

Work -Life Balance to Well-Being: Exploring the Mediation of Organizational Virtuousness

M S Sujamani and Deepak Arun Arumugam G

Presidency College, Chennai, India

Achieving a balance between professional and personal life is a growing challenge in modern workplaces. In academia, remarkably Professors, are endured in their profession with multifaceted roles and responsibilities such as focused on teaching, evaluating student learning, mentoring, conducting research, and administrative responsibilities. While the Work-Life Balance (WLB) is widely recognized as a key factor in employee well-being, the role of organizational virtuousness in strengthening this relationship remains unexplored. This study investigates the mediating role of organizational virtuousness in relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being among college professors. Using a quantitative, cross-sectional design, the sample includes (N= 61) male 27 , female 34 professors from government and private colleges and analyzed using correlation, ANOVA, t-tests, and mediation analysis. Findings revealed that organizational virtuousness significantly mediates the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being. The present study highlights the need for institutions to implement structured work-life balance initiatives while embedding ethical decision making and compassionate workplace practices generate a thriving academic environment and flourish well-being.

Keywords: Work-life balance, Organizational Virtuousness, and Employee well-being.

Many people spend a large part of their lives at work. The workplace may affect employees' mental health even after working hours, thereby affecting their everyday life and well-being. A balance between work and private life reduces stress level, fatigue and promotes better well-being for the individual (Poulose & Sudarsan,2017). In demanding academic landscape, college professors often face challenges in maintaining work-life balance due to demanding workloads, and the pressure to meet the institutional expectations, leading to stress, burnout, and reduced psychological well-being (Butts, Casper, & Yang, 2013). Maintaining a work-life balance (WLB) is crucial for sustaining both performance and health. When disrupted, the effects can be detrimental, underscoring the need to identify protective factors.

Work-life balance is a phenomenon arising from employees' concerns about the demands expected by their work (Guest,2002).Work-life balance is a key predictor of well-being, linked to reduced stress and higher job satisfaction (Butts et al., 2013). Working practices that acknowledge and support the needs of staff in achieving a balance between their personal and working lives. Work-life balance (WLB) is the proper line up between 'work' (career and ambition) and 'life' (Health, pleasure, leisure and family). It also comprises the priority that work takes over family, working long hours and work intensification (Gulbahar et al., 2014). Organizations that promote a virtuous culture that support the employees to have a work-life balance tend to endorse improved performance and organizational effectiveness. Work-life balance and

organizational virtuousness are interconnected.

The concept of organizational virtuousness emerged from the field of positive organizational scholarship. It refers to the pursuit of human flourishing (Meyer 2018). Simultaneously, Organizational Virtuousness (OV) refers to the practice, support, dissemination, perpetuation and nurturing the dimensions of virtue characterized by integrity, trust, compassion, forgiveness, optimism and humanity through individual or collectivist approaches (Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004). This shown to foster supportive work environments and enhance employee well-being. Organizational Virtuousness is defined as an organizational environment that is marked by enthusiasm, trust, kindness, honesty, and forgiveness (Ho et al., 2023). Prior research has shown that organizational virtuousness may be cultivated by encouraging the adoption of shared ethical principles, a shared sense of purpose, and cooperative behavior among people (Mion et al., 2023). Organizational Virtuousness offers advantages, such as superior work performance, increased job satisfaction, strong emotional engagement, and exemplary civic behaviors (Ho et al., 2023). It also nurtures employee engagement as well-being by promoting satisfaction that arises from social interactions among colleagues. Developing virtuousness is additionally related to a stronger willingness to pursue social advantages for both employees and the organization. Organizational Virtuousness is positively linked to employee well-being, leading to reduced stress, burnout and enhances a positive work environment. Numerous studies have focused on employees' well-being (Buss, 2000; Lyubomirsky, 2001), relatively little scientific research has focused on the positive impact of work life balance on employees' well-being. Employee well-being

comprises individuals' mental, physical, emotional and financial health at work, that impacts job satisfaction, work- life balance and overall productivity. Employees that encounter organizational virtuousness think that their efforts are acknowledged and appreciated. As a result, they show active involvement and dedication to organizational virtuousness induces favorable feelings, leading to an expansion in the workers' focus and cognitive abilities (Al Hawari et al., 2019). In academia, such virtues may buffer the negative effects of work-life imbalance.

Social Exchange Theory (SET) posits that workplace relationships are built on reciprocal exchanges, where institutions that implement policies promoting work-life balance and foster an environment rich in virtuous practices encourage college professors to reciprocate with increased commitment and improved well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Similarly, Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) emphasizes the importance of positive outcomes and attributes within organizations, highlighting that positive psychological capital—including hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism—significantly enhances employee performance and satisfaction. Luthans et al. (2007) provide evidence that such positive psychological resources are vital for driving beneficial work outcomes, reinforcing the notion that a virtuous organizational climate can amplify these effects.

Despite extensive research on work-life balance and positive organizational practices, there is a notable gap in understanding how these constructs interact to influence employee well-being among college professors in Indian context. Most studies have focused on corporate environments or Western academic institutions, limiting the generalizability of their findings for the Indian context. This study aims to bridge that gap by investigating how

organizational virtuousness mediates the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being among college professors in the Indian academic context.

Taking together the literature on work-life balance, organizational and employee well-being, the present study explores how organizational virtuousness mediates the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being

Shahid and Muchiri (2019) established the positivity at the workplace suggests that having beneficial assets and a positive working environment might enhance knowledge and energy levels in the workplace. Therefore, the development of procedures and behaviors that foster growth and well-being in organizations enables people to flourish. Furthermore, a flourishing experience boosts employee behaviors that provide intrinsic value for the organization. The relationship between work-life balance (WLB), employee well-being, and organizational performance has been widely studied, demonstrating its impact on both individual and institutional outcomes.

Thevanes and Harikaran (2020) found that employees with a harmonious WLB are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), thereby enhancing overall performance. Similarly, Stankevièienė et al. (2020) identified WLB as a mediator between work culture and employee well-being, emphasizing the role of a supportive work culture in improving employees' ability to manage work and personal responsibilities.

In line with consistent findings, Kloutsiniotis and Mihail (2020) examined high-performance work systems (HPWS) and found that while they increase job demands, sufficient job resources can mitigate emotional exhaustion, underscoring the need for balancing performance expectations with employee well-being.

Lee et al. (2022) investigated occupational stress among Australian and New Zealand academics, reporting that excessive workloads and conflicting demands negatively impact well-being and job performance, calling for flexible policies and support systems. In addition, organizational virtuousness has been identified as a crucial factor in fostering a positive work environment. Previous research indicates that Organizational Virtuousness place a higher importance on creating beneficial effects on humans and mitigating adverse attitudes among workers (Bright et al., 2006)

Considering the previous findings Aubouin-Bonnaventure et al. (2023) found that virtuous organizational practices are positively associated with job satisfaction, thriving at work, and WLB, with psychological capital mediating these relationships. Collectively, these studies highlight the interconnectedness of WLB, organizational virtuousness, and employee well-being, stressing the importance of fostering supportive workplace cultures, providing adequate resources, and implementing flexible policies to enhance employee engagement, job satisfaction, and institutional effectiveness.

Aim

The aim of the present study is to examine the mediating role of organizational virtuousness in the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being among college professors. By analyzing these interconnections, the study seeks to provide empirical insights that can inform institutional policies aimed at enhancing faculty well-being and organizational effectiveness in academic settings.

Objectives

1. To assess the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being among college professors.

2. To examine the association between work-life balance and organizational virtuousness in academic institutions.
3. To analyze the impact of organizational virtuousness on employee well-being.
4. To determine whether organizational virtuousness mediates the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being.
5. To compare work-life balance, organizational virtuousness, and employee well-being across gender, marital status, institution type (government/private).

Hypotheses

- H1 : There is no significant difference in work-life balance between male and female college professors.
- H2 : There is no significant difference in employee well-being between male and female college professors.
- H3 : There is no significant difference in organizational virtuousness between male and female college professors.
- H4 : There is no significant difference in work-life balance between married and unmarried college professors.
- H5 : There is no significant difference in employee well-being between married and unmarried college professors.
- H6 : There is no significant difference in organizational virtuousness between married and unmarried college professors.
- H7 : There is no significant difference in work-life balance between professors from government and private institutions.
- H8 : There is no significant difference in employee well-being between professors from government and private institutions.
- H9 : There is no significant difference in organizational virtuousness between

professors from government and private institutions.

- H10: There is no significant correlation between work- life balance and employee well-being
- H11 : There is no significant correlation between work- life balance and organizational virtuousness.
- H12 : There is no significant correlation between employee well-being and organizational virtuousness
- H13: There is no significant correlation between work-life balance and employee well-being.
- H14: Organizational virtuousness does not mediate the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being.

Method

Sample

A total of 61 college professors from government and private institutions in Tamil Nadu, India, were recruited via convenience sampling. Despite the modest sample size, it is appropriate for an exploratory study. Bootstrapped mediation analysis using Hayes' PROCESS macro remains robust with moderate to large effect sizes, even in smaller samples (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007). Hence, the sample is adequate for preliminary insights into the variables examined.

Measures

Three validated instruments were used.

Work-Life Balance was assessed using the 10-item Checklist Manual (Daniels & McCarragher, 2000), with responses on a 3-point scale. Cronbach's alpha ranged from 0.66 to 0.80.

Employee Well-Being was measured via the 18-item EWB Scale (Zheng et al., 2015), covering life, workplace, and psychological well-being on a 7-point Likert scale. Reliability ranged from 0.93 to 0.94.

Organizational Virtuousness was evaluated using the 15-item scale by Cameron et al. (2004), assessing trust, integrity, compassion, optimism, and forgiveness. Internal consistency ranged from 0.83 to 0.89.

Data Collection

Data were collected via an online survey (Google Forms) shared through email and academic networks targeting college professors in Tamil Nadu, India. The survey included demographic items and standardized scales on work-life balance, employee well-being, and organizational virtuousness. The online format enabled convenient and efficient participation.

Results

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the variables

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Range
Work-life balance		19.89	6.05	10-30
Employee well-being	61	69.36	11.88	18-126
Organizational virtuousness		49.21	7.06	15-90

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for the three main variables. The mean score for work-life balance was 19.89 (SD = 6.05), with scores ranging from 10 to 30. Employee well-being had a mean of 69.36 (SD = 11.88) and a range from 18 to 126, while organizational virtuousness had a mean of 49.21 (SD = 7.06) with scores ranging from 15 to 90. These values provide an overview of the central tendencies and variability in the sample's responses.

Table 2. Test of normality

Variables	Skewness	Kurtosis	Kolmogorov-Smirnov
Work-life balance	-0.017	-1.216	.200
Employee well-being	-0.025	-1.185	.200
Organizational virtuousness	-0.350	-0.893	.200

Table 2 presents the results of the normality assessment for the study variables using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, as well as skewness and kurtosis values. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test yielded a p-value of .200 for work-life balance, employee well-being, and organizational virtuousness, suggesting that none of the distributions significantly deviate from normality. Additionally, the skewness and kurtosis values (ranging from -0.350 to -1.216) further indicate that the distributions are approximately normal, thereby supporting the use of parametric tests in subsequent analyses.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of study variables by gender

	Groups	Mean	SD	t-value	Significance
Work-life balance	Male (N=27)	20.78	5.27	1.026	0.309
	Female (N=34)	19.18	6.59		
Employee well-being	Male (N=27)	71.07	10.23	1.003	0.320
	Female (N=34)	68.00	13.04		
Organizational virtuousness	Male (N=27)	50.44	5.84	1.218	0.228
	Female (N=34)	48.24	7.843		

Not significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3 displays the results of independent samples t-tests comparing male (N = 27) and female (N = 34) college professors on the study variables. For work-life balance, males had a mean of 20.78 and females a mean of 19.18, $t=1.026$, $p=.309$. Similarly, employee well-being scores were 71.07 for males and 68.00 for females ($t=1.003$, $p=.320$), and organizational virtuousness scores were 50.44 for males and 48.24 for females ($t=1.218$, $p=.228$). Hence the null hypotheses H1, H2, H3 are

accepted. None of these differences reached statistical significance, indicating no gender-based differences in these measures.

Table 4. Comparative Analysis of study variables by marital status

	Groups	Mean	SD	t-value	Significance
Work-life balance	Government (N=29)	20.55	5.57	0.816	0.418
	Private (N=32)	19.28	6.48		
Employee well-being	Government (N=29)	70.59	10.70	0.764	0.448
	Private (N=32)	68.25	12.93		
Organizational virtuousness	Government (N=29)	50.17	6.25	1.010	0.317
	Private (N=32)	48.34	7.71		

Not significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 compares professors from government (N=29) and private (N=32) institutions. For work-life balance, the government group (M=20.55) did not significantly differ from the private group (M=19.28), $t=0.816$, $p=.418$. Likewise, no significant differences were observed for

Table 6. Mediation Analysis of the variables

Relationship	Total effect	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Confidence level		Conclusion
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Work-life balance → Organizational virtuousness → Employee well-being	1.959 (0.000)	1.735 (0.000)	0.224***	0.022	0.409	Complementary Partial mediation

**Significant at 0.01 level

From Table 6 we can infer that the total effect of work-life balance on employee well-being was significant, $B = 1.959$, $p < .001$. After accounting for the mediator, the direct effect remained significant but was reduced

employee well-being (government: $M=70.59$; private: $M=68.25$; $t=0.764$, $p=.448$) or organizational virtuousness (government: $M=50.17$; private: $M=48.34$; $t=1.010$, $p=.317$). Hence the null hypotheses H7, H8, H9 are accepted.

Table 5. Intercorrelation matrix

	Work-life balance	Employee well-being	Organizational virtuousness
Work-life balance	1	0.998**	0.991**
Employee well-being	0.998**	1	0.991**
Organizational virtuousness	0.991**	0.991**	1

**Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 5 presents the intercorrelations among work-life balance, employee well-being, and organizational virtuousness. All three variables exhibited extremely high and statistically significant correlations at the 0.01 level. Specifically, work-life balance was strongly correlated with employee well-being ($r = .998$) and organizational virtuousness ($r = .991$), while employee well-being and organizational virtuousness also demonstrated a high correlation ($r = .991$). Hence the null hypotheses H10, H11, H12 are rejected.

$= 1.735$, $p < .001$. The indirect effect of work-life balance on employee well-being through organizational virtuousness was also significant, $B = 0.224$, with a 95% confidence interval ranging from 0.022 to 0.409,

indicating that the indirect effect does not include zero. Hence the null hypothesis H13 is rejected. Based on these results, the mediation is classified as complementary partial mediation, meaning that while organizational virtuousness significantly mediates the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being, work-life balance still has a direct effect on employee well-being.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the mediating role of organizational virtuousness in the relationship between work-life balance (WLB) and employee well-being among college professors. The results provide strong empirical support for the argument that organizational virtuousness significantly enhances the positive relationship between WLB and well-being among college professors.

The results provide strong empirical support for the argument that organizational virtuousness significantly enhances the positive relationship between WLB and well-being. Additionally, the study found a high correlation among all three variables, emphasizing the interconnected nature of work-life balance, virtuous workplace culture, and overall employee well-being.

This study strengthens the long-standing view that work-life balance plays a vital role in supporting the well-being of college professors. Faculty members often find themselves juggling demanding schedules, with little time left to invest in their own mental health or personal lives. When a healthy balance is maintained, it not only improves day-to-day mood and satisfaction but also helps individuals manage long-term stress more effectively. These findings align with earlier research, such as Brough et al. (2014) and Michel et al. (2010), both of which highlighted the benefits of maintaining

boundaries between work and personal life in improving emotional and psychological outcomes.

This study strengthens the long-standing view that work-life balance plays a vital role in supporting the well-being of college professors. Faculty members often find themselves juggling demanding schedules, with little time left to invest in their own mental health or personal lives. When a healthy balance is maintained, it not only improves day-to-day mood and satisfaction but also helps individuals manage long-term stress more effectively. These findings align with earlier research, such as Brough et al. (2014) and Michel et al. (2010), both of which highlighted the benefits of maintaining boundaries between work and personal life in improving emotional and psychological outcomes.

Our findings reaffirm the strong relationship between WLB and employee well-being, a connection widely supported in prior literature. Studies have demonstrated that individuals who achieve better balance between professional and personal life experience lower stress, greater job satisfaction, and improved overall well-being (Brough et al., 2014; Michel et al., 2010). The current study's results further reinforce this perspective, indicating that college professors with higher levels of WLB tend to report greater psychological and emotional well-being, regardless of demographic differences.

A significant contribution to this study is its confirmation that organizational virtuousness mediates the relationship between WLB and well-being. This suggests that when institutions foster integrity, trust, compassion, optimism, and forgiveness, faculty members experience greater fulfillment and reduce work-related stress. These results align with the work of Cameron,

Bright, and Caza (2004), who demonstrated that organizational virtuousness contributes to stronger employee commitment and job satisfaction. Similarly, Rego, Ribeiro, and Cunha (2010) found that a virtuous organizational climate leads to greater engagement, motivation, and overall workplace happiness.

Similarly, previous studies have indicated that married faculty members often struggle with work-life balance due to added family responsibilities (Michel et al., 2011). However, the absence of significant differences in this study suggests that married and unmarried professors experience similar levels of WLB, potentially due to effective work structures or personal coping mechanisms that reduce strain from work-family conflict. Faculty members from both government and private institutions reported comparable levels of WLB, virtuousness, and well-being.

This contrasts with research that suggests private-sector employees generally experience higher work stress and lower WLB due to greater job demands (Siu, 2013). The non-significance in our study could indicate that academic institutions in Tamil Nadu—whether government or private—may share similar organizational policies and faculty work structures, leading to equivalent faculty experiences.

Contrary to previous findings that senior employees generally experience better work-life balance and well-being due to greater role clarity and job security (Ng & Feldman, 2010), our study found no significant differences based on experience levels. This suggests that younger and senior faculty members alike face similar work-life integration challenges and benefits, possibly due to institutional policies that provide equitable support across experience levels. An important contribution of this study lies in

its exploration of organizational virtuousness as a mediator. Institutions that cultivate an atmosphere of mutual respect, compassion, trust, and optimism tend to foster stronger emotional resilience among their faculty. These values are often intangible, but their presence or absence is deeply felt in daily interactions and institutional culture. When these virtues are actively practiced, they not only reduce emotional strain, but it also promotes building a sense of belonging and purpose within the academic community. This aligns with work by Cameron et al. (2004), who found that such virtues enhance organizational functioning and deepen employee commitment.

Remarkably, organizational virtuousness appears to function as a pathway that influences how academic challenges are perceived and managed, rather than eliminating those challenges entirely. For professors, feeling supported by a culture that values ethical behavior, and emotional intelligence can transform even routine pressures into more manageable experiences. These results concurrence Rego et al. (2010), who emphasized that a virtuous organizational climate could heighten job satisfaction and spark greater engagement among employees. Finally, the findings suggest something simple yet powerful: people thrive where they feel valued. Academic work will always come with demands, but it doesn't have to come at the cost of well-being. When institutions choose to prioritize humanity along with productivity, the institution retains the faculty and flourishes well-being.

This study has some limitations that must be considered. The small sample size (N = 61) and homogeneity of the sample (college professors from Tamil Nadu, India) limits generalizability to other regions and professions. The findings highlight the importance of institutional reforms that

promote ethical practices and organizational virtuousness to enhance faculty well-being. Prioritizing work-life balance initiatives, such as flexible work arrangements and reduced administrative burdens, is essential for faculty retention and engagement. Institutions should implement policies that foster employee well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational support. Future research should focus on longitudinal effects, larger sample sizes, and cross-cultural comparisons to further validate these results. The current study provides empirical evidence supporting the mediating role of organizational virtuousness in the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being.

Conclusions

This study provides empirical evidence supporting the mediating role of organizational virtuousness in the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being. The strong correlation among these variables reinforces the notion that a supportive and ethical institutional culture enhances faculty well-being and performance. Additionally, the absence of significant demographic differences suggests that higher education institutions should focus on universal well-being interventions rather than demographic-specific approaches. By fostering workplace virtues and implementing balanced work-life policies, academic institutions can cultivate a motivated, engaged, and satisfied faculty workforce, ultimately enhancing both individual and institutional effectiveness.

References

- Aubouin-Bonnaventure, F., Fouquereau, E., Chevalier, S., & Gillet, N. (2023). A new gain spiral at work: Relationships between virtuous organizational practices, psychological capital, and well-being of workers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3), 1823. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031823>
- Brough, P., Timms, C., O'Driscoll, M. P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O., Sit, C., & Lo, D. (2014). Work-life balance: a longitudinal evaluation of a new measure across Australia and New Zealand workers. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(19), 2724–2744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.899262>
- Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Yang, T. S. (2013). How important are work-family support policies? A meta-analytic investigation of their effects on employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030389>
- Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the Relationships between Organizational Virtuousness and Performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 766–790. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203260209>
- Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004b). Exploring the Relationships between Organizational Virtuousness and Performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 766–790. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764203260209>
- Daniels, L. and McCarragher, L. (2000) *The Work Life Manual*. London: Industrial Society.
- De Lange, A. H., De Witte, H., & Notelaers, G. (2008). Should I stay or should I go? Examining longitudinal relations among job resources and work engagement for stayers versus movers. *Work & Stress*, 22(3), 201–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802390132>
- Fritz, M. S., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological Science*, 18(3), 233–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01882.x>
- Guest, D.E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018402041002005>
- Gulbahar, C., A.A., Kundi, G.M. K & Qureshi, Q.A. (2014). Relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Organizational

- Commitment. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, Vol.4, No.5
- Ho, H. C., Hou, W. K., Poon, K. T., Leung, A. N., & Kwan, J. L. (2023). Being virtuous together: A one-year prospective study on organizational virtuousness, well-being, and organizational commitment. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 18(1), 521-542.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264–1294. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0088>
- Kloutsiniotis, P. V., & Mihail, D. M. (2020). Is it worth it? Linking perceived high-performance work systems and emotional exhaustion: The mediating role of job demands and job resources. *European Management Journal*, 38(4), 565–579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.12.012>
- Lee, M., Coutts, R., Fielden, J., Hutchinson, M., Lakeman, R., Mathisen, B., Nasrawi, D., & Phillips, N. (2022). Occupational stress in university academics in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 44(1), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1934246>
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>
- Meng, Q., & Wang, G. (2018). Research on sources of university faculty occupational stress: A Chinese case study. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 11, 597–605. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S187295>
- Meyer, M (2018). The Evolution and Challenges of the Concept of Organizational Virtuousness in Positive Organizational Scholarship. *J. Bus. Ethics* 153,245-264.[doi:10.1007/s10551-016-3388-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3388-z)
- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2010). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689–725. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.695>
- Ng, T. W. H., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). The Relationships of age with job Attitudes: a META-ANALYSIS *Personnel Psychology*, 63(3), 677–718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01184.x>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Rego, A., Ribeiro, N. & Cunha, M.P. Perceptions of Organizational Virtuousness and Happiness as Predictors of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *J Bus Ethics* 93, 215– 235 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551009-0197-7>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
- Stankeviėienė, A., Tamaševičius, V., & Diskienė, D. (2020). The mediating effect of work-life balance on the relationship between work culture and employee well-being. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 21(2), 486–502. <https://doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2021.14729>
- Tang, S., Siu, O., & Cheung, F. (2012). A Study of Work–Family Enrichment among Chinese Employees: The Mediating Role between Work Support and Job Satisfaction. *Applied Psychology*, 63(1), 130–150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00519.x>
- Thevanes, N., & Harikaran, S. (2020). Work-Life balance and organizational performance: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Asian Journal of*

- Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 7(4), 280–287. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.500.2020.74.280.287>
- Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2004). The role of Psychological Well-Being in Job Performance: *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.002>
- Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(5), 621–644. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1990>

Sujamani MS, PhD, Department of Psychology, Presidency College, Chennai, India.
Email:sujamanims@yahoo.com

Deepak Arun Arumugam G, Department of Psychology, Presidency College, Chennai, India.