work, family and social environment (Thakur & Kumar, 2015). Organizational support is the interpretation of the workers based on how the organization takes care of them. Other previous studies also mentioned that organizational supportive initiatives such as flexible working hours can lower the work burden (Rozaini et al., 2015).

Although the concept of WFH is not something new, COVID-19 has caused new studies to address WFH as a current phenomenon. Even so, limited research still can be found on how the faculty members work online from their homes (Stadtlander et al., 2017). UKSW is one of the universities in Indonesia that changes its way of education system due to the virus. The campus itself has quickly followed the government instruction and implemented online study since March, 16th 2020. Since the campus has moved its activity online, all employees are required to do their activities at home. Notably, the interaction between teachers and students still needs to be carried out during the virus outbreak. The sample for this study will be taken from the lecturers in UKSW who are currently doing the homeworking. Through WFH, the lecturers still have an important role to complete the duties and develop academics competencies. To make sure that the faculty members can carry out their performance at home, research needs to be conducted. To fill the gaps from the previous study, this present study aims to examine the effect of WFH on WLB through social support as a moderating variable and the effect of WLB on employee happiness. Following the objectives, this study is expected to be used as a reference and learning source for further research and consideration for the company that specifically applying WFH in making any decisions. Furthermore, this paper can add insight and knowledge related to the importance of having WLB and happiness for the employees who are working from home during the pandemic.

2. METHODS

This research uses quantitative methods and explanatory research to evaluate the causality between the variables. The population for the research is taken from 490 active lecturers in UKSW and used a non-probability sampling method, in which each population member is selected based on the researcher's preference. A convenience sampling technique is used in obtain the samples. Primary data is used as the main source of data and online questionnaire as the instrument to collect the data. The survey used a closed questionnaire to make the participants respond by choosing one out of several options. The questionnaire is spread via Google Forms, which include several points such as the requirements of the participants as one of the lecturers in UKSW and several other questions that have a linkage with the variables in the study. The size of the sample can be determined through rules of thumb (Sekaran, 2003). The sample size can be greater than 30 and less than 500 or at least 10 times bigger than the variables used in multivariate research.

This research decided to use 94 lecturers in UKSW as the sample to collect the data. The respondent are taken from various major such as Faculty of Economic and Business (FEB), Faculty of Information Technology (FTI), Faculty of Language and Art (FBS), Faculty of Science and Mathematics (FSM), Faculty of Biology, Faculty of Electrical Engineering (FTEK), Faculty of Social and Communication (FISKOM), Faculty of Interdisciplinary (FID), Faculty of Psychology (FPSI), Faculty of Law (FH), Faculty of Agriculture and Business (FPB), Faculty of Teaching and Education (FKIP), Faculty of Theology, Faculty of Medicines and Health Sciences (FKIK). Based on the respondent's gender characteristics, it is known that

there are 37 male respondents with the percentage of 39,4% and 57 female respondents with a percentage of 60,6%. The diversity of respondents based on age are from 23 respondents who aged between 25-35 years or in a percentage of 24.5%, 42 respondents who aged between 36-46 years or in percentage of 44.7%, 16 respondents aged between 47-57 years or in a percentage of 17%, and respondent aged between 56-68 years are 13 people with a percentage of 13.8%. The length of work also varied, most respondents at the length of work >10 years are filling out the questionnaire with 53 people or 56,4% in percentage.

Likert scale is used as a measurement for this study with a scale of 1-5, starting from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The study used path analysis, moderated regression analysis and simple regression analysis to estimate the influence of independent on the dependent variables. Reliability and Validity test, as well as Classical assumption test is needed as prior to perform the hypothesis test. The assumption of the model includes Linearity test, Normality test, and Heteroscedasticity test. Reliability and validity tests are done to measure the consistency and accuracy of the research. The assumption of the model includes Linearity test, Normality test, and Heteroscedasticity test. Normality test is used to see if the data is distributed normally (Shukla, 2015). Linearity test is used to examine the significant linear relationship found between two or more variables. Heteroscedasticity test is used to find out if there is an inequality variance of residual in the observations, the regression model is invalid when the heteroscedasticity is not met.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

Descriptive Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis in this study aims to describe the data that has been collected. After obtaining the data, statistical calculations are carried out to see the value of each question item. The Likert scale range can be obtained by the formula of maximum value minus by the minimum value and divided by the maximum value.

Table 1. Descriptive Variable of WFH

No	Indicators	Averages
1.	I have more control over my activities during WFH	3.82
2.	I am more flexible to arrange my working schedule during WFH	4.28
3.	I am more flexible to arrange my non-working schedule during WFH	4.12
4.	I am able to work more optimally during WFH	3.20
5.	I am able to master digital literacy skills during WFH	4.23
6.	I am easier to control fatigue due to work pressures during WFH	3.53
7.	I am easier to deal with any kind of work distractions during WFH	3.32
The average variable of WFH		3.79

Based on the result from the descriptive test output in Table 1, the average value of the WFH variable is 3.79 which in the interval of 3.41- 4.20 and classified as high. In the WFH variables, the second indicator has the highest average score which is 4.29, this shows that the employees are more flexible to arrange their work schedule during WFH. The lowest score is 3.20, stated in the statement of "I am able to work more optimally during WFH."

Table 2. Descriptive Variable of WLB

No	Indicators	Averages
1.	I am able to divide my time between work and family better during WFH	3.68
2.	I am able to do house chores and professional work at the same time during WFH	3.73
3.	My family takes up more time, which reduces my time in completing work during WFH.	3.43
4.	I don't have enough time for myself, or for my family during WFH	3.49
5.	I don't feel bored when working at home	3.48
The average variable of WLB		3.56

Based on the result from the descriptive test output in Table 2, the average value of the WLB variable is 3.56 which in the interval of 3.41- 4.20 and classified as good. In the WLB variables, the second indicator has the highest average score which is 3.73, this shows that the respondents are able to do house chores and professional work at the same time during WFH. The lowest score is 3.43, stated in the statement of "My family takes up more time, which reduce my time in completing work during WFH."

Table 3. Descriptive Variable of Organizational Support

No	Indicators	Averages
1.	My organization provides facilities that support my activities during WFH (e.g., vacation leave, health insurance, training, retirement planning)	3.97
2.	My organization offers a flexible schedule that allow to fits my needs during WFH	3.96
3.	My organization still provides rights and benefits to me such as paid leave due to illness or other urgency needs during WFH	4.36
4.	My organization gives permission when I have to leave work due to family needs during WFH	4.14
5.	My organization supports and appreciates the contributions I make during WFH	4.11
6.	My organization able to accommodate and respond to my complaints during WFH	3.63
The average variable of Organizational Support		4.03

Based on the result from the descriptive test output in Table 3, the average value of the organizational support variable is 4.03 which in the interval of 3.41- 4.20 and classified as good. In the organizational support variables, the third indicator has the highest average score which is 4.36, which shows that the respondents get the rights and benefits such as paid leave from the organization during WFH. The lowest score is 3.63, stated in the statement of "My organization able to accommodate and respond to my complaints during WFH."

Table 4. Descriptive Variable of Employee Happiness

No	Indicators	Averages
1.	I feel comfortable and happy when working from home	3.78
2.	I am satisfied with my job when working from home	3.72
3.	I feel that my job has meaning and purpose during WFH	4.02
4.	I feel close to my co-workers even when working from home	3.54
5.	I don't feel any pressure when working from home	3.50
6.	I feel more productive when I working from home	3.45
7.	I feel more excited when working from home	3.44
The average variable of Employee Happiness		3.64

Based on the result from the descriptive test output in Table 4, the average value of the employee happiness variable is 3.64 which in the interval of 3.41- 4.20 and classified as good. In the organizational support variables, the third indicator has the highest average score which is 4.36, which shows that the respondents feel their job has meaning and purpose during WFH. The lowest score is 3.44, stated in the statement of "I feel more excited when working from home."

Hypothesis Test

Prior to the hypothesis testing, the research data has been tested with the Classical Assumption Test through the Normality test, Linearity test, Multicollinearity test and Heteroscedasticity test. The Normality test result in the P- value of 0.963 and 0.178 > 0.05, which means that the data are normally distributed. The Linearity test is carried out on the independent variable against dependent variable, where the result of sig. deviation is 0.597, 0.306 and 0.574 > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is linear correlation between the independent variables and dependent variables. The Multicollinearity test of this study indicates that the variables have VIF value 1.155 and 1.575 < 10, which means there is no multicollinearity found in the study and the data passed the multicollinearity test. The heteroscedasticity

test was another requirement to be done, which the result of significance values is 0.835, 0.538 and 0.517 > 0.05. Therefore, can be concluded that there is no heteroscedasticity in this regression model.

Path Analysis Test

Path Analysis is used to analyze the direct dependence relationship between a set of variables, and examine the complex models which one of it is intervening variables. Path Analysis can be done to confirm direct or indirect relation of the variables. Based on the analysis effect of WFH (X) on WLB (Y) the significance value of WFH is $0.000 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a direct significant effect of WFH on WLB. The value of R square contained in the model summary is 0.365. This means that the contribution of WFH (X) influence on WLB (Y) is 36.5%, while the remaining 63.5% is the contribution of other variables outside the study. From the analysis effect of WFH (X) on employee happiness (Z) the significance value of WFH is $0.000 < 0.05$. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a direct significant effect of WFH on employee happiness. The analysis effect of WLB (Y) on employee happiness (Z) indicates a significance value of $0.002 < 0.05$. Therefore, there is direct significant effect of WLB on employee happiness. Additionally, this research also tries to analyze the indirect effect and direct effect of WFH (X) through WLB (Y) on employee happiness (Z). It is known that the direct effect given by WFH to employee happiness is 0.607. While the indirect effect of WFH through WLB on employee happiness is the multiplication between the beta value of WFH (X) against WLB (Y) with the beta value of WLB (Y) against employee happiness (Z), namely: $0.604 \times 0.258 = 0.155$. Based on the calculation results above, the direct effect is 0.607 and the indirect effect is 0.155 which shows that the direct effect of WFH on Employee Happiness is greater than the indirect effect of WFH on Employee Happiness through WLB. Thus, the intervening variable does not play a role in helping the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable. The value of R square contained in the model summary is 0.624. This means that the contribution of WFH (X) and WLB (Y) influence on employee happiness (Z) is 62.4%, while the remaining 37.6% is the contribution of other variables outside the study.

Moderated Regression Analysis Test

The Moderated Regression Analysis with one independent variable, one dependent variable and one moderating variable was used in the study. This method is used to estimate the relationship between the independent and dependent variable through how the moderating variable strengthens or weakens the effect. The value of coefficient determinant (R^2) obtained is 0.365 or 36.5%. It can be interpreted that WFH (X) has a contribution effect of 36.5% on WLB (Y), and 63.5% is influenced by another variable. The significance value of WFH towards WLB is $0.000 < 0.05$. This means there is a significant influence of WFH towards WLB. The value of coefficient determinant (R^2) obtained is 0.400 or 40%. It can be interpreted that WFH (X) has a contribution effect of 40% on WLB (Y) through Organizational Support, and 60% is influenced by another variable. However, the significant value of WFH (0.708), Organizational Support (0.829) and WFH*OS (0.522) is > 0.05 . Thus, it can be concluded that Organizational Support does not moderate the WFH (X) effect on WLB (Y).

Simple Regression Test

Simple Linear Regression is a statistical method to test the extent of the causal relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. The value of coefficient determinant (R^2) obtained is 0.390 or 39%. It can be interpreted that WLB (X) has a contribution effect of 39% on employee happiness (Y), and 61% is influenced by other variables. The significance value of WLB (X) towards employee happiness (Y) is 0.000, lower ($>$) than 0.05. It can be concluded that there is a significant influence of WLB (X) on employee happiness (Y).

Discussion

WFH will have an impact on employee's WLB

In accordance with the developed hypothesis, it appears that there is a positive and significant effect of WFH on employee's WLB, which shown a significance value of $0.000 < (0.05)$. Thus, H1 is accepted. These research findings showed an evidence that WFH can provide greater flexibility available for the workers, and lead to better personal life balances. The result of this study support the previous research (Akmal et al., 2021; Ambikapathy & Ali, 2020; Crosbie & Moore, 2004; Khotimah & Yusuf, 2021; Kinman, 2016). The interpretation of the findings is in line with the past research where WFH positively affect the work-life balance. The research conducted with Malaysian employees as the samples indicates similar output, where WFH significantly impact the WLB (Ambikapathy & Ali, 2020). In corresponding with this study, through analysis, synthesis and comparative method also show that WFH has positive influence on WLB (Krasulja et al., 2015). Indeed, working from home become a great representation to

solve the WLB issues. Through WFH, the employee can readjust work hours, address personal issues as well as work-related matters. This hypothesis supported by the prior research which stated that WFH offers employees the flexibility needed to foster quality work and life (Saxena, 2018).

WLB will have an impact on employee's happiness

In accordance with the second hypothesis, it appears that WLB have a positive and significant impact on employee's happiness with a significance value of $0.000 < (0.05)$. Thus, H2 is accepted. This paper implies that WLB can result in happy employees and better wellbeing through work and life satisfaction. To be mentioned, the research related to the impact of WLB on employee's happiness still limited and rather focused on the well-being, job satisfaction or job performance. However, this study supports the prior research (Begum Otken & Erben, 2013; Ullah & Siddiqui, 2020; Zheng et al., 2015). This finding implies that the higher WLB result in the higher degree of employee's happiness. So, happiness will increase when work and life domains are well balanced. As comparison, the research on 250 Turkey employees have a similar result to this study, where positive relationship found between WLB and happiness (Begum Otken & Erben, 2013). Based on the result, the ability to divide time for family and work at home could contribute to feelings of individuals. Therefore, having work-life balance and flexibility at work can create a positive working environment which lead to the overall happiness of employees.

Organizational support moderates the relationship between WFH and WLB

In accordance hypothesis stated that organizational support able to moderates the relationship of WFH on WLB. However, it appears with a significance value of $0.522 (>0.05)$, indicates that organizational support does not moderate the relationship between WFH and WLB. Thus, the H3 is not accepted. The finding are similar with the research which showed that organizational support does not moderates the variable (Gadi & Kee, 2020; Haryokusumo, 2015). However, this study is inconsistent with prior research by Amazue and Onyishi (2016) with 254 Nigerian bank workers revealed that organizational support as significant predictors for WLB. It is possible to happen when organizational support fluctuate and vary over time, lead to the increasing or decreasing POS based on the positive or negative occurrence (Caesens et al., 2016). Based on the result of this study, it can be said that on a specific week, an employee may receive appreciation, bonus payment or holiday leave while on another week they received less at their work. Moreover, the inconsistency of organization roles that provide support and be the source of stress at the same time may result in mixed message for the employees. This could be the potential reason that generate negative perception of employees towards the organization

4. CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to find out the effect of WFH on WLB, the implications to employee happiness and the influence of organizational support as moderating variable. Through the result, it can be concluded that: (1). WFH has an influence on WLB, (2). WLB has an influence on employee happiness, (3). Organizational support does not moderate the impact of WFH on WLB. The limitation of the study came from the small sample size and cross-sectional data. Additionally, future studies may try to compare and contrast from different settings such as gender perspectives, and extending the study to different organizations rather than educational background such as industrial employees, social or office workers with larger populations in Indonesia. This study might provide valuable extension to the theoretical gap between the previous and present papers. The finding of this study also can be used as managerial practice for any institution and employees to be more aware of their life balances and well-being during the pandemic. For organization, this study can be beneficial to enhance several aspects in making the employees happier. This study also indicates that homeworking could become good alternatives that mutually benefit for both organizations and employees, including flexible work and improving work-life balance.

5. REFERENCES

- Akmal, M. El, Marpaung, W., Manurung, Y. S., & Mirza, R. (2021). Work from home during the pandemic & work-life balance: Married working woman perspective. *International Research Journal of Advanced Engineering and Science*, 6(2), 1–5.
- Amazue, L. O., & Onyishi, I. E. (2016). Stress coping strategies, perceived organizational support and marital status as predictors of work–life balance among Nigerian bank employees. *Social Indicators Research*, 128(1), 147–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-015-1023-5>.

- Ambikapathy, M., & Ali, A. (2020). Impact and challenges towards employees work from home during covid-19 (MCO) period. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 2(4), 97–107.
- Bataineh, K. adnan. (2019). Impact of work-life balance, happiness at work, on employee performance. *International Business Research*, 12(2), 99. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v12n2p99>.
- Beauregard, A., Kelly, B., & Canonico, E. (2013). Home is where the work is: A new study of homeworking in Acas – and beyond. In *Acas Research Papers* (Vol. 13, Issue 10). Acas.
- Begum Otken, A., & Erben, G. S. (2013). The relationship between work-life balance and happiness from the perspectives of generation x and y. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, 2(4), 2165–625845.
- Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., & Ohana, M. (2016). Perceived organizational support and well-being: a weekly study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(7), 1214–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-01-2016-0002>.
- Crosbie, T., & Moore, J. (2004). Work–life balance and working from home. *Social Policy and Society*, 3(3), 223–233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1474746404001733>.
- Gadi, P. D., & Kee, D. M. H. (2020). The moderating effect of perceived support in the link among work engagement and turnover intention: Evidence from Nigeria. *European Journal of Molecular and Clinical Medicine*, 7(3), 180–190.
- Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2015). Are telecommuters remotely good citizens? Unpacking telecommuting’s effects on performance via i-deals and job resources. *Personnel Psychology*, 68(2), 353–393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12082>.
- Hamouche, S. (2020). COVID-19 and employees’ mental health: Stressors, moderators and agenda for organizational actions. *Emerald Open Research*, 2, 15. <https://doi.org/10.35241/emeraldopenres.13550.1>.
- Haryokusumo, D. (2015). The effect of workplace spirituality dimensions on organizational commitment with perceived organizational support as a moderating variable. *Jurnal Dinamika Manajemen*, 6(2), 187–202. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jdm.v6i2.4307>.
- Joo, B. K., & Lee, I. (2017). Workplace happiness: work engagement, career satisfaction, and subjective well-being. *Evidence-Based HRM*, 5(2), 206–221. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-04-2015-0011>.
- Khotimah, N. H., & Yusuf, R. M. (2021). The effect of work from home (WFH) on employee performance through the work-life balance (WLB) during the covid-19 period. *Hasanuddin Journal of Business Strategy*, 3(2), 105–116. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.26487/hjbs.v3i2.454>.
- Kinman, G. (2016). Managing the work-home interface: The experience of women academics. *Exploring Resources, Life-Balance and Well-Being of Women Who Work in a Global Context*, 127–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31736-6_8.
- Krasulja, N., Vasiljevic-Blagojevic, M., & Radojevic, I. (2015). Working from home as alternative for acheiving work-life balance. *Ekonomika*, 61(2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.5937/ekonomika1502131k>.
- Liang, J., Roberts, J., Ying, Z. J., Cao, J., Qi, M., & Sun, M. (2015). Does working from home work ? Evidence from a chinese experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qju032.Advance>.
- Mustajab, D., Bauw, A., Rasyid, A., Irawan, A., Akbar, M. A., & Hamid Muhammad Amin. (2020). Working from home phenomenon as an effort to prevent COVID-19 attacks and its impacts on work productivity. *The International Journal of Applied Business TIJAB*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.
- Othman, A. K., Mahmud, Z., Noranee, S., & Noordin, F. (2018). Measuring employee happiness: Analyzing the dimensionality of employee engagement. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 739, 863–869. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8612-0_90.
- Punia, V., & Kamboj, M. (2013). Quality of work-life balance among teachers in higher education institutions. *Learning Community-An International Journal of Educational and Social Development*, 4(3), 197. <https://doi.org/10.5958/j.2231-458x.4.3.010>.
- Rozaini, R., Norailis, A. W., & Aida, B. (2015). Roles of organizational support in quality of work life in insurance industry. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 3(8), 753–757. <https://doi.org/10.7763/joebm.2015.v3.280>.
- Rupietta, K., & Beckmann, M. (2016). Working from home: What is the effect on employees’ effort? *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 70(1), 25–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41464-017-0043-x>.
- Saxena, R. (2018). Achieving work life balance through flexible work schedule: A conceptual study. *Asian Journal of Management*, 9(1), 307–312. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2321-5763.2018.00046.X>.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. (4th editio). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shukla, S. (2015). Normality test. In *Conference: New Trend in Educational Research* (Issue March).

- Stadlander, L., Sickel, A., LaCivita, L., & Giles, M. (2017). Home as workplace: A qualitative case study of online faculty using photovoice. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 7(1), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.5590/jerap.2017.07.1.04>.
- Thakur, A., & Kumar, N. (2015). The effect of perceived organizational support, role related aspects and work involvement on work-life balance: Self efficacy as a moderator. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(1), 1–8.
- Thompson, C. A., & Prottas, D. J. (2006). Relationships among organizational family support, job autonomy, perceived control, and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(1), 100–118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.100>.
- Ullah, M. H., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2020). Does learning, development and work life balance affects happiness: A moderated mediatory model. *Human Resource Research*, 4(1), 94. <https://doi.org/10.5296/hrr.v4i1.16615>.
- van der Meer, P. H., & Wielers, R. (2013). What makes workers happy? *Applied Economics*, 45(3), 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2011.602011>.
- Zaharah, Z., Kirilova, G. I., & Windarti, A. (2020). Impact of corona virus outbreak towards teaching and learning activities in Indonesia. *SALAM: Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Syar-I*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.15408/sjsbs.v7i3.15104>.
- Zheng, C., Molineux, J., Mirshekary, S., & Scarparo, S. (2015). Developing individual and organisational work-life balance strategies to improve employee health and wellbeing. *Employee Relations*, 37(3), 354–379. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2013-0142>.