Article

The Mediating Role of Person-Job Fit between Work-Life Balance (WLB) Practices and Academic Turnover Intentions in India's Higher Educational Institutions

Abdul Samad Kakar ¹ , Roselina Ahmad Saufi ², Babin Dhas Devadhasan ³ , Natanya Meyer ^{4,*} ,
Seetharampalayam Chettiannan Vetrivel ⁵ and Róbert Magda ^{6,7}

¹ Department of Management Sciences, University of Loralai, Loralai 84800, Pakistan; samadkakar87@gmail.com

² Malaysian Graduate School of Entrepreneurship and Business, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Kota Bharu 16100, Malaysia; roseline@umk.edu.my

³ Department of Management Studies, Loyola Institute of Technology, Chennai 600123, India; babindhasmba@gmail.com

⁴ DHET-NRF SARCHI Entrepreneurship Education, Department of Business Management, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg 2092, South Africa

⁵ School of Management Studies, Kongu Engineering College, Erode 638060, India; scvetrivel@gmail.com

⁶ Institute of Economics, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, 2100 Gödöllő, Hungary; magda.robert@uni-mate.hu

⁷ Vanderbijlpark Campus, North-West University, Vanderbijlpark 1900, South Africa

* Correspondence: natanyam@uj.ac.za; Tel.: +27-82347-6611

Citation: Kakar, A.S.; Saufi, R.A.; Devadhasan, B.D.; Meyer, N.; Vetrivel, S.C.; Magda, R. The Mediating Role of Person-Job Fit between Work-Life Balance (WLB) Practices and Academic Turnover Intentions in India's Higher Educational Institutions. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 10497. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910497>

Received: 25 July 2021

Accepted: 30 August 2021

Published: 22 September 2021

Corrected: 24 March 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Abstract: This study examines the impact of work-life balance (WLB) practices concerning academics' turnover intention, person-job fit (PJF), and PJF's relationship with academics' intention to leave their jobs. The study further investigates person-job fit as an underlying mechanism of the association between WLB practices and turnover intention. The study's data were collected through a self-administered questionnaire garnered from 550 full-time academics working in higher educational institutions in South India (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and Telangana, as well as the union territories of Lakshadweep and Puducherry). Partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) was employed for the statistical analysis of the data, using Smart PLS 3.2.8 software. The study ascertained that WLB practices have a negative impact on academics' turnover intention. Additionally, the study discovered that WLB practices have a positive impact on PJF. Similarly, PJF seems to have a significant negative influence on turnover intention. Moreover, PJF partially and negatively mediates the influence of WLB practices on turnover intention. Consequently, this study suggests implementing several WLB practices (e.g., telecommuting, job sharing, flexitime, paid parental leave, etc.) into higher educational institutions, since it may not only improve academics' perception of their person-job fit but it may also reduce their turnover intention.

Keywords: person-job fit (PJF); PLS-SEM; turnover intention; work-life balance (WLB) practices; intention to leave

Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Can organisations succeed in reducing academics' turnover intention? To answer this research question, existing literature has primarily focused on academics' attitudes, behaviours [1–4], and organisational practices, in particular, its human resource management practices, which are perceived as predictors of academics' turnover intention [5–8]. Most recently, the focus has been on the role of work-life balance practices in alleviating employees' turnover intention. In this regard, several studies have concluded that work-life balance (WLB) practices exert a significant influence on employees' turnover intention [9–11]. While WLB practices are certainly important, recent studies have suggested

that the effectiveness of mere provisions of WLB practices do not necessarily guarantee success. More specifically, success is predicated on when and/or if employees' perceptions of WLB practices are taken into account [10,12,13]. Hence, further research is required to comprehend WLB practices from academics' perspectives and how it may influence their turnover intention. Moreover, when organisations implement organisational practices, employees may perceive these practices either in a positive or negative light [14,15]. In the former case, employees often perceive that organisational investment in WLB practices is designed to enhance their knowledge, skills, and abilities and, thus, meet their needs and preferences. Consequently, as related to the norms of reciprocity, positive work outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment [9,16], employees' wellbeing [17], and citizenship behaviour, ensue. However, in the latter case, employees generally perceive that the use of these practices by themselves would be interpreted by management as a lack of commitment towards their organisation [12]. Hence, due to fears of reprisal [18], employees become reluctant to take advantage of such protocols; thus, organisations fail to implement WLB practices. Hence, it is not a question of what categories of WLB practices are implemented by the organisation, but rather a question of how employees perceive these practices. In this study, by applying the theory of social exchange and norms of reciprocity, we answer the research question of how academics perceive WLB practices influencing their intention to leave their job. While it is widely acknowledged that WLB practices have a significant impact on individuals, as well as organisations [19–22], a clear picture of the underlying mediating mechanism through which WLB practices are linked to turnover intention is non-existent in the extant literature. Given the potential of WLB practices for both individuals and organisations, it is imperative to overcome this gap so that appropriate intervention can be undertaken to abate academics turnover intention. Past studies have suggested that there are numerous mechanisms by which WLB practices can influence turnover intention and have thus called for further research to investigate other mediating variables in order to better comprehend the different aspects in which WLB practices affect employees' turnover intention [11].

In an effort to bridge these theoretical gaps, the present research examines the influence of academics' perception of WLB practices on turnover intention. This study also analyses the mediating role of person-job fit (i.e., the fit between the person and job characteristics) regarding this relationship from the perspective of social exchange theory (SET). Social exchange theory posits that employees feel obliged to reciprocate organisations' fair treatment with positive attitudes and behaviours [23]. For example, when organisations appropriately utilise WLB practices, employees may believe that these practices are likely to meet their needs and preferences while enhancing their ability to meet their job requirements [24,25]. These perceptions of need fulfilment and ability enhancement result in PJJF [26], which, in turn, lower employees' turnover intention [27]. In contrast, working in a position that is devoid of WLB practices and incompatible with employees' needs/desires and abilities, one would expect a person-job misfit and high turnover. Therefore, we assert that WLB practices will enhance person-job fit (PJJF), and, in return, diminish the academics' turnover intention. In so doing, the present research makes several contributions to the current literature. First, the study examines the direct effect of WLB practices on turnover intention and PJJF and the PJJF influence on the turnover intention of academics. Second, it specifies and tests a mechanism through which WLB practices influence turnover intention. Third, understanding the mediating mechanism increases our ability to design and implement WLB strategies that fulfil academic needs and preferences and enhances their capacity to meet job requirements. Thus, the results of this research provide significant contributions related to practice and theory.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Work-Life Balance Practices, Person-Job Match, and Turnover Intention

Organisational practices that address issues related to employees' work and family responsibilities are characterised as WLB practices. These practices include flexible working

hours, childcare facilities, telecommuting (i.e., working from home or other remote sites by using telecommunication equipment), and job sharing (i.e., sharing job responsibilities between two or more employees [16,28,29]. Primarily, WLB practices are envisioned to enhance the autonomy of the worker through integrating their work and personal lives [29]. Moreover, these practices aim to reduce employees' work-life conflict and increase their ability to simultaneously and pragmatically manage their work and family responsibilities [9,17]. Organisations also adopt WLB practices to improve employees' job satisfaction, organisational commitment [9,10], and intention to stay and mitigate their stress [30], work-family conflict, and, ultimately, turnover intention [11]. Although implications of WLB practices are well espoused in the current academic literature, the main emphasis has been on actual and implemented WLB practices. Thus, perceived WLB practices have received comparatively scant scholarly attention, yet employees' perception is presumed to be the most proximal predictor of individual and organisational outcomes [15,31,32]. In this study, we postulate new insights by relating academics' perception of WLB practices to PJF and turnover intention simultaneously.

To further expound on these relationships, we rely on the theoretical foundation provided by SET [23]. SET posits that the relationship between employees and employers is contingent upon social and economic exchanges. Social exchanges are "voluntary actions" of either party that is privy to the employment relationship. These actions are engendered by future unquantified benefits, such as prestige, respect, motivation, and satisfaction. However, economic exchanges are quantifiable (e.g., pay) and rest upon a formal legal agreement between employees and employers [33]. Research has revealed that the length of the employment relationship is determined by the satisfaction of both parties based on social and economic exchanges [34]. Since the nature of academic life is challenging [7], the employee and employer have different social and economic expectations with regard to this employment relationship. The social and economic resources/benefits that academics expect from organisations are provisions for WLB practices that tend to fulfil their needs/desires and strengthen their capability to meet their job and family-related responsibilities. On the other hand, organisations expect employees to meet their job requirements and remain with the organisation for an extended period of time. Thus, from the Social Exchange Theory (SET) perspective, when an organisation fulfils academics' expectations related to WLB practices, this favourable treatment of the organisation will engender a sense of belief among academics that organisations appreciate and value their contributions. In the norm of reciprocity [35], academics will respond to this favourable treatment by developing more desirable work attitudes, such as exhibiting an ability to meet or exceed job requirements and resources (i.e., PJF), thereby lowering turnover intention. Hence, based on the SET and related literature, the present research proposes the following:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *Work-life balance practices are negatively related to academics' turnover intention.*

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *Work-life balance practices are positively related to person-job fit.*

2.2. Person-Job Fit (PJF) and Turnover Intention

Person-job fit is defined as matching an individual's attributes (e.g., knowledge, skills, abilities (KSAs), and experience) with their job [36,37]. A person's compatibility or suitability for the job occurs on two specific dimensions, namely, the demands-ability fit and the needs-supply fit [37,38]. For example, the demands-ability fit (D-A fit) is the congruence of a person's KSAs with the requirements of the job, while the needs-supply fit (N-S fit) is conceptualised as the compatibility between employees' needs/preferences and resources offered by the job. Organisations use job resources (e.g., pay, allowances, and work-life benefits) to meet individuals' desires, while an individual uses his or her abilities to meet the job requirements. When there is a correspondence or fit between the two, a broad spectrum of positive work outcomes ensues. For instance, a strong PJF results in job satisfaction [38], organisational commitment [38], and intention to stay [27]. In contrast, a poor PJF implies that employees' characteristics are not appropriately matched with the

job; therefore, such employees are expected to experience emotional exhaustion, stress, burnout, and turnover intention.

Comprehensive assessment of the Person–Environment Fit Dimensions and their relationships with work-related outcomes and consequences of individuals studies shows that PJF generates desirable work outcomes and mitigates a variety of negative consequences [38–40]. However, thus far, the implications of PJF in relation to academics' turnover intention have not been adequately explored, especially in the context of higher education. Based on the related literature, the present research asserts that academics' PJF is negatively associated with their turnover intention. To further clarify this relationship, the present research refers to the Social Exchange Theory [23], which assumes that the interaction between a person and a job is based on the reciprocity principle. Furthermore, the principle of reciprocity implies that parties participating in an exchange relationship provide benefits, with the expectation that the same benefits will be reciprocal or returned [35]. In the case of PJF, individuals' qualifications, abilities, expertise, and knowledge are related to their job and are associated with the performance benefits that employers require from their employees, while employees' needs and preferences represent the benefits that employees seek from the job. Thus, from the social exchange perspective, when either party fails to provide benefits, the correspondence/cooperation between the two parties would be weak or limited. This weak correspondence between the person and the job (i.e., person-job misfit) may, in turn, result in the termination of the employment relationship [27,38,39]. Hence, based on Social Exchange Theory and related empirical evidence, the present research proposes the following:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *Person-job fit is negatively correlated to academics' turnover intention.*

2.3. Person-Job Match as an Intercessor

Scholars have highlighted job embeddedness [11], organisation support, and job autonomy [16] as underlying mechanisms that associate WLB practices with turnover intention. This study provides new insights by systematically exploring the mediating role of PJF in this type of relationship. PJF refers to the association “between the abilities of a person and the demands of a job or the needs/desires of a person and what is provided by a job” [40,41]. Recently, scholars have included PJF as an attitudinal variable, which is predicted based on organisational factors, such as human resource management practices [24] and high-performance work practices [42]. Moreover, organisational leadership is also predicted to enhance PJF [43]. In accordance with the related lines of inquiry, several researchers have argued that WLB practices improve employees' “goodness of fit” with workplace experience [18] and increase their suitability for their work and non-working environment [44]. Accordingly, WLB practices were also found to enhance individuals' abilities to meet job requirements and, thus, fulfil their needs and desires [16]. Hence, given that WLB practices fulfil individual desires (i.e., N-S fit) and strengthen their KSAs to meet the job requirements (i.e., D-A fit), it is anticipated that WLB practices are more likely to enhance PJF.

Furthermore, numerous scholars have discovered a significantly negative association between PJF and turnover intention; however, not in the context of higher education. For example, [27,37] reported that employees are less likely to quit their job when they perceive that their attributes are clearly compatible with the job requirements. Recently, using a sample of French employees, [38] demonstrated a negative and significant impact of PJF on turnover intention. Moreover, several scholars have found similar results that showed that individuals with a high PJF are less prone to quit and more likely to remain on the job [26,40]. Hence, when considering prior literature proposing a link between PJF and turnover intention, we expect that, when academics perceive a high PJF, their intention of leaving their job will decline.

In summary, by combining the association between WLB practices and PJF with the negative influence of the latter on academics' turnover intention, we hypothesise the following:

Hypothesis 4 (H4). *The relationship between WLB practices and turnover intention is mediated by PJF.*

3. Methodology

The present research aimed to ascertain the implications of WLB in higher education institutions (HEIs) in South India. Therefore, the population of the study consisted of full-time academics working in HEIs in South India (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and Telangana, as well as the union territories of Lakshadweep and Puducherry). The sample from this population was garnered using convenient sampling (i.e., approaching those who were conveniently available to participate in the study). Furthermore, this research adopted well-established and valid scales to measure the constructs of the study. WLB practices were assessed on a four-item scale adopted from [45]. An example item is: "My organisation provides flexible working arrangements." In measuring PJF [39], a six-item scale comprised of N-S fit and D-A fit was used. The sample items are as follows: "The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills" and "The job that I currently hold gives me just about everything that I want from a job". Likewise, a five-item scale adopted from [46,47] was used to measure academics' turnover intention. A sample item from the scale is as follows: "Thoughts about quitting this job has crossed my mind". Additionally, a five-point Likert scale (where 1 = "Strongly Disagree", and 5 = "Strongly Agree") was applied for the measurement of variables (See Appendix A for item statements).

Moreover, the researchers used a self-administered survey for the data collection. The researchers visited 19 public sector institutions (i.e., colleges) in South India and manually distributed 750 questionnaires among the academics working in HEIs of South India. However, only 577 questionnaires were returned, representing a 76.9% initial response rate. Furthermore, 27 out of 577 questionnaires were withdrawn based on straight-lining (i.e., where participants intentionally chose the same response to all the questions) and missing values. The elimination of 27 cases resulted in 550 viable questionnaires, representing an effective response rate of 73.33%. Out of 550 participants, 72% ($n = 396$) were lecturers, 15% ($n = 82$) were assistant professors, 8% ($n = 44$) were associate professors, while the remaining 5% (27%) were professors. Furthermore, 61% ($n = 335$) of the participants were male, while female participants constituted 39% ($n = 214$) of the survey. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the majority (40%, $n = 220$) of the participants were over 40 years of age. Out of the total participants, 37% ($n = 203$) had accumulated work experience of 1–5 years, 25% ($n = 137$) had a working tenure of 6–10 years, 16% ($n = 88$) had worked for their organisation for 11–15 years, while the remaining 22% ($n = 121$) had a working experience exceeding 16 years. Additionally, 77% ($n = 423$) of the participants had attended a postgraduate programme, 20% ($n = 110$) had acquired a Master of Philosophy, while the remaining 3% ($n = 16$) had a doctoral degree.

4. Data Analysis

4.1. Preliminary Analysis

The means (M), standard deviations (SD), and correlations of the study's constructs are provided in Table 1. Consistent with our expectations, the results indicate that WLB practices and PJF are inversely related to turnover intention. Moreover, WLB practices reflected a positive correlation with PJF.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3
Work-Life Balance(WLB)practices	3.27	0.96	—		
Person-job fit(PJF)	3.27	0.83	0.38 **	—	
Turnover Intention	3.01	1.01	−0.26 **	−0.39 **	—

Note: $N = 550$. ** $p < 0.01$; SD = standard deviation.

4.2. Inferential Analysis

In accordance with the guidelines suggested by [48], we analysed the data using PLS-SEM, because PLS-SEM is less sensitive to normal distribution assumptions [49] and least affected by sample size [50]. Additionally, it has the advantage of performing factor analysis and structural analysis, as well as controlling measurement errors simultaneously [51]. PLS-SEM is also suitable for prediction-oriented studies [48,52], such as predicting WLB practices' positive effects on PJF and negative effects on turnover intention. Furthermore, following recommendations, the data were analysed in two stages. In stage one, the constructs' reliability and validity were estimated through confirmatory factor analysis [48]. In stage two, structural equation modelling (SEM) was applied to assess the relationship among the constructs comprising the conceptual model depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Conceptual model; the dashed line indicates mediation.

4.2.1. Stage One: Measurement Model Assessment

The measurement model specifies how observable items or indicators measure the latent constructs and describes the validity and reliability of the latent constructs and their items. The assessment of the measurement model includes the estimation of indicators reliability, latent constructs internal consistency, validity, and multicollinearity among latent constructs [52]. Indicator reliability was verified with factor loadings and measurement model specification and as formative constructs are part of the structural model, we selected PLS-SEM, as suggested by [53]. Hence, for this purpose, we loaded all the indicators on their respective constructs in Smart PLS 3.2.8 software. The research presented in Table 2 indicate that the factor loadings for all the indicators were above the 0.70 threshold as recommended by [53], thereby providing evidence for the reliability of the indicators. Construct reliability was verified with the criteria established by [53] concerning the composite reliability ($CR \geq 0.70$), Cronbach's Alpha ($CA \geq 0.70$), and convergent validity (average variance extracted: $AVE \geq 0.50$) involving the measures. The results presented in Table 2 showed that all constructs' CA, CR, and AVE exceeded their minimum thresholds, thus providing support for constructs' reliabilities and convergent validity. The model's multicollinearity was assessed through the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The VIF values were all in the acceptable range (i.e., less than five), thus nullifying the possibility of multicollinearity.

Discriminate validity, which represents the distinctiveness of a construct from the remaining constructs of the model [54], was assessed through the heterotrait–monotrait ratio (HTMT) and Fornell–Larcker criterion. HTMT “is the average of the correlations of indicators across constructs measuring different phenomena relative to the average of the correlations of indicators within the same” constructs [55]. For a construct to be distinct

from the rest of the model, the HTMT values should be less than 0.90 [56]. The results (Table 3) indicate that the HTMT values of all the measures were less than 0.90. Furthermore, the results from Table 4, utilising the criterion of [57], demonstrated that the square root of the AVE of all measures was higher than the inter-construct correlations. Thus, both HTMT and the criterion established by [57] provided support for discriminant validity.

Table 2. Constructs' reliability and validity.

Constructs	Indicators	CA	CR	AVE	VIF
Person-job fit	0.733	0.852	0.890	0.574	1.763
	0.830				
	0.810				
	0.757				
	0.696				
	0.710				
Turnover intention	0.770	0.857	0.896	0.633	-
	0.764				
	0.737				
	0.854				
	0.847				
Work-life balance practices	0.747	0.7781	0.856	0.598	1.182
	0.807				
	0.719				
	0.817				

Note: Cronbach's alpha (CA), composite reliability (CR), average variance extracted (AVE), and variance inflation factor (VIF).

Table 3. Heterotrait–Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

Constructs	PJF	TOI	WLB Practices
Person-job fit (PJF)			
Turnover intention (TOI)	0.465		
Work-life balance (WLB) practices	0.408	0.325	

Table 4. Fornell–Larcker Criterion.

Constructs	PJF	TOI	WLB Practices
Person-job fit (PJF)	0.758		
Turnover intention (TOI)	−0.425	0.796	
Work-life balance (WLB) practices	0.340	−0.283	0.773

4.2.2. Stage Two: Structural Model Assessment

In stage two, the structural portion of the model depicted in Figure 1 was examined. The model proposed that WLB practices are directly and indirectly associated with turnover intention through PJF. The model's goodness of fit was estimated by calculating the model's root mean square residuals [55], predictive power or the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect size (f^2), and the predictive relevance (Q^2) proposed by [58,59]. In this study, the estimated value of SRMR was below the 0.08 threshold (i.e., 0.07), which indicates a better model [60].

R-square (R^2) represents the structural model's predictive power, while R^2 values closer to 1 indicate that the model exhibits a significant variance in endogenous constructs. In this study, the 20.2% variance in the endogenous construct (i.e., intention to leave; $R^2 = 0.202$) was clarified by exogenous constructs (WLB practices and PJF). Similarly, WLB practices predicted an 11.6% variance in PJF ($R^2 = 0.116$). Furthermore, to assess the incremental power of exogenous constructs, we calculated the effect size of f^2 [61]. A score of $f^2 = 0.02$ reflects a small effect size, while $f^2 = 0.15$ represents a medium effect size. Moreover, $f^2 = 0.35$ is considered a large effect size [62]. In this study, the effect size of WLB

practices on turnover intention was weak ($f^2 = 0.027$), while its effect on PJF was medium ($f^2 = 0.13$). We also calculated the model's Q^2 by using the test identified in [58,59]. A model is said to possess predictive relevance if Q^2 values exceed zero [52]. For the present study, Q^2 values were acquired using a blindfolding procedure in Smart PLS 3.2.8. The results indicated that the Q^2 values were greater than zero, thereby confirming the predictive relevance of the model. In summary, the overall results substantiate the fit of the model.

4.3. Hypotheses Testing

The hypotheses were tested using recommended path coefficients (β) [52], p -values, and t -values for the structural model through a bootstrapping procedure. The bootstrapping procedure is commonly utilised in the nonparametric inferential test, which randomly extracts several subsamples (e.g., 5000), which are replaced with data from the original dataset. PLS-SEM was then employed to estimate the underlying PLS path model's β , t -values, and p -values by using each of the subsamples. The β results from Table 5 revealed that WLB practices have a negative relationship with academic turnover intention ($\beta = -0.157$, t -value = 2.470, $p < 0.00$) and a significant and positive relationship with PJF ($\beta = 0.340$, t -value = 5.588, $p < 0.05$). Thus, H_1 and H_2 are supported. The results also provided support for the negative and significant influence of PJF on turnover intention ($\beta = -0.372$, t -values = 6.113, $p < 0.05$); hence, H_3 is also supported.

Table 5. Hypothesis testing.

Hypothesis	β	t -Values	p -Values
Work-Life Balance practices → Turnover intention	−0.157	2.470	<0.00
Work-Life Balance practices → PJF	0.340	5.588	<0.05
PJF → Turnover intention	−0.372	6.113	<0.05
Work-Life Balance practices → PJF → Turnover intention	−0.126	3.868	<0.05

$N = 550$; significance at 0.05; PJF = person job fit.

In order to assess the mediation impact of PJF on the relationships between WLB practices and turnover intention, this research conducted bootstrapping of the indirect effect, as suggested by [63,64]. If the confidence interval (upper and lower) does not equate to zero, then there is sufficient evidence to suggest that mediation exists. The results obtained from Table 5 denote that the mediation impact of PJF on the relationship between WLB practices and turnover intention was significant and negative ($\beta = -0.126$, t -values = 3.868, p -values < 0.05). The bias-corrected 95% confidence interval did not include any zeros, thereby supporting H_4 .

5. Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between WLB practices and turnover intention as well as endeavouring to specify the underlying mechanism through which these associations work. Moreover, the study examined the influence of WLB practices on PJF and PJF influence on turnover intention. Although it may appear logical that WLB practices can directly affect PJF and turnover intention, this study particularly focused on exploring whether PJF mediates the impact of WLB practices on turnover intention.

Present research predicted that WLB practices would relate negatively to turnover intention and positively to PJF of academics. The initial results revealed that WLB practices significantly and negatively predicted turnover intention and positively predicted PJF. These results imply that when organisations provide WLB practices that could meet academics' needs and preferences, it will enhance their ability to maintain an acceptable balance between their family life and work. Thus, employees are less likely to quit their jobs and more likely to feel well-matched in the context of their jobs. This study also found support for the direct and negative influence of PJF on academics' turnover intention. This PJF-turnover relationship suggests that when academics believe that organisational

resources are sufficient to meet their needs/desires and strengthen their abilities to meet their job requirements, they are then less likely inclined to leave their job. This finding is in line with the work in [27,39,40], which posited that PJF reduces employees' willingness to leave their job. Furthermore, the study also demonstrated that PJF partially mediated the linkage between WLB practices and turnover intention. Thus unique WLB practices and the PJF turnover intention relationship implies that when academics believe that an organisation intends to support them through its WLB practices (i.e., telecommuting, job sharing, flexible timing, childcare facilities, etc.), they feel comfortable with their job, which, in turn, reduces their likelihood of resigning. Therefore, this finding suggests that WLB practices can reduce academic turnover intention; however, the effect may not be direct. In fact, WLB practices initially enhanced academics' perception of PJF, and this enhanced perception of PJF results in a reduced inclination to resign. This suggests the possibility that WLB practices can be used by institutions to demonstrate their support and concern for academics' needs, desires, and work, while promoting a positive family dynamic [18,44]. Moreover, these findings suggest that institutions can use WLB practices to strengthen the bond between the employee and employer [9,11] and oblige academics to reciprocate by exhibiting an attitude/belief of being fit or suitable for the job and lessen their proclivity to leave the organisation. In addition, some studies further suggest that education institutions should be more entrepreneurial, and this could also relate to WLB policies and practices [65]. In line with other studies [11,16], this added to the literature by validating PJF as an underlying mechanism impacting the relationship between WLB practices and academics' intention to leave their jobs.

6. Implications of the Study

Although scholars have explored the effect of WLB practices on turnover intention—albeit in non-academic work settings—this study expands on the current literature by investigating WLB practices' impact on turnover intention and the PJF of the academics in HEIs in South India. These findings are important for academics and practitioners. The concluding results infer that when institutions fail to provide WLB practices, such as flexible working hours, telecommuting, childcare, and parental leave, academics may perceive that they are not important or valued by their institution. This perception of being inadequately cared for and thus less valued by the institutions is detrimental to academics' level of satisfaction with their work and family life [66]. Hence, this negative perception of being less valuable to or valued by the organisation also affects employees' fit with or suitability for the job, off-the-job work environment [18], and turnover intention [11]. These findings provide implications for higher education management personnel to implement WLB practices in order to enhance employees' perception of PJF and reduce their turnover intention. With the provisions of WLB practices (e.g., flexible timing, telecommuting, job sharing, etc.), managers may fulfil individual needs/preferences and enhance employees' abilities to meet job requirements. These fulfilments of need and ability enhancement will strengthen the fit between academics and job performance while reducing their turnover intention.

The study also discovered a negative and significant association between PJF and turnover intention. Although previous researchers have widely acknowledged this relationship [27,37–39], most of these studies were conducted in non-academic work settings and Western countries. Overall, this study has provided new insights by examining the influence of academics' perception of PJF on their turnover intention in India and in a higher education context. The findings demonstrated that when academics believe that their attributes are identical to or in line with their jobs, they are less likely to leave their jobs. This discovery has implications for policy formulation that should not only focus on enhancing academics' knowledge, skills, and abilities but also on satiating their desires. For example, by providing training, development opportunities, flexible working hours, and competitive pay to academics, it will strengthen their compatibility level with their job, which, in turn, will lower academics' willingness to leave their job.

One of the more significant contributions of this study is predicated on specifying the mechanism through which WLB practices are linked to turnover intention. This suggests that WLB practices are the means through which institutions can meet faculty members' needs and preferences and thus enhance their ability to meet their job requirements. This perception of need fulfilment and job requirements will strengthen faculty members' perception of PJF, which, in turn, will lower their turnover intention. Therefore, management and practitioners can now focus on adopting WLB practices that best fulfil their needs/desires. Furthermore, management can also employ this finding by engendering a positive attitude among employees, since previous studies suggested that a positive attitude among employees can be enhanced through WLB practices [18,67]. This positive attitude facilitated by WLB practices can also engender a more positive attitude and improve behaviour. For example, studies have revealed that WLB practices enhance employees' satisfaction and commitment [9,16], which consequently strengthen their bond with the organisation and lower their turnover intention.

This study can also aid practitioners in designing viable recruitment and selection policies. An organisation often recruits employees who they believe will meet the job requirements and resources. However, this is not always the case as life and work domains are changing at a rapid pace. Here, the results suggest that the institutions should recruit academics who possess the necessary skills, knowledge, and qualifications for the job. In addition, prior to recruitment, institutions need to understand the family life of the faculty members, since this will also help design strategies that will enable faculty to allot sufficient time to their home and family life, respectively. Moreover, recruiting academics who share similar characteristics with their jobs will not only lessen turnover but also reduce future costs involving recruitment, selection, and training.

7. Limitations

Despite the significant theoretical and managerial contributions, this study has certain limitations. The cross-sectional design of the study is one of its limitations, and this may limit the generalizability of the study. Thus, future researchers may extend the literature by testing the proposed model with a longitudinal study. Second, data were collected from a single source; hence, collecting data from diverse sources, such as management and academics, will increase the worth of the model. In addition, the study employed a quantitative approach for data analyses; therefore, the use of the mixed method is warranted. Furthermore, due to the causal link between WLBP and turnover intention, future researchers may need to test the mediating role of person-organisation fit, person-group fit, and person-vocation fit, respectively. Furthermore, testing the model with contextual and economic factors, such as job opportunities as a moderator, may broaden our cognition of the boundary conditions under which WLB practices can operate more effectively. Prospective researchers are also encouraged to test and replicate the model of the present study in various work settings and countries.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.S.K., R.A.S. and N.M.; methodology, A.S.K., N.M. and S.C.V.; software, B.D.D.; validation, B.D.D., N.M., S.C.V. and R.M.; formal analysis, A.S.K., B.D.D.; investigation, A.S.K., B.D.D.; resources, N.M.; data curation, A.S.K.; writing—original draft preparation, A.S.K.; writing—review and editing, R.A.S. and N.M.; visualization, B.D.D. and N.M.; supervision, R.A.S.; project administration, S.C.V., N.M. and R.M.; funding acquisition, N.M. and R.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: The APC was funded by North-West University and DHET-NRF SARCHI Entrepreneurship Education/118845.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Committee of Kongu Engineering College, Perundurai, Erode-638060.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Work life balance practices:
My organisation provides flexible working arrangement.
My organisation grants leave to meet family needs.
My organisation provides health and wellness program.
Person-job fit:
There is a good fit between what my job offers me and what I am looking for in a job.
The attributes that I look for in a job are fulfilled very well by my present job.
The job that I currently hold gives me just about everything that I want from a job.
The match is very good between the demands of my job and my personal skills.
My personal abilities and education provide a good match with the demands that my job places on me.
My abilities and training are a good fit with the requirements of my job.
Turnover Intention:
I would prefer another, more ideal job than the one I have now.
As soon as I can find a better job, I will leave the current job.
Thoughts about quitting this job cross my mind.
I often think about quitting my job.
I have thought seriously about changing job since beginning to work here.
I think I will be working for this organisation five years from now.

References

- Jin, M.H.; McDonald, B.; Park, J. Person–Organization Fit and Turnover Intention: Exploring the Mediating Role of Employee Followership and Job Satisfaction through Conservation of Resources Theory. *Rev. Public Pers. Adm.* **2016**, *38*, 167–192. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Miner, K.N.; Smittick, A.L.; He, Y.; Costa, P.L. Organizations Behaving Badly: Antecedents and Consequences of Uncivil Workplace Environments. *J. Psychol.* **2019**, *153*, 528–554. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Oliveira, L.B.; da Costa, E.M.T.C.M. Comparing Attitudes of Public Servants and Outsourced Employees. *RAUSP Manag. J.* **2019**, *54*, 38–53. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Smart, J.C. A Causal Model of Faculty Turnover Intentions. *Res. High. Educ.* **1990**, *31*, 405–424. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bibi, P.; Ahmad, A.; Majid, A.H.A. The Impact of Training and Development and Supervisor Support on Employees Retention in Academic Institutions: The Moderating Role of Work Environment. *Gadjah Mada Int. J. Bus.* **2018**, *20*, 113. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Converso, D.; Sottimano, I.; Molinengo, G.; Loera, B. The Unbearable Lightness of the Academic Work: The Positive and Negative Sides of Heavy Work Investment in a Sample of Italian University Professors and Researchers. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 2439. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- King, V.; Roed, J.; Wilson, L. It's Very Different Here: Practice-Based Academic Staff Induction and Retention. *J. High. Educ. Policy Manag.* **2018**, *40*, 470–484. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Park, J. Higher Education employees' Self-Assessment of person–organisation Fit: The Role of Work Conditions and Job Satisfaction. *Int. Rev. Public Adm.* **2018**, *23*, 55–77. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Allen, T.D. Family-Supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2001**, *58*, 414–435. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Koon, V. A Multilevel Analysis of work–life Balance Practices. *Asia Pac. J. Hum. Resour.* **2020**, 1–22. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Thakur, S.J.; Bhatnagar, J. Mediator Analysis of Job Embeddedness. *Empl. Relat.* **2017**, *39*, 718–731. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pailhé, A.; Solaz, A. Is There a Wage Cost for Employees in family-friendly Workplaces? The Effect of Different Employer Policies. *Gend. Work Organ.* **2018**, *26*, 688–721. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Waters, M.A. Work-Family Policies in the Context of Higher Education: Useful or Symbolic? *Asia Pac. J. Hum. Resour.* **2006**, *44*, 67–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bowen, D.E.; Ostroff, C. Understanding HRM–Firm Performance Linkages: The Role of the “Strength” of the HRM System. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **2004**, *29*, 203–221. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bowen, D.E. Linking various perspectives on service. In *The People Make the Place*; Psychology Press: Hove, UK, 2008. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Baughman, R.; DiNardi, D.; Holtz-Eakin, D. Productivity and wage effects of “family-friendly” fringe benefits. *Inter. J. Manp.* **2003**, *24*, 247–259. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Lazar, I.; Osoian, C.; Ratiu, P. The Role of Work-Life Balance Practices in Order to Improve Organisational Performance. *Eur. Res. Stud. J.* **2010**, *13*, 201–214. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Newman, M.; Mathews, K. Federal Family-Friendly Workplace Policies. *Rev. Public Pers. Adm.* **1999**, *19*, 34–48. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

19. Adisa, T.A.; Mordi, C.; Osabutey, E.L. Exploring the Implications of the Influence of Organisational Culture on Work-Life Balance Practices. *Pers. Rev.* **2017**, *46*, 454–473. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Cegarra-Leiva, D.; Sánchez-Vidal, M.E.; Gabriel Cegarra-Navarro, J. Understanding the Link Between Work Life Balance Practices and Organisational Outcomes in SMEs. *Pers. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 359–379. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Odriozola, M.D.; Baraibar-Diez, E. Do Work-Life Balance Practices Mediate in the Relationship Between Female Participation and Financial Performance? *Eur. J. Manag. Bus. Econ.* **2018**, *27*, 249–265. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Straub, C. A Comparative Analysis of the Use of work-life Balance Practices in Europe. *Women Manag. Rev.* **2007**, *22*, 289–304. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Blau, P.M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2017. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Boon, C.; Den Hartog, D.N.; Boselie, P.; Paauwe, J. The Relationship Between Perceptions of HR Practices and Employee Outcomes: Examining the Role of person–organisation and person–job Fit. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2011**, *22*, 138–162. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Uppal, N. Mediating Effects of person–environment Fit on the Relationship Between High-Performance Human Resource Practices and Firm Performance. *Int. J. Manpow.* **2020**, *42*, 356–371. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Cable, D.M.; DeRue, D.S. The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2002**, *87*, 875–884. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
27. Vogel, R.M.; Feldman, D.C. Integrating the levels of person–environment fit: The roles of vocational fit and group fit. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2009**, *75*, 68–81. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. De Cieri, H.; Holmes, B.; Abbott, J.; Pettit, T. Achievements and Challenges for work/Life Balance Strategies in Australian Organisations. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2005**, *16*, 90–103. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
29. Felstead, A.; Jewson, N.; Phizacklea, A.; Walters, S. Opportunities to Work at Home in the Context of Work-Life Balance. *Hum. Resour. Manag. J.* **2002**, *12*, 54–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
30. Chiang, F.F.; Birtch, T.A.; Kwan, H.K. The Moderating Roles of Job Control and Work-Life Balance Practices on Employee Stress in the Hotel and Catering Industry. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **2010**, *29*, 25–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Kilroy, S.; Flood, P.C.; Bosak, J.; Chênevert, D. Perceptions of High-Involvement Work Practices, Person-Organization Fit, and Burnout: A Time-Lagged Study of Health Care Employees. *Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2016**, *56*, 821–835. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Kooij, D.T.; Boon, C. Perceptions of HR Practices, Person-Organisation Fit, and Affective Commitment: The Moderating Role of Career Stage. *Hum. Resour. Manag. J.* **2017**, *28*, 61–75. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Aryee, S.; Budhwar, P.S.; Chen, Z.X. Trust as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Organizational Justice and Work Outcomes: Test of a Social Exchange Model. *J. Organ. Behav.* **2002**, *23*, 267–285. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Gutierrez, A.P.; Candela, L.L.; Carver, L. The structural relationships between organisational commitment, global job satisfaction, developmental experiences, work values, organisational support, and person–organisation fit among nursing faculty. *J. Adv. Nurs.* **2012**, *68*, 1601–1614. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
35. Gouldner, A.W. The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **1960**, *25*, 161. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Chhabra, B. Work Role Stressors and Employee Outcomes. *Int. J. Organ. Anal.* **2016**, *24*, 390–414. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. Tseng, L.M.; Yu, T.W. How Can Managers Promote salespeople’s Person-Job Fit? *Learn. Organ.* **2016**, *23*, 61–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Andela, M.; van der Doef, M. A Comprehensive Assessment of the Person–Environment Fit Dimensions and Their Relationships with Work-Related Outcomes. *J. Career Dev.* **2018**, *46*, 567–582. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Campbell, D.T.; Fiske, D.W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychol. Bull.* **1959**, *56*, 81–105. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
40. Kristof-Brown, A.L.; Zimmerman, R.D.; Johnson, E.C. Consequences of Individuals. *Pers. Psychol.* **2005**, *58*, 281–342. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Lauver, K.J.; Kristof-Brown, A. Distinguishing Between Employees. *J. Vocat. Behav.* **2001**, *59*, 454–470. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
42. Wu, L.; Wei, L.-Q.; Zhang, Y.; Han, T. Employee Experienced HPWPs and Job Performance: Roles of Person-Job Fit and Intrinsic Motivation. *Front. Bus. Res. China* **2011**, *5*, 344–363. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Birasnav, M.; Rangnekar, S. The Role of Career Management Between Human Capital and Interim Leadership. *J. Adv. Manag. Res.* **2012**, *9*, 124–138. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Mitchell, T.R.; Lee, T.W. 5. The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Turnover and Job Embeddedness: Foundations for a Comprehensive Theory of Attachment. *Res. Organ. Behav.* **2001**, *23*, 189–246. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Zheng, C.; Kashi, K.; Fan, D.; Molineux, J.; Ee, M.S. Impact of Individual Coping Strategies and Organisational work–life Balance Programmes on Australian Employee Well-Being. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2015**, *27*, 501–526. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Cennamo, L.; Gardner, D. Generational Differences in Work Values, Outcomes and person–organisation Values Fit. *J. Manag. Psychol.* **2008**, *23*, 891–906. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. O’Reilly, C.A.; Chatman, J.; Caldwell, D.F. People and organisational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person–organization fit. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1991**, *34*, 487–516. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Sarstedt, M.; Ringle, C.M.; Hair, J.F. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. *Handb. Mark. Res.* **2017**, *26*, 1–40. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
49. Hair, J.F.; Sarstedt, M.; Ringle, C.M.; Mena, J.A. An Assessment of the Use of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling in Marketing Research. *J. Acad. Mark. Sci.* **2011**, *40*, 414–433. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

50. Xu, F.; Akther, T. A Partial Least-Squares Structural Equation Modeling Approach to Investigate the Audit Expectation Gap and Its Impact on Investor Confidence: Perspectives from a Developing Country. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 5798. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Williams, L.J.; Vandenberg, R.J.; Edwards, J.R. Structural Equation Modeling in Management Research: A Guide for Improved Analysis. *Acad. Manag. Ann.* **2009**, *3*, 543–604. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Hair, J.F.; Risher, J.J.; Sarstedt, M.; Ringle, C.M. When to Use and How to Report the Results of PLS-SEM. *Eur. Bus. Rev.* **2019**, *31*, 2–24. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Hair, J.F.; Ringle, C.M.; Sarstedt, M. PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *J. Mark. Theory Pract.* **2011**, *19*, 139–152. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Gefen, D.; Straub, D. A Practical Guide to Factorial Validity Using PLS-Graph: Tutorial And Annotated Example. *Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst.* **2005**, *16*, 5. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Henseler, J.; Hubona, G.; Ray, P.A. Using PLS Path Modeling in New Technology Research: Updated Guidelines. *Ind. Manag. Data Syst.* **2016**, *116*, 2–20. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Markus, K.A. Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling by Rex B. Kline. *Struct. Equ. Modeling Multidiscip. J.* **2012**, *19*, 509–512. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Fornell, C.; Larcker, D.F. Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *J. Mark. Res.* **1981**, *18*, 39. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Geisser, S. A Predictive Approach to the Random Effect Model. *Biometrika* **1974**, *61*, 101–107. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Stone, M. Cross-Validatory Choice and Assessment of Statistical Predictions. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B (Methodol.)* **1974**, *36*, 111–133. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. Hu, L.; Bentler, P.M. Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria Versus New Alternatives. *Struct. Equ. Modeling Multidiscip. J.* **1999**, *6*, 1–55. [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Ringle, C.M.; Sarstedt, M.; Straub, D.W. A Critical Look at the Use of PLS-SEM in MIS Quarterly. *MIS Q.* **2012**, *36*, iii–xiv. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Chin, W.W. How to Write Up and Report PLS Analyses. In *Handbook of Partial Least Squares*; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 2009; pp. 655–690. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Preacher, K.J.; Hayes, A.F. SPSS and SAS Procedures for Estimating Indirect Effects in Simple Mediation Models. *Behav. Res. Methods Instrum. Comput.* **2004**, *36*, 717–731. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Preacher, K.J.; Hayes, A.F. Asymptotic and Resampling Strategies for Assessing and Comparing Indirect Effects in Multiple Mediator Models. *Behav. Res. Methods* **2008**, *40*, 879–891. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
65. Da Cruz, M.D.F.P.; Ferreira, J.J.; Kraus, S. Entrepreneurial orientation at higher education institutions: State-of-the-art and future directions. *Int. J. Manag. Educ.* **2021**, *19*, 100502. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Fraser, H.; Draper, J.; Taylor, W. The Quality of Teachers. *Eval. Res. Educ.* **1998**, *12*, 61–71. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Candela, L.; Gutierrez, A.P.; Keating, S. What Predicts Nurse Faculty Members intent to stay in the academic organisation? A structural equation model of a national survey of nursing faculty. *Nurse Educ. Today* **2015**, *35*, 580–589. [[CrossRef](#)]