ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Remote Working and Wellbeing of Academicians in a Public University in Malaysia

Wan Syahirah Wan Ghazali, Halimatus Sakdiah Minhat

Department of Community Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Remote working or working from home among academicians during the COVID-19 pandemic introduced new challenges including blurred work-life boundaries, technostress, professional isolation, and workload difficulties. This study aimed to explore the prevalence, and factors associated with well-being among remote-working academicians at Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM) during the Movement Control Order (MCO), addressing a gap in understanding the impact of these challenges on their well-being. **Materials and methods:** A cross-sectional study was conducted among remote-working academicians from the UPM Serdang Campus, using stratified proportionate-to-size sampling from October 2020 to July 2021. Data were collected using online questionnaires, with Cronbach Alpha values between 0.712 and 0.899. The well-being was measured using General Health Questionnaires (GHQ-12). Other variables in this study were constructed based on the Social Ecological Model, including technostress, work-life balance, workload, professional isolation, and flexible working policy. **Results:** The prevalence of positive well-being among respondents was 58.13%. Significant associations were observed between positive well-being and age (p=0.005), number of children (p=0.040), technostress level (p<0.001), work-life balance (p<0.001), intensity of remote working (p=0.025), workload (p<0.001), and professional isolation (p<0.001). Multivariate logistic regression identified good work-life balance (AOR 3.636, 95% CI 1.915-6.902, p<0.001) and absence of professional isolation (AOR 4.870, 95% CI 2.595-9.140, p<0.001) as predictors of positive well-being. **Conclusion:** This study establishes a baseline for understanding the well-being of academicians working from home during a pandemic. Ensuring positive well-being is crucial for maintaining teaching and learning quality, and strategies to support this should focus on work-life balance and reducing professional isolation.
Malaysian Journal of Medicine and Health Sciences (2025) 21(2): 85-92. doi:10.47836/mjmhs.21.2.12

Keywords: Wellbeing, remote working, academicians, Covd-19, Public university

Corresponding Author:
Halimatus Sakdiah Minhat, DrPH
Email: halimatus@upm.edu.my
Tel : +603-97692413

INTRODUCTION

Remote working refers to a work arrangement conducted outside the central office (1). It is a flexible working arrangement mutually agreed upon between the employee and employer to cater to the firm's needs (2). Terms such as telecommuting, work from home, virtual work, and telework are often used interchangeably with remote working, all involving working away from the office using Information Communication Technology (ICT) (1).

The concept of remote working was first introduced in the United States in 1973 by Jack Niles, an engineer working with NASA, to reduce traffic problems and energy consumption by moving work to workers rather than moving workers to work (1). The popularity of remote working has grown with technological advancements such as personal laptops in the 1980s and cell phones in the 1990s. During the Covid-19 pandemic, remote working became a common arrangement despite the lack of prior experience and low technical knowledge. The number of remote workers in the United States increased from 11% before the pandemic to 65% in early May 2020 (3).

One of the sectors affected by the pandemic was the educational sector, particularly with schools and universities closing worldwide. To ensure the continuation of education, learning was transformed into online education. For instance, institutions like the University of Cambridge in the UK conducted the 2020/2021 academic year online (4). In China, the government provided additional web-based and television resources to rural areas with poor network coverage to assist with online learning(4). In Malaysia, limited evidence exists on remote working in higher

education, however, a pre-COVID-19 survey in a public university showed that 87% of academicians preferred physical classes, with only 13% preferring a combination of physical and online learning (5). Academicians doubted the efficacy of online classes compared to on-campus classes. During the pandemic, the lockdown forced academicians to adapt to remote working, including organizing online teaching, research, publications, administrative work, and balancing work and life requirements. These new challenges potentially impact the well-being of academicians and should be addressed accordingly.

A study among academicians in the Indian cities of Hyderabad and Nagpur reported that social support, family support, and education significantly influenced psychological wellbeing during the pandemic(6). Wellbeing is a holistic concept reflecting an individual's overall quality of life, combining positive emotions, control over life, a sense of purpose, and positive relationships (7). Better well-being increases productivity, effective learning, creativity, and positive relationships (8). Moreover, in the Middle East and North Africa, 32.6% of university students, staff, and faculty members reported low mental wellbeing during home confinement (9). At York University, UK, 66.2% of staff and 71.7% of students experienced high-stress levels during the lockdown (10). Given the importance of maintaining good wellbeing among workers and the increasing demand for remote working in the education sector, it is crucial to examine its impacts.

In high educational institutions, remote-working academicians are said to have greater flexibility in handling personal and family matters(11). They have more control over managing household chores, including childcare and eldercare. However, with increasing work requirements such as teaching, exams, research, administrative work, and strict deadlines, academicians juggle between work and family matters. Multiple roles at home may create conflicts that potentially affect the academician's wellbeing.

Moreover, Information Communication Technology (ICT) is crucial for remote working. After the abrupt enforcement of working from home, academicians are expected to quickly adapt to various virtual platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and Google Meet. Stress resulting from improper adaptation and coping skills to technology requirements is known as 'technostress'(12). Academicians lacking ICT training or skills, inadequate infrastructure such as poor internet connectivity, and no support from technology experts are more prone to developing technostress. Addressing technostress is essential to ensure high job satisfaction and positively affect their wellbeing.

Furthermore, remote-working academicians may experience professional isolation due to inadequate interactions and a lack of emotional information exchange. Professional isolation is the feeling of being 'alone' and not connected with others in the workplace (13). The lack of face-to-face interactions and informal sharing of thoughts and opinions between coworkers in online learning environments can contribute to low job satisfaction and negatively affect their wellbeing.

Therefore, while remote work offers flexibility in handling personal and family matters, it also brings challenges such as work-life balance, workload, technostress, and professional isolation. Understanding these factors will help to develop strategies to support the wellbeing of academicians in a remote working environment. Therefore, this study aims to identify the predictors of wellbeing among remote-working academicians at Universiti Putra Malaysia using the Social Ecological Model as the theoretical framework.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study design

The study aimed to investigate the determinants of This cross-sectional study was conducted among academicians from Universiti Putra Malaysia Serdang Campus from October 2020 until July 2021, during the enforcement of Movement Control Oder (MCO), which began in March 2020.
.

Study population and sample size

Academicians in this study consist of academicians from 14 different faculties in UPM Serdang Campus. A list of academicians was obtained from the UPM official website, and proportionate sampling was used to determine the number of academicians needed from each faculty.

All identified academicians were approached via email to assess their eligibility based on the inclusion criteria (academicians who had been remotely working since the first implementation of MCO, which was March 18th, 2020) and exclusion criteria (academicians on sabbatical, maternity, and sick leave during the data collection). Simple random sampling was then performed among eligible respondents. The sample size was calculated using the two-proportion Lwange and Lameshow formula (1990), based on the negative wellbeing among males (0.546) and females (0.732) (El-Zoghby et al., 2020). The final calculated sample size was 288 accounting for a 20.00% non-response rate.

Study instruments

Respondents were invited via email to complete a questionnaire provided through a Google form link, which includes three sections. Section 1 collected data on sociodemographic characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, and number of children. Section 2 measures the wellbeing of the respondents. This section used the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-

12), consisting of 12 items with four responses per item, using a 0-0-1-1 or 1-1-0-0 scoring method, with a total score ranging from 0 to 12. Based on the mean GHQ score of the study population, a score ≤3 indicated positive wellbeing, while a score >3 indicated negative well-being. Section 3 measures factors associated with wellbeing. This section included 28 items covering various factors, Technostress level (5 items, adapted from Wang and Li) (14), Work-life balance (6 items, adapted from Heiden et al.)(15), Intensity of remote working (1 item, adapted from Heiden et al.) (15), Workload (6 items, adapted from Mukosolu et al.)(16), Professional isolation (7 items, adapted from Golden et al.)(13), Presence of flexible access policy (3 items). All items, except for the intensity of remote working, were measured on a 5-point Likert Scale and dichotomized into high and low based on their medians. The intensity of remote working was measured by the frequency of remote work over the past six months, ranging from always to less than once per month.

The face validity of the questionnaires was assessed by two public health physicians and further validated by a small group of academicians from other public universities. Suggestions for improvement included structural adjustments and clarification of ambiguous items. Moreover, the reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using internal consistency, computed via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 25). The questionnaire was distributed to 30 academicians from universities other than UPM, who were not included in the main study. The Cronbach's Alpha values for the seven sets of Likert Scale questionnaires ranged from 0.712 to 0.899, indicating acceptable internal consistency.

Statistical analysis

All data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. Descriptive statistics were used to present categorical data as frequency and percentage, and continuous variables were presented as mean and standard deviation (for normally distributed data) or median and interquartile range (IQR) (for not normally distributed data). Normality was tested using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk test, with p>0.05 indicating normally distributed data.

Continuous variables were converted to categorical variables using the median split method (DeCoster et al., 2011). The association between the positive well-being of academicians and all independent variables was analyzed using the Chi-Square test. Subsequently, multivariate analysis using multiple logistic regression was conducted with SPSS version 25 to develop a predictive model for the positive well-being of remote-working UPM Serdang academicians during the MCO. Assumptions of the regression analysis, including linearity, independence of errors, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity, were checked to ensure the validity of

the model. During univariate analysis, variables with p < 0.25 were further analyzed in the multivariate logistic regression. Results were presented as adjusted odds ratios (aOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). The level of significance was set at a p-value of less than 0.05.

Ethical Clearance
Ethical approval was obtained from the Ethic Committee for Research Involving Human Subjects, Universiti Putra Malaysia (JKEUPM), reference number JKEUPM-2021-205. Individual oral and written consents were obtained from eligible respondents before data collection.

RESULTS

A total of 288 questionnaires were emailed to eligible respondents, and 248 responses were received. Two respondents were excluded as they recently started working at UPM, resulting in 246 responses and an overall response rate of 85%. Table I presents the descriptive findings of the study.

Table I: Descriptive findings (N=246)

Characteristics	n	%
Wellbeing		
Positive	143	58.13
Negative	103	41.87
Intrapersonal Factors		
Gender		
Male	74	30.08
Female	172	69.92
Age (mean ± SD)	43.24±7.61	
36 years and below	35	14.23
36- 40 years	76	30.89
41 – 45 years	38	15.45
46 years and above	97	39.43
Marital Status		
Married	207	84.15
Single	32	13.00
Widowed/ divorced	7	2.85
Number of children		
None	46	18.70
1 – 3 children	149	60.57
4 and more children	51	20.73
Technostress		
Low technostress level (score 5- score 12)	112	45.53
High technostress level (score 13 – score 25)	134	54.47
Interpersonal Factor		
Work-life balance		
Good work-life balance (score 6 -18)	119	48.37
Poor work life balance (score 19- score 30)	127	51.63
Organisational Factors		
Intensity of remote working		
Less than 1x/month	12	4.88
Several times/ month	33	13.41
Several times/ week	74	30.08
All the time/ Always	127	51.63

CONTINUE

Table I: Descriptive findings (N=246). (CONT.)

Characteristics	n	%
Organisational Factors		
Workload Level		
Low (score 6 – score 19)	121	49.19
High (score 20 – score 36)	125	50.81
Community Factor		
Professional isolation		
No (score 7 – score 22)	117	47.56
Yes (score 23 – score 35)	129	52.44
Policy Factor		
Flexible access policy		
Agree (score 3 – score 8)	139	56.50
Disagree (score 9 – score 15)	107	43.50

The prevalence of positive well-being among respondents was 58.13%, while negative well-being was 41.87%. The mean ± SD age of respondents was 43.24 ± 7.61 years. In terms of intrapersonal factors, the majority were female (69.92%), aged over 40 years (54.88%), married (84.15%), had 1-3 children (60.57%), and over half (54.47%) experienced high levels of technostress. For interpersonal factors, the majority had poor work-life balance (51.63%). Regarding organizational factors, 50.81% had a high workload, and 51.63% worked remotely full-time during the past six months. Under community factors, the majority perceived professional isolation (52.44%). Additionally, 56.50% of respondents agreed on the need for a flexible access policy related to remote working. The normality test was conducted on continuous variables which included the age of the respondent, technostress score, work-life balance score, workload score, professional isolation score, and the flexible access policy score using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-wilk test computed by the SPSS. All variables, except for the professional isolation scores, were not normally distributed, as indicated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, where only the professional isolation scores showed a p-value greater than 0.05, confirming normal distribution.

Table II shows factors significantly associated with respondents' well-being measured through chi-square analysis. Gender did not show a significant association with well-being, as both male and female respondents had similar levels of positive and negative well-being (p=0.262). However, age was a significant factor; older respondents were more likely to report positive well-being compared to younger respondents (p=0.005). Marital status did not significantly affect well-being, though married individuals showed a higher prevalence of positive well-being compared to single or widowed/divorced respondents (p=0.250).

Table II: Factors associated with the wellbeing of the respondents

Variables	Wellbeing		X^2	df	P value
	Positive n=143 (%)	Negative n=103 (%)			
Gender					
Male	47 (63.5)	27 (36.5)	1.26	1	0.262
Female	96 (55.8)	76 (44.2)			
Age					
35 years and below	17 (48.6)	18 (51.4)	12.67	3	**0.005***
36 – 40 years	34 (44.7)	42 (55.3)			
41 – 45 years	27 (71.1)	11 (28.9)			
46 years and above	65 (67.0)	32 (33.0)			
Marital Status					
Married	125 (60.4)	82 (39.6)	2.77	2	0.250
Single	15 (46.9)	17 (53.1)			
Widowed/divorced	3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)			
Number of children					
None	20 (43.5)	26 (56.5)	6.42	2	**0.040***
1 – 3	88 (59.1)	61 (40.9)			
3 or more	35 (68.6)	16 (31.4)			
Technostress level					
Low	83 (74.1)	29 (25.9)	21.56	1	**< 0.001**
High	60 (44.8)	74 (55.2)			
Work-life Balance					
Good work-life balance	95 (79.8)	24 (20.2)	44.60	1	**< 0.001***
Poor work-life balance	48 (37.8)	79 (62.2)			
Intensity of remote working					
Less than 1x/month	7 (58.3)	5 (41.7)	9.38	3	**0.025***
Several times/month	25 (75.8)	8 (24.2)			
Several times/week	48 (64.9)	26 (35.1)			
All the time/always	63 (49.6)	64 (50.4)			
Workload					
Low workload	91 (75.2)	30 (24.8)	28.53	1	**< 0.001***
High workload	52 (41.6)	73 (58.4)			
Professional Isolation					
No	95 (81.2)	22 (18.8)	48.77	1	**< 0.001***
Yes	48 (37.2)	81 (62.8)			
Presence of flexible access policy					
Not agreed	74 (53.2)	65 (46.8)			
Agreed (Score 3 – score 9)	69 (64.5)	38 (35.5)	3.14	1	0.076

(*) significant at p<0.05

The number of children was another significant factor, with respondents having more children reporting better well-being compared to those without children

(p=0.040). Technostress level was strongly associated with well-being; respondents with low technostress reported much higher positive well-being compared to those with high technostress (p<0.001). Work-life balance was also crucial, with those reporting a good work-life balance being significantly more likely to have positive well-being than those with poor work-life balance (p<0.001).

The intensity of remote working had a significant impact on well-being, with those working remotely several times a month or a week reporting better well-being than those working remotely all the time or less than once a month (p=0.025). Additionally, workload was highly significant; respondents with a lower workload reported significantly better well-being compared to those with a higher workload (p<0.001). Professional isolation was another critical factor, with those not experiencing isolation reporting significantly higher levels of well-being (p<0.001).

Finally, while the presence of a flexible access policy was not significantly associated with well-being (p=0.076), there was a trend suggesting that those who agreed with the policy tended to report better well-being. In summary, factors such as age, number of children, technostress level, work-life balance, intensity of remote working, workload, and professional isolation were significantly associated with the well-being of respondents, highlighting the importance of managing these factors to enhance well-being in remote working environments.

Table III presents the determinants of positive well-being analyzed from the logistic regression. Respondents with good work-life balance were 4 times more likely to report positive well-being than respondents with poor work-life balance (AOR 3.636, 95% CI 1.915-6.902, p<0.001), and respondents not having professional isolation were 5 times more likely to report positive wellbeing than respondents having professional isolation (AOR 4.870, 95% CI 2.595-9.140, p<0.001). The final multiple logistic regression model for this study is Log (probability of positive wellbeing of remote working academician in UPM Serdang during the MCO) = -1.303 + 1.291 (good work-life balance) + 1.583 (no professional isolation).

Table III: Determinants of positive wellbeing among the respondents

Variable	B	SE	Wald	p-value	AOR	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
Work-life balance							
Poor	Ref						
Good	1.291	0.327	15.578	<0.001*	3.636	1.915	6.902
Professional Isolation							
Yes	Ref						
No	1.583	0.321	24.286	<0.001*	4.870	2.595	9.140
Constant	-1.303	0.252	26.814	<0.001	0.272		

Note:(*) significant at p< 0.05
Hosmer and Lameshow test, x^2 (2) = 2.521, p = 0.866, Cox and Snell R^2 = 0.286
Nagelkerke R^2 = 0.385

DISCUSSION

Several studies have been conducted globally to assess remote working and its effect on wellbeing, yielding mixed findings. Remote workers have been demonstrated to experience more negative emotions such as loneliness, irritation, worry, and guilt than office workers (17). However, a study conducted among remote working employees in Klang Valley, Selangor, Malaysia, found that 72% preferred working from home to reduce commuting time (18). Reduced commuting provided more time at home with family and less time on the road, reducing commuting time, cost, and travel stress (19).

In the context of remote working academicians during the COVID-19 pandemic, this current study showed that 58.13% of the academicians had positive wellbeing. In the Middle East and North Africa, 67.40% of the university staff reported high well-being (9). Conversely, a study in India showed that only 27.30% of academicians reported high well-being (6). Based on these studies, the prevalence of positive wellbeing ranged from 27.30% to 67.40%, which could be attributed to different instruments used to measure well-being. This current study used the GHQ-12 as a measurement tool, Kilani et al. (2020) used the WHO-5 Well-being Index, and Vaidya (2020) used the 18-item Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale. Moreover, other reasons contributing to the differences in prevalence include the timing of data collection. This study among UPM academicians was conducted after 14 months of remote working implementation, whereas studies by Kilani et al. (2020), Vaidya (2020), Pierce et al. (2020), and Every-Palmer et al. (2020) were conducted only after 1-2 months of lockdown. The longer duration of remote working in the current study may have affected the well-being of academicians, as it is very much related to the progress of the pandemic during the data collection.

The findings of this study revealed that academicians with good work-life balance predicted positive well-being during remote working or work-from-home. Work-life balance is a subjective construction by individuals, with 'work' commonly referring to formal paid employment and 'life' encompassing personal and

family commitments (19). A study by Grant et al. (2013), highlighted that the well-being of remote workers would be negatively affected when there was no clear boundary between 'work' and 'life' (20). For instance, when there was a temptation to work beyond office hours, extending into the night due to easy accessibility to work. This could lead to insufficient time to recuperate, making work-life balance unfeasible and negatively impacting well-being. However, when boundaries are clearly defined, work-life balance can be achieved, leading to positive well-being. This relationship was emphasized by Gudep (2019) in a study among teaching staff in the United Arab Emirates, in which there was a positive correlation between flexible work systems and work-life balance (21). Therefore, promoting clear boundaries between work and personal life can enhance the well-being of remote-working academicians, as shown by this study's findings.

The findings of this study highlight the significant impact of professional isolation on the well-being of remote-working academicians, reinforcing the critical role of social support in mitigating the adverse effects of isolation. Professional isolation, a subset of social isolation, refers to the disconnection or lack of interaction with colleagues in the workplace, which can be particularly detrimental in a remote working environment. This isolation disrupts the informal networks and peer support systems that are essential for emotional and professional well-being. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the importance of social support has been underscored by various studies. For instance, research conducted among academicians in India during lockdown conditions found that social support was a key determinant of well-being, particularly for those with lower levels of well-being (AOR 8.80, 95% CI: 2.13-36.50, p<0.001) and medium well-being levels (AOR 2.00, 95% CI: 1.14-3.75, p<0.001). Similarly, a study at York University in the United Kingdom reported that social isolation significantly contributed to increased vulnerability during lockdown, with those experiencing professional isolation more likely to suffer from reduced job performance and poorer well-being (AOR=1.97, 95% CI: 1.39-2.79). These findings are consistent with pre-pandemic research at Universiti Putra Malaysia, where co-worker support was identified as a crucial factor in reducing job stress among academicians. Together, these studies suggest that professional isolation and a lack of social support not only diminish job performance but also critically impair well-being. Therefore, fostering strong social support networks and minimizing professional isolation should be prioritized in remote working arrangements, particularly in academic settings, to enhance overall well-being and job satisfaction.

This study also reported that academicians with no professional isolation are more likely to have positive well-being than those experiencing professional isolation. It highlights the significant impact of professional isolation on the well-being of remote-working academicians, reinforcing the critical role of social support in mitigating the adverse effects of isolation. Professional isolation, a component of social isolation, is defined as being out of touch with others in the workplace (22). This isolation disrupts the informal networks and peer support systems that are essential for emotional and professional well-being. In a recent study published during the pandemic, social support was identified as a significant determinant of well-being among academicians in India during lockdown (6). The study found that social support was crucial for those with low well-being levels (AOR 8.80, 95% CI: 2.13, 36.50, p<0.001) and medium well-being levels (AOR 2.00, 95% CI: 1.14, 3.75, p<0.001) (6). Similarly, research on staff at York University in the United Kingdom showed that vulnerability during lockdown was significantly influenced by social isolation (AOR=1.97, 95% CI: 1.39-2.79), with professional isolation negatively affecting job performance and leading to poorer well-being . Additionally, a study conducted before the pandemic reported that co-worker support significantly determined job stress among academicians at UPM (16). Together, these studies suggest that professional isolation and a lack of social support not only diminish job performance but also critically impair well-being. Therefore, fostering strong social support networks and minimizing professional isolation should be prioritized in remote working arrangements, particularly in academic settings, to enhance the overall well-being of the academicians.

During the unprecedented pandemic, academicians had to adapt to sudden system changes while working from home. According to Allen et al. (2020), perceived professional isolation in an organization depends on the value placed on developmental activities, and the extent to which these activities are missed. The lack of visibility increases remote workers' concerns about losing opportunities for promotion, rewards, and positive performance reviews. On the other hand, academicians who are not experiencing professional isolation could overcome these challenges and feel 'present' or 'visibly seen' by their organizations despite the absence of face-to-face informal interactions with superiors, colleagues, or students. Therefore, to sustain positive well-being among academicians, organizations, and employers must understand and acknowledge the efforts of academicians in adapting to the radically new norm. This acknowledgment and support would contribute to their positive well-being.

Limitations and recommendations
This study had some limitations. Firstly, the 'well-being' in this study was subjective and based on self-reports, which may have led to reporting bias. Secondly, methodologically, this study utilized a cross-sectional design, capturing data at a single point in time,

which prevents the establishment of causal-temporal relationships between well-being and associated factors. Thirdly, data collection occurred during the MCO Phase III, when all movements across districts or states were prohibited. Therefore, eligible respondents and faculty contacts could only be reached via email, complicating the data collection process.

Fourthly, the unprecedented nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and its varying impact across countries means that the findings of this study are most applicable to contexts similar to Malaysia. Finally, the study was conducted solely among UPM Serdang academicians, excluding those from the UPM Bintulu campus. This limitation restricts the generalizability of the findings to all UPM academicians. Consequently, any policy changes based on this study's findings should be evaluated for feasibility in the UPM Bintulu setting before being implemented as part of UPM's overall policy.

There are several recommendations based on the findings of this study. Although COVID-19 is currently under control in Malaysia, with the population adapting to living with the virus as a new norm, the unpredictability of future pandemics underscores the importance of this research. This study provides a foundational understanding of academicians' well-being while working from home during a pandemic, specifically within the context of Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM). However, the generalizability of the findings is limited due to the study's focus on a single institution. Future research should expand to include academicians from multiple universities across Malaysia to gain a more comprehensive and representative perspective. This broader inclusion would help capture variations in institutional policies, resources, and demographics, which may influence the well-being of remote-working academicians. Additionally, given the variability in well-being outcomes observed among participants, it is recommended that future studies standardize measurement tools to enhance the comparability of results across different academic settings.

Apart from that, ensuring positive well-being among academicians is crucial for maintaining quality teaching and learning, with key areas of focus being work-life balance and professional isolation. To sustain a positive work-life balance among the academicians, initiatives such as webinars and scheduled online physical activities like Zumba, yoga, or virtual runs should be organized. Furthermore, to prevent professional isolation, ongoing support from the employers is crucial, for instance, providing technological support for online classes and periodic discussion sessions among the academicians. These recommendations are relevant not only during periods like the MCO but can also be utilized to improve remote working practices in the future.

CONCLUSION

This study serves as a baseline for understanding academicians' well-being while working from home during a pandemic, highlighting the variability in well-being outcomes among remote-working academicians. It underscores the importance of ensuring positive well-being among academicians to maintain quality teaching and learning, focusing on work-life balance and professional isolation. These findings are relevant not only during the pandemic but for also future remote working practices to enhance academicians' well-being.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Allen TD, Golden TD, Shockley KM. How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. Psychol Sci Public Interes. 2015;16(2):40–68.
2. Thompson RJ, Payne SC, Taylor AB. Applicant attraction to flexible work arrangements: Separating the influence of flextime and flexplace. J Occup Organ Psychol. 2015;88(4):726–49.
3. Chong SH, Huang Y, Daisy Chang CH. Supporting Interdependent Telework Employees: A Moderated-Mediation Model Linking Daily COVID-19 Task Setbacks to Next-Day Work Withdrawal. J Appl Psychol. 2020;
4. Mheidly N, Fares MY, Fares J. Coping With Stress and Burnout Associated With Telecommunication and Online Learning. 2020;8(November).
5. Haron H, Abbas WF, Rahman NAA. The Adoption of Blended Learning among Malaysian Academicians. Procedia - Soc Behav Sci [Internet]. 2012;67(November 2011):175–81. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.318
6. Vaidya R. Perceived Psychological Wellbeing of an Academician in Higher Education Is a Function of Organizational Support , Supervisor Perceived Psychological Wellbeing of an Academician in Higher Education Is a Function of Organizational Support , Supervisor Suppo. Int J Manag Bus. 2020;11(July):1292–306.
7. Huppert F. Psychological well-being: evidence regarding its causes and consequences. Appl Psychol Heal Well Being [Internet]. 2009;1(2):137–64. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01008.x.
8. Ruggeri K, Garcia-Garzon E, Maguire A, Matz S, FA H. Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: A multidimensional analysis of 21 countries. Heal Qual Life Outcomes.

2020;18(192):. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01423-y.

9. Kilani HA, Bataineh MF, Al-Nawayseh A, Atiyat K, Obeid O, Abu-Hilal MM, et al. Healthy lifestyle behaviors are major predictors of mental wellbeing during COVID-19 pandemic confinement: A study on adult Arabs in higher educational institutions. PLoS One [Internet]. 2020;15(12 December):1–15. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0243524

10. Feltz-cornelis CM Van Der, Varley D, Allgar VL. Workplace Stress , Presenteeism , Absenteeism , and Resilience Amongst University Staff and Students in the COVID-19 Lockdown. 2020;11(November):1–15.

11. Ng CF. Academics telecommuting in open and distance education universities: Issues, challenges, and opportunities. Int Rev Res Open Distance Learn. 2006;7(2).

12. Panisoara IO, Lazar I, Panisoara G, Chirca R, Ursu AS. Motivation and continuance intention towards online instruction among teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic: The mediating effect of burnout and technostress. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2020;17(21):1–29.

13. Golden TD, Veiga JF, Dino RN. The Impact of Professional Isolation on Teleworker Job Performance and Turnover Intentions: Does Time Spent Teleworking, Interacting Face-to-Face, or Having Access to Communication-Enhancing Technology Matter? J Appl Psychol. 2008;93(6):1412–21.

14. Wang X, Li B. Technostress Among University Teachers in Higher Education : A Study Using Multidimensional Person-Environment Misfit Theory. 2019;10(August).

15. Heiden M, Widar L, Wiitavaara B, Boman E. Telework in academia: associations with health and well-being among staff. High Educ. 2020;

16. Mukosolu O, Ibrahim F, Rampal L, Ibrahim N. Prevalence of job stress and its associated factors among Universiti Putra Malaysia staff. Malaysian J Med Heal Sci. 2015;11(1):27–38.

17. Mann S, Holdsworth L. The psychological impact of teleworking: Stress, emotions and health. New Technol Work Employ. 2003;18(3):196–211.

18. Ma G, Hen KW, Chooi TF. Telecommuting Adaptation in Malaysia: Demographics, Beliefs and Practices. Asian Soc Sci Humanit Res J. 2019;1(1):11–8.

19. Minhat HS, Syahirah W, Ghazali W. ORIGINAL ARTICLE REMOTE WORKING AND WELLBEING OF THE FEMALE ACADEMICIANS DURING THE COVID-19 MOVEMENT CONTROL ORDER ENFORCEMENT (MCO) IN MALAYSIA. 2024;24(1):204–14.

20. Grant CA, Wallace LM, Spurgeon PC. An exploration of the psychological factors affecting remote e-worker's job effectiveness, well-being and work-life balance. Empl Relations. 2013;35(5):527–46.

21. Gudep VK. An empirical study of the relationships between the flexible work systems (FWS), Organizational commitment (OC), work life balance (WLB) and job satisfaction (JS) for the teaching staff in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Int J Manag. 2019;10(5):11–27.

22. Banerjee D, Rai M. Social isolation in Covid-19: The impact of loneliness. Int J Soc Psychiatry. 2020;66(6):525–7.