E-ISSN: 2962-6110
P-ISSN: 2964-7843
JSRET
jsret.knpub.com
Journal of Scientific Research, Education, and Technology

Personality Traits and Digital Wellbeing: Work Life Balance as a Mediator

Puteri Nur Diana Sari Choirudin, Eko April Ariyanto, Amanda Pasca Rini
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The increasing reliance on digital technology has reshaped work practices, particularly among digital workers, raising concern about digital wellbeing. Ths study investigates the relationship between personality traits and digital wellbeing, with work life balance as a mediating variable. A quantitative correlational approach was applied to Generation Z digital workers in Surabaya. Data were colledted using Likert-scale instruments and analyzed through Sctructural Equating Modeling Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) with SmartPLS 4.1.1.6. The Result demonstrate that personality traits significantly influence digital wellbeing and work life balance. Work life balance also shows a significant effect on digital wellbeing and mediates the relationship between personality traits and digital wellbeing. These findings highlight the importance of work life balance as a key psychological mechanism in explaining how individual personality characteristics shape digital wellbeing in digitally intensive work contexts

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Work Life Balance, Digital Wellbeing, Digital Worker.*

Corresponding author
Name: Puteri Nur Diana Sari Choirudin
Email: Puteridianaaa10@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technology has fundamentally transformed contemporary work systems, giving rise to digital workers who depend heavily on digital devices and platforms in performing their tasks. This transformation provides flexibility in terms of time and location, however it also intensifies work demands and blurs the boundaries between professional and personal life. As a result, individuals are increasingly exposed to prolonged screen time, continuous connectivity, and digital overload, which may negatively affect psychological funtionng and overall wellbeing (Abeele, 2021; Burr et al., 2020). These challenges are particularly salient among Generation Z, a cohort that dominates the digital workforce and demonstrates high levels of technology engagement in both work and daily life (Hutagalung et al., 2024).

In response to these challenges, the concept of digital wellbeing has grained growing scholarly attention. Digital wellbeing refers to an individual's ability to use digital technology in a balanced, controlled, and beneficial manner that supports productivity

without compromising mental healt and quality of life (Abeele, 2021). Prior research suggests that low levels of digital wellbeing are associated with digital fatigue, emotional distress, sleep disturbances, and decreased psychological wellbeing, whereas higher digital wellbeing reflects effective self regulation and healthy digital engagement (Burr et al., 2020; Thomas et al., 2022).

Existing literature highlights work life balance as a critical influencing welbeing in modern work environment. Work life balance reflects an individual's ability to manage work and personal role harmoniously, minimizing role conflict while enhancing role enrichment (Sirgy & Lee, 2018). In digital work setting, flexible arrangements such as remote work from home practices may improve balance by reducing commuting time, yet they may also exacerbate role overlap and increase by reducing commuting time, yet they may also exacerbate role overlap and increase digital demands when boundaries are poorly managed (Molino et al., 2020; Damayanti & Atmaja, 2020). Empirical evidance consistently shows that poor work life balance is associated with increased stress, burnout, and reduced psychological wellbeing (Kim & Chon, 2022).

Beyond contextual and organizational factors, individual characteristic play an essential role in shaping how digital workers experience and manage digital demand. Personality traits, particularly those descrbe in the Big Five personality model; extraverion, agreableness, conscientiousness, neuroticsm, and openness have been shown to onfluence coping strategies, emotional regulation, and responses to work related stressors (John & Srivastava, 1999). Individuals with high conscientiousness tend to demonstrate better self regulation with high conscientiousness tend to demonstrate better self regulation and boundary management, whereas those with high neuroticm are move vulnerable to stress and emotional strain in demanding work enviromenment (Ingram & Park, 2021; Prasad et al., 2020).

Although previous studies have established the importance of personality traits and work life balance in predicting various forms of wellbeing, research examining their combined role in explaining digital wellbeing remains limited. Most prior studies focus on direct relationship, such as the effect of personality traits on wellbeing or the impact of work life balance on psychological outcomes, without adequately addressing the uderlying mechanism that link these variables, particularly within the context of digital work (Sheron & Jiji, 024; Alfithon & Safitri, 2019).

Addresing this gap, the present study aims to investigate the relationship between personality traits and digital wellbeing, with work life balance positioned as a mediating variable among digital workers. Specifically, this study seeks to examine whether personality traits influence digital wellbeing directly and inderectly through work life balance. By adopting this integrative approach, the study respond to calls for more comprehensive models that account for both individual and contextual factors in understanding wellbeing in digitally intensive work environments (Sirgy & Lee, 2018).

This research contributes to the growing literature on digital wellbeing in several ways. First, it extend wellbeing research by focusing on digital workers, a population that remains underrpresented despite the rapid digitalization of work. Second, it advances

theoritical understanding by positioning work life balance as a psychological mechanism that explains how personality traits translate into digital wellbeing outcomes. Finally, the findings offer practical implications for organizations and policymakers by highlighting the importance of considering indiviual differences and work life balance strategies when designing interventions and policies aimed at promoting healthier and more sustainable digital work practices.

METHOD

This study employes a quantitative survey design to examine the relationships among personality traits, work life balance, and digital wellbeing, as well as to test the mediating role of work life balance. A cross sectional approach was used, with data collected at a single point in time to capture participants experiences in digital work settings.

The subject of this study this study were Generation Z digital workers in Surabaya, Indonesia. Digital workers were defined as individuals whose work activities primarily depend on digital technologes and online platforms. Due to the unknown population size, a non-probability sampling method was applied using purposive sampling. Participants were selected based on criteria including generational cohort, active engagement in digital based work, and regular use of digital tools in occupational tasks.

Data were collected through a self administered questionnaire distributed to eligible participants. They survey included likert scale instruments measuring personality traits based on the Big Five model, work life balance reflecting interactions between work and personal life, and digital wellbeing related to balanced and healthy technology use.

Data analysis was condicted using Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) with SmartPLS version 4.1.1.6. The analysis involved evaluating the measurement model for validity and realibility, followed by testing the structural model to assess path relationship and the mediating effect of work life balance using a bootstrapping procedure.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

RESEARCH RESULT

The result of this study present the findings related to the relationships among personality traits, work life balance, and digital wellbeing, as well as the mediating role of work life balance among digital workers. Data analysis was conducted using SEM-PLS with SmartPLS version 4.1.1.6. The main findings are presented below according to the research objectives.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Variable Categorization

Variabel	Mean Empirik	Mean Hipotetik	Kategorisasi
Digital wellbeing	52,4	51	ME>MH
Work life balance	50,57	42	ME>MH
Personality traits	97,28	96	ME>MH

Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Variable Categories

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Digital Wellbeing	Low	20	14.9
	Moderate	102	76.1
	High	12	9.0
Work Life Balance	Low	20	14.9
	Moderate	85	63.4
	High	29	21.6
Personality Traits	Low	42	31.3
	Moderate	55	41.0
	High	37	27.6

Table 3: R-Square Adjusted Test Results

Variabel	*R-Square Adjusted*
DW	0,612
WLB	0,319

Table 4: Effect Size (f^2) Test Results

Relationship	f^2	Category
PT → DW	0.441	Large
PT → WLB	0.479	Large
WLB → DW	0.264	Moderat

Table 5: Hypothesis Testing Results (Bootstrapping)

Hypothesis & Path	Original Sample (β)	T Statistics	P Values
H1: PT → WLB → DW (Mediation)	0.220	6.611	0.000
H2: PT → DW	0.499	11.431	0.000
H3: WLB → DW	0.386	6.308	0.000
H4: PT → WLB	0.569	7.668	0.000

The analysis shows that the empirical mean scores for all three variables—Digital Wellbeing (52.40), Work Life Balance (50.57), and Personality Traits (97.28) are higher than their respective hypothetical means (51.00, 42.00, 96.00), placing them in the moderate category. The majority of respondents were categorized as having a moderate level for each variable: Digital Wellbeing (76.1%), Work Life Balance (63.4%), and Personality Traits (41.0%).

The structural model indicates that the predictors explain 61.2% of the variance in Digital Wellbeing ($R^2 = 0.612$) and 31.9% of the variance in Work Life Balance ($R^2 = 0.319$). The effect size analysis reveals that Personality Traits have a large effect on both Digital Wellbeing ($f^2 = 0.441$) and Work Life Balance ($f^2 = 0.479$). Work Life Balance has a medium effect on Digital Wellbeing ($f^2 = 0.264$).

All hypothesized paths are statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). The path coefficients are as follows: Personality Traits to Work Life Balance ($\beta = 0.569$), Personality Traits to Digital Wellbeing ($\beta = 0.499$), Work Life Balance to Digital Wellbeing ($\beta = 0.386$), and the indirect mediation path via Work Life Balance ($\beta = 0.220$).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that personality traits significantly influence digital wellbeing both directly and through the mediating role of work-life balance among digital workers. These results are important as they highlight that individual psychological characteristics serve as foundational factors in managing digital work demands. The strong explanatory power of the model (R^2 = 0.612 for digital wellbeing) underscores the combined relevance of dispositional and behavioral factors in determining how digital workers experience and navigate technologically saturated work environments.

These findings align with prior research emphasizing the role of personality in digital adaptation. The direct relationship between personality traits and digital wellbeing supports earlier work by Ingram & Park (2021), who noted that personality dimensions affect how individuals process digital stressors. Similarly, the mediating role of work-life balance corroborates the spillover theory and research by Sheron & Jiji (2024), confirming that balance serves as a critical pathway through which personality influences wellbeing in digital contexts. However, the moderate effect size of work-life balance compared to the stronger effect of personality suggests that other psychological or contextual factors may also contribute significantly to digital wellbeing—an area that warrants further exploration.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design limits causal inference, and the sample comprising Generation Z digital workers in Surabaya—may not be fully representative of other age groups, regions, or cultural settings. Self-reported data may also be subject to biases such as social desirability. Furthermore, while the study focused on psychological and balance-related factors, organizational, technological, and socioeconomic variables were not examined but could meaningfully influence digital wellbeing outcomes.

These results offer both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they contribute to an integrated model linking personality, balance, and digital wellbeing. Practically, organizations could consider incorporating personality-aware support systems—such as tailored boundary management training or flexible work policies—to help digital workers maintain balance and digital health. For individuals, developing self-regulation strategies aligned with one's personality may enhance both work-life harmony and digital wellness. Future studies should adopt longitudinal or experimental designs, include more diverse samples, and examine additional moderators such as job autonomy, digital literacy, or organizational culture to deepen understanding of these relationships and inform effective wellbeing interventions in the digital work era.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that personality traits play an important role in shaping digital wellbeing among digital workers, both directly and indirectly through work life balance. The findings indicate that individuals with certain personality characteristics are better able to manage digital demands and maintain healthier technology use when supported by a balanced integration between work and personal life. Work life balance is confirmed as a key mechanism that explains how personality traits influence digital wellbeing in digitally intensive work environments.

These results suggest that efforts to enhance digital wellbeing should not only focus on technological or organizational factors but also consider individual differences. Future research is recommended to employ longitudinal or experimental designs to examine causal relationships and changes in digital wellbeing over time. Additionally, further studies may explore other mediating or

moderating variables, such as digital self-regulation, organizational support, or job demands. From a practical perspective, organizations are encouraged to develop policies and interventions that promote work–life balance and support sustainable digital work practices tailored to employees' individual characteristics.

REFERENCES

Alfithon, A. M., & Safitri, A. (2019). Penerapan *Digital well being* Untuk Mencapai *Work life balance Pada* Fresh Graduate Perguruan Tinggi Di Dunia Kerja Era Revolusi Industri 4.0. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional*, 204-207.

Damayanti, M. R. & Atmaja, D. R., 2022. Pengaruh Work From Home, Work-Life Balance, Stres Kerja, dan Employee Relations Terhadap Kepuasan Kerja

Hutagalung, E. R., Fahrudin, A., & Febrieta, D. (2024). Hubungan Antara Literasi Digital Dengan *Digital well being* Pada Pengguna Internet Dan Media Sosial Di Kota Bekasi. *Jurnal Psikologi dan Bimbingan Konseling*, 1-7.

Ingram, J., & Park, S. (2021). *Personality traits* and *digital wellbeing*: The role of self-control and digital literacy. *Computers in Human Behavior, 122,* 106835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106835

Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., & Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing costs of technology use during COVID-19 remote working: An investigation using the JD-R model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.578886

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. Dalam L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Kim, K. H., & Chon, M.-G. (2022). *When work and life boundaries are blurred: The effect of after-hours work communication through communication technology on employee outcomes. Journal of Communication Management, 26*(3), 262–277. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-06-2022-0073

Prasad, K. D. V., Vaidya, R. W., & Mangipudi, M. R. (2020). Effect of occupational stress and remote working on psychological wellbeing of employees: An empirical analysis during COVID-19 pandemic concerning information technology industry in Hyderabad. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology, 11*(4), 372–389. https://doi.org/10.34218/IJARET.11.4.2020.034

Sheron, K. P. R., & Jiji, J. A. (2024). *Work-life balance and personality traits: A comparative study among private and public school teachers. iJournals: International Journal of Social Relevance & Concern (IJSRC), 12*(7), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.26821/IJSRC.12.6.2024.120607

Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2018). Work-life balance: An integrative review. Applied Research in Quality of Life, 13(1), 229–254. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-017-9509-8

Thomas, V., Azizi, L., & Binyamin, S. S. (2022). Digital well-being: Conceptualization, measurement, and implications for mental health. *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 24*(9), e36106. https://doi.org/10.2196/36106

Vanden Abeele, M. (2021). *Digital well being* as a dynamic construct. Communication Theory, 31(4), 932–955. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtaa024