



AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION ON DETERMINANTS OF WORK LIFE BALANCE IN IT SECTOR: EVIDENCE FROM INDIA

Dr. Sathyanarayana S.

Professor, MPBIM, Bangalore

Corresponding Email: sathya4u.s@gmail.com

Prof. Sudhindra Gargsha

Joint director, MPBIM, Bangalore

Email: gargesa@gmail.com

Lakshmi Bellave

Student, MPBIM, Bangalore

Abstract

Work-Life Balance is the need of the hour in the current economic, cultural and societal scenario across the world. The demand on employees to achieve organizational goals, along with integrating their personal goals are some of the challenges encountered by HR managers. Significant number of determinants promote Work-Life Balance among men and women throughout the wide expanse of organizations which are bound by diverse policies, practices and procedures. Therefore, the current study, "Drivers of Work-Life Balance in IT Sector" has been undertaken to investigate the major determinants of Work-Life Balance. To realize the stated objectives the researchers have identified seven major determinants of Work-life balance in IT sector such as Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, Organisation Culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management. The data has been collected from a structured questionnaire from 164 respondents. The validity of the questionnaire was adjudged using Cronbach's coefficient (α) and was calculated to test the reliability and internal consistency of the responses. A significant relationship was found with Age, Gender, Marital status, number of children, dependents at home with Work Life balance. Further results revealed that Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organizational culture (F3), family support (F6) and Self-management (F7) were the major determinants of work-life-balance. When we ranked the identified dimensions, Self-Management (F7) stood very prominent, followed by Organisation Culture (F3). Finally, the results have been compared with possible evidence.

Keywords: Work Life balance, Work Autonomy, Organisation culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Self-Management.

Introduction

Across the world, people are juggling between balancing a successful career and catering to the needs of a family, often leading to a conflict between time allotted to work life and family life. Each individual has diverse elements such as family, self, society, finance, spiritual, hobbies and health. Work related pressures are on the rise among both the genders and predominantly evident amidst women due to societal and cultural expectations which bind them. While a majority of time is consumed in work, there is an obligation to devote a certain amount of an individual's time in all these elements for a lesser conflict driven life. Present day changes in the socio-economic environment have emphasized the relevance of work-life balance. Plenty of youngsters are relocating to the cities looking for a steady income and better standard of living. The concept of Work-Life Balance was first used in the 1970s in the United Kingdom to outline the relation between work and personal life. It was later used in the United States in 1986. With organizations adopting business practices built on

technology, there is a dire need to enhance and strategize work-life balance programs and initiatives to protect interests of employees as well as retain employees, which in turn relates to talent recruitment, retention and motivation in an organization.

Work-Life Balance extends to all sectors, i.e., public, private, banking, education, insurance, pharmaceutical etc. According to Edmund Heery & Noon (2008), "Work-life balance is the principle that paid employment should be integrated with domestic life and community involvement in the interests of personal and social wellbeing." In the words of Julie Morgenstern, "Work-life balance is not about the amount of time you spend working versus not-working. It's more about how you spend your time working and relaxing, recognizing that what you do in one fuels your energy for the other." Kalliath and Brough (2008), mention that, "Despite the contradiction in the definition, a large part of literature has defined work-life balance as being either the absence of work-life conflict or work-life spill over." Over the years, there have been certain fundamental changes in the number of women, particularly mothers, entering the massive workforce, increase in the number of dual-income families, significant rise in single parents leading to flexible workplace and technology enabling work from home and virtual work stations (Sullivan and Lewis (2001); Greenhaus and Powell (2003); Noor (2002a); Pitt-Catsoupes and Christensen (2004)).

Work-Life Balance is organic to the various roles donned by individuals in their routine lives. Every role demands a reasonable amount of time and some may consume more time than the others, which may often lead to over compensation in work life or family life. In metropolitan cities, where a major portion of earning class is seen, commuting to the workplace is often a tedious task, thereby posing a serious problem in balancing work and life. Work-Life Balance has a direct relation between the well-being of individuals from the employee perspective and also employee absenteeism, employee behaviour, performance, attrition and retention, from the organization perspective. It is also seen that flexible, as well as reduced working hours has a positive impact on employee satisfaction. Employees who clock in higher working hours must be compensated and recognized by organizations, in full or in partial or with additional holidays. When companies across the world are going global, work-life balance is significant now, more than ever and investing in such practices can reduce employee turnover. A major intention of employees to switch places of employment is the work-life balance practices and policies leading to loss of critical knowledge in the organization.

Employees are the backbone of any organization. They are responsible in making or breaking the organization. HR Policies of any organization must adhere to integrating the goals of the organization with that of an individual, failing which leads to lower morale, disinterest and lack of motivation among employees to contribute to the organization and self-growth. The structure of the current research paper comprises of five sections including the current one. Chapter two deals with the review of literature linked to work life balance. While section three outlines the objectives of the study, hypothesis proposed and the research design employed for the study purpose. Section four deals with the analysis of the collected primary information and in the epilogue, a brief discussions and conclusion have been made, and the findings of the study are compared with the possible evidence.

Review of Literature

Research on Work life balance has been extensively carried out in the recent times with respect to several factors such as its relationship with mental and physical health performance and productivity (Yamamoto and Kuroda (2014); Sakazume (2002) McDonald et al., (2009); Morrison,(2005); Williams et al., (2000); Garg & Rastogi, (2006); (Muse et al., (2008), relationships- personal and professional, satisfaction and happiness (Clarke et al. (2004)), work-to-family and family-to-work conflict (van Steenbergen and Ellemers (2009); Clark (2000); Greenhaus et al. (1989); Taylor, DelCampo and Blancero (2009)), its impact on organizational performance (Pooja Ainapur et al. (2016)), employee's job satisfaction and performance (Daniel (2011); Gray and Ivey (2010); Harrison et al. (2006), Timothy and Golden (2008); Auko (2009)) , WLB policies and their impact on employee's job satisfaction and performance (Kinunen et al. (2003); Torrington et al. (2009); Karatepe and Tekinkus (2006), Weiss (2002)); psychological distress (Achille, (2003); Keyes and Lopez, (2002) and psychological well-being (Keyes, (2006)); flexible working hours (Dalcos and Daley, (2009); Robbins et al., (2004); Chow and Keng-Howe's ,(2006)), paid parental leave; family friendliness and gender equality (Wakisaka (2009) ; Ikeda (2010)), the effects of family responsibilities on the work commitment and job performance of women (Kennard (1994) Higgins et al.(1992), Kelley and Voydanoff (1985), Thompson & Walker (1989), Employee turnover (Eaton, 2001)), work-life balance policies of the organisation (Konrad and Mangel, (2000); Evans (2001); Allen (2001); White et al., (2003);

Harris & Foster, (2008); Callan (2008), emotional intelligence (Sjoberg (2008)), “psychosocial working conditions (Nordenmark, Vinberg & Strandh (2012)), role of gender in work life balance (Grzywacz et al. (2007); (Gregory & Milner, (2011), (2012)), career growth and work-life (family) conflict (Ballout (2008))etc. WLB explanations might seem forthright and non-argumentative, however, some work-life researchers suggest that its actual understanding can’t be wholly taken as just one social fact due to continuous variations of personal situations, changes of personality characteristics, differences between the males and females, cultural differences and several other demographic factors that mostly affects approaches and discernments of the notion regarding the subject (Fleetwood, (2007)). Reviews also indicate that the perception of work-life balance is observed to be different across genders (Connell (2005); Smithson and Stokoe (2005); Duxbury and Higgins (1991). According to Burke (2002), both men and women prefer to work in organizations that support WLB. Balancing work and family is often more difficult of women then for men because of the disproportionate burden of the family responsibilities (Bird, (2006).

Hyman & Summers, (2004) supported this view of De Bruin & Dupuis, (2004). Similar findings were documented in the literature by Sparks, et al. (2002); Lowe (2005), Strathmore Business School Survey (2011) Ajith et al. (2013). In an empirical study conducted by Roehling et al., (2001) documented a significant and direct relationship between Work Life balance and employee retention. In an empirical study by Chawla and Sondhi (2011) concluded that factors such as job autonomy and organizational commitment share positive relation with work-life balance. However, Ignacia Levy (2012) documented that the child-care support drives the perceived work-life balance and role conflict shares inverse relation with work-life balance (Shelton, (2006); Welter, (2004)). Women face uneven distribution of child care and other domestic responsibilities which become major barrier in the advancement of their carrier (Cross and Linehan, (2006)). There is also a notion that work family roles a largely shipped by stereo typical gender roles (Gutek et. al. (1991)) due to the traditionally held belief of men as “Bread-winners and women as house makers.” Studies on Work-Life Balance have shown that an imbalance created between work and family role conflict has had a significant impact on an employee’s performance and also reflects on other job related undertakings such as productivity, attainment of personal and professional goals (Freidman & Greenhaus, (2000)) and has also resulted in poor employee input and performance, because an employee, who finds it difficult to balance his or her family life, tends to also have difficulties managing tasks at his or her workplace, therefore resulting in poor employee performance (Sparks, et al., 2002).

While several studies (Williams et al., (2000); Clarke et al., (2004); McDonald et al., (2009); Nganga,(2010); Morrison, (2005); Garg & Rastogi, (2006)) have been done focusing on different aspects of employee performance and further appreciating the crisis in every organization in terms of employee productivity, all empirical evidences are in short of the actual factors of work-life balance that influences the employee productivity itself. Reorganizing employee work schedules by giving them flexibility, job redesign, working hours and autonomy is one of the measure to create balance between work and family life (Chow, I. H., & Keng-Howe, I. C. (2006); Garg, P. & Rastogi, R., (2006); Sakazume, H. (2002), Konard, A.M., and Mnagel, R., (2000); Wakisaka, A. (2009)). While several studies (Williams et al., (2000); Clarke et al., (2004); McDonald et al., (2009); Nganga, (2010); Morrison, (2005); Garg & Rastogi, (2006)) have been focusing on different aspects of employee performance and further appreciating the crisis in every organization in terms of employee productivity, all empirical evidences are in short of the actual factors of work-life balance that influences the employee productivity itself. Many studies also cite the need for work-life balance on men, with their growing involvement in parenting (H.S. Sandhu & Mehta, (2006); Rupashree Baral, Shivganesh Bhargava, (2011); Loscoco (1997) and Aryee et al. (1999); Burke (2002)). It is imperative for organizations to deploy work-life balance initiatives for all employees, without any gender bias, as a strategy for well-being as well as retention.

This is supported by various studies and suggestions such as inculcating family friendly practices (Sakazume, H. (2002)), work-life programs (Konard, A.M., and Mnagel, R., (2000); Allen, T. D. (2001); Gregory, A. and Milner, S. (2009)), identifying drivers of work-life balance (Harris, L.A. and Foster, B. (2008)), controlling job demands and employee well-being (Nordenmark, M., Vinberg, S. and Strandh, M. (2012)), high performance management practices to enhance work-life balance (White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C. and Smeaton, D. (2003)), contemporary management practices (K. Thriveni, (2012)), access to part-time work, childcare and parental leave (Natalie Skinner, Janine Chapman, (2013); Doris Ruth and Axel, (2009) and Caroline Straub (2007)), yoga and stress management workshops (Karamvir Singh and Priyanka, (2013)), family services and day care (Neil Gilbert, (2005)), vocational tasks (Maynard. (2005)), workplace

flexibility and work time flexibility (Subramaniam, (2010)), and leisure time, sports and social networking (Fischimayr and Lollinger, (2010)).

The objective of the current research paper is to investigate the drivers of the work life balance in IT sector in Bangalore city. The review of the literature on the current topic, thus throws light on facts relating to the gap in the study of the chosen subject. Majority of the studies on the proposed topic the work life balance have examined the phenomenon in western and developed countries, with very little focus on underdeveloped and developing countries like India; (ii) India, being a developing economy exhibits several cultural differences and factors significantly influencing work life balance. Further, the above mentioned researchers have concentrated their studies on other sectors such as health care, manufacturing, hospitality, textiles etc. and this leaves a gap for the researchers to undertake study particularly in the IT sector. Therefore, the current study has been undertaken to understand the demographic factors and its impact on the chosen variables. Additionally, in this research, several hypotheses have been proposed to test the relationships amongst common issues in work life balance in IT sector.

Research Design

Objectives of the study

- To examine the influence of demographic factors such as age, gender, length of service, income, on individual factors of work-life-balance.
- To evaluate various chosen factors such as Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, Organisation Culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management and their impact on Work-Life-balance and also to identify the key drivers of Work-Life Balance in the company.
- To offer suggestions based on this empirical study.

Hypothesis

- H1:** There is no significant difference in the demographic factors of the respondents on Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, Organisation Culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management.
- H1:** There is no significant relationship between Work-Life Balance and supervisor support, work autonomy, organizational culture, work expectation, work satisfaction, family support and self-management.
- H2:** There is no significant correlation among the various factors identified for the purpose of the study.

Tools for data collection

Literature has given a number of factors to measure the drivers of Work-Life Balance in an organizational context. Based on a thorough review of literature, seven important factors, namely, supervisor support, work autonomy, organization culture, work expectation, work satisfaction, family support and self-management were identified. For every individual construct, researchers have developed items using five point Likert's scale. The objective of this model is to measure the major Drivers of Work-Life Balance in IT sector in Bangalore city. In order to realize the stated objectives, items for each construct was developed as follows: for factor one, supervisor support - six items, for the second factor, work autonomy – five items, for third factor, organization culture - four items, for fourth factor, work expectation - five items, for fifth factor, work satisfaction - five items, for sixth factor, family support - five items and for the last factor, self-management - five items.

Sampling

For the research, convenience sampling has been employed. A structured questionnaire was developed and pre-tested before administering it on the respondents. The validity of the questionnaire was adjudged using Cronbach's coefficient (α) and was calculated to test the reliability and internal consistency of the responses. The questionnaire was administered on 210 respondents in Bangalore city, out of which, a 164 responses were retained for the purpose of research. The remaining responses were rejected.

Table 1 ; Reliability statistics

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
Supervisor support (F1)	.871	6
Work Autonomy (F2)	.712	5
Organisation culture (F3)	.713	4
Work Expectation (F4)	.751	5
Work Satisfaction (F5)	.915	5
Family Support (F6)	.841	5
Self-Management (F7)	.913	5
Work Life balance (DV)	.857	5

For the purpose of the current empirical study, seven different factors (independent) were identified. In order to assess the reliability of the constructed research instrument we have conducted a reliability statistic (Cronbach's coefficient Alpha) for all the factors. It is evident from the above Table No.1 that the Cronbach's Alpha value is greater than 0.7, meaning that there is a high degree of internal consistency among the constructed items.

Plan of analysis

Data collected from the respondents has been collated by using SPSS (Statistical Software for the Social Sciences) software. Analysis of data was spread across three stages. In the first stage of data analysis, frequency distribution tables were created to identify all the majority factors along with drawing inferences to mean and standard deviation. In the second phase of data analysis, the relationship between demographic factors and other important variables was established using Chi square, where the Pearson Chi square values, along with the degrees of freedom and p values were used to identify whether there were any significant relationships between the said important factors and the demographic variables. In the final phase of data analysis, a multiple regression model has been run to determine the various factors driving work-life balance. Based on the data analysis, a brief summary of findings has been drawn. Based on the brief summary of findings, suggestions have been offered to the organization, followed by drawing a meaningful conclusion to the study.

Data Analysis

The intention of the researchers in constructing Table No. 2 is to present the demographic profile of the respondents included in the survey

Table 2 : Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Variables	Categories	No of respondents	Percentage
Gender	Male	116	29.3
	Female	48	70.7
Age	Below 30	54	32.9
	31-40	26	15.9
	41-50	80	48.8
	51 and above	4	2.4
Annual Household Income	< Rs. 5,00,000 per annum	57	34.76
	Rs. 5,00,001-7,50,000 per annum	78	47.56
	Rs. 7,50,001-10,00,000 per annum	17	10.37
	Rs. 10,00,001-15,00,000 per annum	11	6.71
	> Rs. 15,00,001 per annum	1	0.06
Marital status	Unmarried	44	26.8
	Married	120	73.2
Length of service	Below 3 Years	96	58.5
	3-5 Years	18	11.0
	5-10 years	50	30.5
	Above 10 years	-	-
Number of children	None	58	35.4
	One	64	39.0
	Two	32	19.5
	Three	10	6.1
Dependent adults	Dependent adults	70	42.7
	Dependents requiring special attention	64	39.0
	None	30	18.3

It is evident from Table that 70.7 % of the respondents included in the survey are male and the rest 29.3% are female. The researchers have created four strata of age. From Table 4.1 it is evident to the researchers that 48.8% of the respondents fall in the age group of 41 to 50 years of age, 32.9% in the age group of below 30 years and 15.9% in the age groups of 50 to 31-40 years. Researcher, after taking into consideration all the specific factors created five strata. From Table 4.1. it is clear that 41.56% of the respondents indicate that they belong to annual income class of less than Rs. 5, 00,001-7, 50,000 per annum, 34.76% indicating that they belong to annual house hold income less than Rs. 5, 00,000 per annum, 10.37% indicating that they belong to the annual household income class between Rs. 7,50,001-10,00,000 per annum, 6.71% of them belong to income class of Rs. 10,00,001-15,00,000 per annum. However, balance 0.06% greater Rs. 15, 00,001 per annum. The intention of the researcher in constructing Table is to present the marital status of the respondents included in the survey. 73.2% of the respondents included in the survey are married, 26.8% of the respondents included in the survey are unmarried. From the above table, it can be inferred that 58.5 per cent of the respondents have up to 3 years of experience in the current role; 30.5 per cent of the respondents have more than 5 years of experience in the current role and 11 per cent of the respondents have 3-5 years of experience in the current role. Dependent adults: From the above table it can be inferred that, 42.7 per cent of the respondents are providing support to dependent adults; 39 per cent of the respondents are providing support to dependents requiring special attention and 18.3 per cent of the respondents are not providing support to anybody. From the above table it can be inferred that, 39 per cent of the respondents have one child; 35.4 per cent of the respondents do not have children; 19.5 per cent of the respondents have 2 children and 6.1 per cent of the respondents have 3 children.

Pearson CHI square Results

In order to assess the relationship between the chosen demographic factors and various factors identified for the purpose of the study (Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, Organisation Culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management), the researcher constructed the following hypothesis and used a Pearson Chi-Square analysis to prove or disprove the hypothesis.

H0: There is no significant influence of demographic factors of the respondents in the manner on factors F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6 and F7 and dependent variable. The following table shows the results:

Table 3: Table showing the chi square results

Variable 1	Variable 2	Chi Square Value	P value	Results
Age	Supervisor support (F1)	62.091	.000	Reject
Age	Work Autonomy (F2)	59.940	.007	Reject
Age	Organisation culture (F3)	155.545	.000	Reject
Age	Work Expectation (F4)	21.200	.012	Reject
Age	Work Satisfaction (F5)	130.256	.000	Reject
Age	Family Support (F6)	190.599	.000	Reject
Age	Self-Management (F7)	13.977	.123	Accept
Age	Work Life balance	174.678	.000	Reject
Gender	Supervisor support (F1)	23.948	.002	Reject
Gender	Work Autonomy (F2)	36.419	.000	Reject
Gender	Organisation culture (F3)	35.395	.000	Reject
Gender	Work Expectation (F4)	24.706	.000	Reject
Gender	Work Satisfaction (F5)	33.153	.007	Reject
Gender	Family Support (F6)	44.928	.000	Reject
Gender	Self-Management (F7)	11.821	.008	Reject
Gender	Work Life balance	28.657	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Supervisor support (F1)	46.097	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Work Autonomy (F2)	33.171	.001	Reject
Marital Status	Organisation culture (F3)	38.288	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Work Expectation (F4)	33.997	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Work Satisfaction (F5)	75.933	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Family Support (F6)	107.756	.000	Reject
Marital Status	Self-Management (F7)	4.681	.197	Accept
Marital Status	Work life balance	54.698	.000	Reject
No of children	Supervisor support (F1)	42.410	.012	Reject
No of children	Work Autonomy (F2)	152.405	.000	Reject
No of children	Organisation culture (F3)	80.341	.000	Reject
No of children	Work Expectation (F4)	11.979	.214	Accept
No of children	Work Satisfaction (F5)	155.913	.000	Reject
No of children	Family Support (F6)	119.453	.000	Reject
No of children	Self-Management (F7)	37.158	.000	Reject
No of children	Work life balance	54.718	.000	Reject
Dependents	Supervisor support (F1)	21.022	.178	Accept
Dependents	Work Autonomy (F2)	66.681	.000	Reject
Dependents	Organisation culture (F3)	47.084	.001	Reject
Dependents	Work Expectation (F4)	17.226	.008	Reject
Dependents	Work Satisfaction (F5)	82.115	.000	Reject
Dependents	Family Support (F6)	88.255	.000	Reject
Dependents	Self-Management (F7)	5.520	.479	Accept
No of children	Work life balance	79.654	.000	Reject

- **Age** Factor 1: It is evident from Table 4.2; the Pearson Chi square value is 62.091 with a p value of 0.000. We can reject the null hypothesis in case of Age with Factor one, meaning that there is a significant relationship between Age of the respondents and the supervisors support. For Factor 2: The Pearson Chi square value is 59.940 with a p value of 0.007. There is no significant relationship between Age of the respondents and Work autonomy. Factor 3: The Pearson Chi square value is 155.545 with a p value of 0.000. We can reject the null hypothesis in case of Age with Factor3. Factor 4: The Pearson Chi square value is 21.200 with a p value of 0.012. We can accept the alternate hypothesis in case of Age with Factor four. Factor 5: The Pearson Chi square value is 130.256 with 48 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. We can reject the null hypothesis, meaning that there is a significant relationship between Age of the respondents and work satisfaction. Factor 6: The Pearson Chi square value is 190.599 with a p

value of 0.000. We can reject the null hypothesis in case of Age with Factor six. Factor 7: The Pearson Chi square value is 13.977 with 9 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.123. We can accept null hypothesis in case of Age with Factor seven. However, for WLB with Age, the Pearson Chi square value is 174.678 with 9 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000, therefore we rejected the null hypothesis.

- **Gender:** For Factor 1: The Pearson Chi square value is 23.948 with a p value of 0.002. Factor 2: The Pearson Chi square value is 36.419 with a p value of 0.000. Factor 3: The Pearson Chi square value is 35.395 with a p value of 0.000. Factor 4: The Pearson Chi square value is 24.706 with a p value of 0.000. Factor 5: The Pearson Chi square value is 33.153 with a p value of 0.007. Factor 6: The Pearson Chi square value is 44.928 with a p value of 0.000 and for Factor 7: The Pearson Chi square value is 11.821 with a p value of 0.008. We can reject null hypothesis in case of Gender with Factors one to seven meaning that there is a significant relationship between Gender of the respondents and various factor chosen for the purpose of the study. However, for WLB with gender, the Pearson Chi square value is 28.657 with a p value of 0.000, therefore we rejected the null hypothesis.
- **Marital status:** For Factor 1: The Pearson Chi square value is 46.097 with a p value of 0.000 Factor 2 the Pearson Chi square value is 33.171 with a p value of 0.001. Factor 3: The Pearson Chi square value is 38.288 with 10 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 4: The Pearson Chi square value is 33.997 with 3 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 5: It is evident from Table 4.17; the Pearson Chi square value is 75.933 with 16 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 6: The Pearson Chi square is 107.756 with a p value of 0.000. We can reject the null hypothesis in all the chosen cases, meaning that there is a significant relationship between marital status of the respondents and all the seven factors namely, Supervisor support (F1), Work Autonomy (F2), Organization culture (F3), Work Expectation (F4), Work Satisfaction (F5), Family Support (F6). However, for Factor 7: The Pearson Chi square is 4.681 with a p value of 0.197. Therefore, we can accept null hypothesis in case of marital status with Factor seven (F7). However, for WLB with gender, the Pearson Chi square value is 54.698 with a p value of 0.000, therefore we rejected the null hypothesis.
- **No of Children:** For Factor 1: Pearson Chi square value is 42.410 with 24 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.012, for Factor 2 the Pearson Chi square value is 152.405 with 36 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 3: The Pearson Chi square value is 80.341 with a p value of 0.000. Factor 5: The Pearson Chi square value is 155.913 with a p value of 0.000. Factor 6: The Pearson Chi square value is 119.453 with a p value of 0.000, for Factor 7: The Pearson Chi square value is 37.158 with a p value of 0.000. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis in all the chosen cases except factor 7, meaning that there is a significant relationship between no children for the respondents and all the factors except factor 4. For Factor 4: The Pearson Chi square value is 11.979 with 9 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.214. We can accept null hypothesis, meaning that there is no significant relationship between Number of children of the respondents and work expectation. However, for WLB with gender, the Pearson Chi square value is 54.718 with a p value of 0.000, therefore we rejected the null hypothesis.
- **Providing care to dependents:** Factor 2 the Pearson Chi square value is 66.681 with 24 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 3: The Pearson Chi square value is 47.084 with a p value of 0.001. For factor 4: The Pearson Chi square value is 17.226 with a p value of 0.008. Factor 5: The Pearson Chi square value is 82.115 with 332 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Factor 6: The Pearson Chi square value is 88.255 with 26 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.000. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis in all the chosen cases except factor for factor 1 and 7, meaning that there is a significant relationship between providing care to dependents for the respondents and all the factors except factor one and factor seven. 4. However, for Factor 1 the Pearson Chi square value is 21.022 with a p value of 0.178 and for factor 7: The Pearson Chi square value is 5.520 with 6 degrees of freedom with a p value of 0.479 therefore, we can accept null hypothesis, meaning that there is no significant relationship between Providing care to dependents of the respondents and work expectation. However, for WLB with gender, the Pearson Chi square value is 79.654 with a p value of 0.000, therefore we rejected the null hypothesis.

Regression model

For the purpose of the study, a multiple regression model was run to test the hypothesis. The Following multiple regression model has been used to test the theoretical relationship between the overall work life balance as perceived by the

respondents with various identified factors (Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, organization culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management).

$$Y (\text{work life balance}) = a + b_1 X_1 (\text{Supervisor support}) + b_2 X_2 (\text{Work Autonomy}) + b_3 X_3 (\text{Organization culture}) + b_4 X_4 (\text{Work Expectation}) + b_5 X_5 (\text{Work Satisfaction}) + b_6 X_6 (\text{Family Support}) + b_7 X_7 (\text{Self-Management}) + \epsilon \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where,

Y = (Work Life Balance)

X is the vector of explanatory variables in the estimation model

X_1 = Supervisor support

X_2 = Work Autonomy

X_3 = Organization culture

X_4 = Work Expectation

X_5 = Work Satisfaction

X_6 = Family Support

X_7 = Self-Management

a = constant intercept term of the model

b = coefficients of the estimated model

ϵ = error component

Table 4: Model Summary

R	.807
R Square	.651
Adjusted R Square	.636
R Square Change	.651
Std. Error of the Estimate	.89725
F	41.618
Sig. of F	.000
Durbin-Watson	1.986

R square represents the percentage movement of the dependent variable which is captured by the intercept and the independent variable(s). Above obtained results explain 65.1% of the variation in Work Life Balance is captured by independent variables (*Supervisor support, Work Autonomy, Organisation Culture, Work Expectation, Work Satisfaction, Family Support and Self-Management*).

Inference: From the above analysis one can infer that Work-Life balance is highly dependent on the predictors or explained by the independent variables (Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organizational culture (F3), Work expectation (F4), Work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6) and Self-management (F7)), which means there is an impact of independent variables on the dependent variable Work life balance. F value is 41.618 with a significance value of .0000. Therefore, we can reject the Null Hypothesis.

Table 5: Table Showing Regression Results

Dimension	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	SE	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
Constant	0.615	0.636		.967	.335		
F1	-0.158	0.051	-.084	-3.09804	.015	.415	2.410
F2	-0.443	0.036	-.070	-12.3056	.000	.659	1.516
F3	0.33	0.05	.480	6.6	.000	.420	2.378
F4	0.022	0.073	.018	0.30137	.764	.623	1.606
F5	0.003	0.023	.007	0.130435	.894	.852	1.174
F6	0.315	0.022	.039	14.31818	.000	.704	1.420
F7	1.048	0.067	.819	15.64179	.000	.822	1.217

Intercept is α in the set equation. Standard error measures the variability in approximation of the coefficient and lower standard error means coefficient is closer to the true value of coefficient. Work life balance is a dependent variable and Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organisational culture (F3), Work expectation (F4), Work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6), Self-management (F7) are independent variables.

Results show that independent variables Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2) have negative coefficients i.e. they share indirect relationship with Work life balance. However, results show that independent variables (F3), Work expectation (F4), Work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6), Self-management (F7) have positive coefficients i.e. they have a direct relationship with Work life balance.

Test of Hypothesis

In order to assess the relationship between the independent variable (s) and dependent variable, the researcher has established the following hypothesis and to prove or disprove the hypothesis the researcher has employed multiple regression analysis.

- **Null Hypothesis (H_0)** There is no significant relationship between independent variables (Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organisational culture (F3), Work expectation (F4), Work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6), Self-management (F7)) and dependent variable (Work life balance).
- **Alternative Hypothesis (H_1)** There is significant relationship between independent variables (Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organisational culture (F3), Work expectation (F4), Work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6), Self-management (F7)) and dependent variable (Work life balance).

Results show that P-value is less than 0.05 at 5% level of significance for Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organisational culture (F3), family support (F6) and Self-management (F7) so the null hypothesis is rejected. This indicates that the Work life balance has significant relationship with Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organisational culture (F3), family support (F6) and Self-management (F7). Results show that P-value is more than 0.05 at 5% level of significance for Work expectation (F4) and Work satisfaction (F5), so the null hypothesis is accepted, which signifies that work life balance has no significant relationship with these variables.

Table 6: The relative weights of the chosen factors

Factor	Relative weights in percentage
Self-Management (F7)	0.677419355
Organisation culture (F3)	0.397022333
Work Expectation (F4)	0.014888337
Work Satisfaction (F5)	0.005789909
Work Autonomy (F2)	-0.05789909
Supervisor support (F1)	-0.069478908

It is evident from the above Table No. 6 that the very important Work Life balance dimension was Self-Management (F7) with a relative weight of 0.677419355 or 67.74 percent is consistent with the findings of several researchers' findings; followed by Organisation culture (F3) with 39.70 percent, Work Expectation (F4) with 1.4 percent, work satisfaction (F5) with 0.579 percent.

Discussion and conclusion

Across the world, people are juggling between balancing a successful career and catering to the needs of a family, often leading to a conflict between time allotted to work life and family life. Each individual has diverse elements such as family, self, social, finances, spiritual, hobbies and health. Work related pressures are on the rise among both the genders and predominantly evident amidst women due to societal and cultural expectations bound to them. While a majority of time is consumed in work, there is an obligation to devote a certain amount of an individual's time in all these elements for a lesser

conflict driven life. Therefore, it is very important to conduct a study relating to the proposed topic. The current empirical study has been undertaken with an intention to examine the work life balance of employees in IT sector in Bangalore city. In order to realise the stated objectives a structured questionnaire was constructed and administered on the respondents. Based on the literature, seven important factors were identified, namely, supervisor support, work autonomy, organization culture, work expectation, work satisfaction, family support and self-management were identified. In order to assess the reliability of the constructed research instrument we have conducted a reliability statistic (Cronbach's coefficient Alpha) for all the factors. The study revealed the following major findings: 70.7 % of the respondents included in the survey were male and the rest 29.3% were female. 48.8% of the respondents fall in the age group of 41 to 50 years of age, 32.9% in the age group of below 30 years. 41.56% of the respondents indicate that they belong to annual income class of less than Rs. 5, 00,001-7, 50,000 per annum, 34.76% indicating that they belong to annual house hold income less than Rs. 5, 00,000 per annum, 10.37% indicating that they belong to the annual household income class between Rs. 7,50,001-10,00,000 per annum.

73.2% of the respondents included in the survey are married, 26.8% of the respondents included in the survey are unmarried. 42.7 per cent of the respondents are providing support to dependent adults; 39 per cent of the respondents are providing support to dependents requiring special attention. We found a significant relationship between Age of the respondents and the supervisors support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), organization culture, (F3) and work expectation, work satisfaction (F4), family support (F5) self-management (F6). However, we rejected the hypothesis in case of Age with self-management (F7). In case of gender, we found a significant relationship with supervisors' support (F1), work autonomy (F2), organization culture, (F3) and work expectation (F4), work satisfaction (F5), family support (F6) and self-management (F7). However, in case of Marital status, we found a significant relationship between Age of the respondents and the supervisors support (F1), Work autonomy(F2), organization culture, (F3) and work expectation, work satisfaction (F4), family support (F5) self-management (F6). However, we rejected the hypothesis in case of self-management (F7). In case of No of children to support and the supervisors support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), organization culture, (F3) and work expectation, family support (F5) self-management (F6) and self-management (F7). However, we accept the null hypothesis with work satisfaction (F4). For the last factor providing care to dependent adults at home we found a significant relationship with Work autonomy(F2), organization culture, (F3) and work expectation, work satisfaction (F4), family support (F5) self-management (F6). However, we accept the null hypothesis in case of supervisors' support (F1) and self-management (F7). Further, regression results revealed that, Supervisor support (F1), Work autonomy (F2), Organizational culture (F3), family support (F6) and Self-management (F7) were the major determinants of work-life-balance. However, Work expectation (F4) and Work satisfaction (F5) were rejected. When we ranked the identified dimensions Self-Management (F7) stood very prominent with a relative weight of 67.74 percent followed by Organisation culture (F3) with 39.70 percent, Work Expectation (F4) with 1.4 percent and work satisfaction (F5) with 0.579 percent. The first item Self-Management (F7) is the major driver for the work life balance (I can spend the time I want on my own self-development) stood highest with a mean score of 3.87 and with a second lowest standard deviation of .890, followed by third item (I have sufficient time to take care of myself) with a mean score of 2.589 with a standard deviation 0.963. However, fifth item (I have sufficient time to relax myself) stood third with a mean score of 2.547 with second highest standard deviation of 1.267. However, item four (I have time and energy to engage in any leisure activities that I want to do) has recorded the highest volatility with 1.687 standard deviation. Organisation culture (F3) item two (The organization makes the employees very clear about the expectations to be fulfilled) stood first with highest mean score of 2.987 with a standard deviation of 1.05, followed by item two (My organization supports the employees in terms of combining professional life with family life) with a mean score of 2.489 with a standard deviation of 0.97 and item four (All the employees are treated equally if they request assistance with work and family related matters) with a mean score of 2.421 and a standard deviation of 1.22. However, item one (I can give my attention for urgent family or personal issues immediately) recorded the least mean score of 2.14 with a high degree of volatility of 1.456. The next prominent dimension was Work Expectation (F4) item five (I expect to receive adequate training when new systems are introduced in the organisation) reported the highest mean of 3.01 with a standard deviation of 1.45, followed by item three (I want to get criticism or appropriate feedback regarding my work performance from my superior) with a mean score of 2.89 with a standard deviation of 1.168. However, item two (I want to have Effective Work life balance to make me to stay healthy) reported the least standard deviation of 0.915 with a mean score of 2.791. Item one (I want to get fair treatment and respect among the employees of the organisation) reported a mean score of 2.75 with a standard deviation of .97 and the last place was occupied by fourth item (I should be informed about the policies and procedures of the organisation) with a mean score 2.415 with a standard deviation of 1.47. However, another

work satisfaction (F5) item three (I am satisfied with the challenging opportunities I get in the organisation) stood first with a mean score 2.97 with a standard deviation 1.25 followed by item two (I am satisfied with the fair treatment and respect I get among the employees of the organisation) with a mean score of 2.72 with a standard deviation of 1.15. However, item one (I am satisfied with the work performance and respect with co-workers, customers and superior from diverse backgrounds) with a mean score of 2.67 and a standard deviation 1.34, item five (I am more satisfied with the flexibility of targets) had a mean score of 2.10 with a standard deviation of 1.45. Item four (I am satisfied with the separation of both my professional and personal life without any conflicts) stood last with a mean score of 1.75 with a standard deviation of 1.12.

After analysing the responses received from the respondents with great care and accuracy, in the background of findings, the researchers have offered the following suggestions to the managers with a view to enhance the quality of work life balance. From the analysis, majority of the respondents opined that they have heavy work load and multiple deadlines to meet in the organization. Organization must take corrective steps to reduce the work overload by assessing type of job and allotting the said tasks appropriately, avoiding tasks that do not add any value and deadlines must be meaningful. Also, employees must be consulted to take into account the real problems faced before setting deadlines.

The study also indicates lack of autonomy among employees, leading to over dependence on supervisors and other authorities within the organization. Jobs must be defined and designed well in order to avoid this expense of time by establishing efficient procedures and channels of communication. Employees belonging to various age groups are spread across the organization. Supervisor support, work autonomy, organization culture, work expectation, work satisfaction, family support and self-management is not identical for all age groups implying that the communication channel is failing to reach employees of all age groups because it differs from the senior level to mid-level and entry level employees. Therefore, it is necessary to deploy communication channels which communicate same information to all the employees across all the age groups.

The current study results indicate that the major portion of employees in the organization is performing routine tasks and they are not happy with the current routine tasks. Such employees must be identified and reasons for lack of motivation must be addressed. Further proper training and development, job-rotation and enrichment can be done to improve the quality of the routine work. Majority of the respondents, neither agree nor disagree that they are satisfied with the personal and career growth opportunities in the organization. Employees must be given ample growth opportunities by providing them with sufficient motivation and benefits for the same.

Major chunk of the respondents ranked rewards and recognition as neutral. There must be transparency in providing rewards and recognition which must be communicated to all the employees well before. Rewards and recognition provided must be task oriented and motivational. The organization has both men and women working together to accomplish various tasks. The organization must ensure that communication is not gender biased and must reach all the employees without regard to gender.

Number of children reflects on extended supervisor support and work autonomy. Number of children implies additional responsibility, thereby leading to an increase in necessity of work autonomy, family support and self-management. Sufficient training must be provided in order to enhance efficiency and work effectively. Further, Employees are seen to provide care to dependent adults which can be inculcated as a part of the organization culture and can be implemented in the policies to provide care to dependents.

Limitations of the study and directions for future research

Given the background of empirical studies on Work Life Balance conducted so far, certain areas for further investigation on Work Life Balance were identified. As the study is confined to the geographic limits of Bangalore city, an extended study of this kind encompassing a larger geography in a prolonged time period can be taken up. Work-Life Balance can be applied to various other sectors such as Bio-Technology, Automobile, BPOs, KPOs, Healthcare, Hospitality, Insurance, etc. Enhancing studies on Work Life Balance is necessary to understand its dynamics and to generate more reliable data. With rapid growth in technology and need for intellectual assets within organizations and reduced dependency on physical and manual labor, there is an increase in women taking up key roles in the workforce by creating value and impact to their roles

in the organizations. Theoretical extensions and comparing the findings of this study with existing theories is another possible avenue for future research. The researchers recommend focus on aspects like flexible work arrangements, positive working environment, certain degree of autonomy at work, and guide the employees to allocate the enough time for family responsibilities. Besides other factors, the study finds that the working hours and child care responsibilities are among prominent issues facing by working women in balancing their work-life balance.

References

- Achille, M. A. (2003), "De'finir la sante' au travail. I. La base conceptuelle d'un mode'le de la sante' au travail", in: Foucher, R., Savoie, A., Brunet, L. (Eds.), *Concilier performance organisationnelle et sante' psychologique au travail, Montre'al, Canada: Editions Nouvelles, Canada*, pp. 65 – 90.
- Allen, T. D. (2001). "Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 414-435.
- Anjali Taneja (2015), "Review Study on Work Life Balance Practices & Employee's Turnover Intention in an Organization", *International Journal Research Publication's Research Journal of Social Science & Management*, ISSN: 2251 1571.
- Aryee, S., Fields, D., & Luk, V. (1999a). "A cross-cultural test of a model of the work family interface". *Journal of Management*, 25(4), 491-511.
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A. & Lo, S. (1999b). "Role stressors, inter role conflict and wellbeing: the moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 259-278.
- Atasi Mohanty, Lalatendu Kesari Jena (2016), "Work-Life Balance Challenges for Indian Employees: Socio-Cultural Implications and Strategies", *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 2016, 4, 15-21.
- Auko Y.A., (2009). "Work-Family Conflict and Coping Strategies Adopted by Women in Academia. *Gender and Behaviour*", Vol. 7 (1), pp. 2095-2122
- Ballout, H.I. (2008). "Work-family conflict and career success: the effects of domains pecific determinants". *Journal of Management Development*, 27(5), 437-466.
- Batt, R., & Valcour, P. M. (2003). "Human resources practices as predictors of work-family Outcomes and Employee Turnover. *Industrial Relations": A Journal of Economy and Society*, 42(2), 189-220.
- Burke, R. J. (2002). "Organizational values, job experiences and satisfaction among managerial and professional women and men: Advantage men?" *Women in Management Review* 17 (5): 5-6.
- Burke, R. J. and Nelson, D. L. (2002). "Advancing Women's Careers: Research and Practice (London: Blackwell)".
- Callan, S.J. (2008). Cultural revitalisation: "The importance of acknowledging the values of an organisation's —golden eral when promoting work-life balance". *Qualitative Research in Organisations and Management: An International Journal*, 3(1), 78-97.
- Chang, Artemis and McDonald, Paula K. and Burton, Pauline M. (2009), "Methodological Choices in Work-Life Balance Research 1987 To 2006: A Critical Review." *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 22(13): 2381 –2413
- Chow, I. H., & Keng-Howe, I. C. (2006). "The effect of alternative work schedules on employee performance". *International Journal of Employment Studies*, 14(1), 105-130.
- Clark, S.C. (2000). "Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance". *Human Relations*, Vol. 53, pp. 747-770.
- Clarke, M.C., Koch, L.C., and Hill, E.J. (2004), "The Work-Family Interface: Differentiating Balance and Fit", *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2).
- Connell, R. W. (2005). "A really good husband: work/life balance, gender equity and social change". *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 40 (3): 369-383.
- Daniel M., (2011). "Leadership and organisational performance: from research to prescription?" *International Journal of Educational Management*, pp. 45-60
- Doris Ruth Eikhof, Chris Warhurst, Axel Haunschild (2009), "Introduction: What work? What life? What balance? Critical reflections on the work life balance debate". *Emerlad group Publishing Limited, Volume-29, Issue 4, Pg.28*.
- Duxbury, L. E., and C. A. Higgins. (1991). "Gender differences in work- family conflict". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76 (1): 60-73.

- Fisher, K., and M. Layte. 2002–2003. “Measuring work-life balance and degrees of sociability: A focus on the value of time use data in the assessment of quality of life”. *Working Paper of the European Panel Analysis Group* 32.
- G.Delina, R. Prabhakara Raya (2013). “A study on Work-Life Balance in Working Women” *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management (IJCBM)*, ISSN: 2319–2828, Vol. 2, No.5, October, pp. 274-282
- Garg, P. &Rastogi, R., (2006). “New Model of Job Design: Motivating Employees’ Performances”. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(6), 572-587.
- Gary W. and Ivey T.J., (2010). “Transformational and active transactional leadership in the Canadian military”. *Leadership & Organization Development*. pp. 246-262.
- Greenhaus, J. H. (2003). “The relation between work-family balance and quality of life”. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63 (3): 55–61.
- Gregory, A. and Milner, S. (2009). Editorial: work-life balance: a matter of choice? *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(1), 1-13.
- Gregory, A. and Milner, S. (2012). “Supporting fathers at work?” *Paper for inaugural conference, International Work-Family Research Network, New York, 14-16 June 2012*.
- Grzywacz, J.G., Arcury, T.A., Marin, A., Carrillo, L., Burke, B., Coates, M.L. and Quandt, S.A. (2007). “Work-family conflict: Experiences and health implications among immigrant Latinos”. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 92(4), 1119-1130.
- H. S. Sandhu, Ritu Mehta (2006). “Work-family conflict among women executives in service sector: an empirical study”, *Journal of Advances in Management Research, Bingley*, Vol. 3, Iss. 2; pg. 68-80.
- Harris, L.A. and Foster, B. (2008). “The drivers of work-life balance: A critical review”. *Journal of Career Development*, 75, (1), 188 – 210.
- Harrison D.A., Newman D.A. and Roth P.L., (2006). “How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioural outcomes and time sequences”. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 49, pp. 305–325
- Hudson Highland Group (2005), “The Case for Work/Life Balance. Closing the Gap between Policy and Practice”, *A Hudson Initiative to Help Businesses Compete and Succeed in the Future*.
- Ikeda, S. (2010), “Review of Sociological Research on Work-Life Balance,” *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies*, Vol. 52, No. 6, pp. 22-31 (in Japanese).
- J. Renee Arathi, R. Rajkumar (2015), “Women and Work-Life Balance- Rationale behind Imbalance- An Empirical Study”, *International Journal of Applied Research* 2015; 1(7): 625-627.
- Kalyani Mohanty & Sasmita Mohanty, (2014), “An Empirical Study on the Employee Perception on Work-Life Balance in Hotel Industry with Special Reference to Odisha”, *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 65-81.
- Karatepe O.M. and Tekinkus M., (2006). The effects of work-family conflict, emotional exhaustion, and intrinsic motivation on job outcomes of frontline employees: *International Journal of Banking Marketing*, Vol. 24(3), pp. 173-193.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2006), “Subjective well-being in mental health and human development research worldwide: An introduction”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 77 No. 1, pp. 1 – 10.
- Keyes, C. L. M., Lopez, S. J. (2002), “Toward a science of mental health: Positive directions in diagnosis and interventions”, in: Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S. J. (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology*, Oxford University Press. New York, pp. 45 – 59
- Kinunen U., Vermulst A., Gerris J. and Makikangas A., (2003). “Workfamily conflict and its relations to well-being: The role of personality as a moderating factor”. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 35, pp. 1669-1683.
- Konard, A.M., and Mnagel, R., (2000), “The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21 (12), 1225-1235.
- Levy, Ignacia. (2012), “Research work on Working Mothers and Their Perceived Work Life Balance”, *unpublished thesis, Netherlands*.
- Lochhead, C., & Stephens, A. (2004). Employee retention, labour turnover and knowledge transfer: case studies from the Canadian plastics sector. *Canadian Labour and Business Centre Report*.
- Loscocco, K.A. (1997). Work family linkages among self-employed women and men. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50, 204-226.
- McCabe, S. and Johnson, S. (2013). The happiness factor in tourism: Subjective well-being and social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 41, pp. 42-65.

- N.M.N.P Dissanayaka and M.A.M Hussain Ali (2013), "Impact of Work-Life Balance on Employees Performance: An Empirical Study on Seven Apparel Organizations in Sri Lanka", *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium, SEUSL*: 6-7.
- N.Prabha, P.Nirmala, (2016), "An Empirical Study On Work Life Balance of Married Women Employees At Educational Sector In Namakkal District", *International Conference on "Innovative Management Practices" Organized by SVCET, Virudhunagar, Vol-1 Issue-1*.
- Natalie Skinner, Janine Chapman (2013), "Work-life balance and family friendly policies" *Evidence Base, issue 4*, <journal.anzsog.edu.au>, ISSN 1838-9422.
- Nordenmark, M., Vinberg, S. and Strandh, M. (2012). "Job control and demands, work life balance and wellbeing among self-employed men and women in Europe". *Vulnerable Groups & Inclusion* Vol. 3.
- Peeters, M. C. W., Montgemery, J. J., Bakker, A. B. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2005). "Balancing work and home: How job and home demands are related to burnout". *International Journal of Stress Management*, 12, pp. 43– 61.
- Pooja Ainapur, B. Vidyavathi, and Keerti Kulkarni, Mamata P. (2016). "Work Life Balance Policies, Practices and Its Impact on Organizational Performance". *International Journal of Latest Technology in Engineering, Management & Applied Science. Volume V, Issue VII, July 2016*, pp. 11-21.
- Rupashree Baral & Shivganesh Bhargava (2011), "Examining the moderating influence of gender on the relationships between work-family antecedents and work-family enrichment", *Gender in Management*, Vol.26, No.2, pp. 122-147.
- Sakazume, H. (2002), "Impacts of Family-friendly Practices on Employee Attitude and Organizational Performance," *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 6, pp. 29-42 (in Japanese).
- Sarah Holley and Alwine Mohnen (2012), "Impact of Working Hours on Work-Life Balance", *SOEP – The German Socio-Economic Panel Study at DIW Berlin*, 465-2012.
- Sjöberg, L. (2008). 'Emotional intelligence and life adjustment. In J. C. Cassady & M. A. Eissa (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence: Perspectives on Educational & Positive Psychology* (pp. 169-184). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Taylor, B. L., DelCampo, R. G., & Blancero, D. M. (2009). "Work–family conflict/facilitation and the role of workplace supports for U.S. Hispanic professionals". *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30, 643–664. DOI: 10.1002/job.605
- Timothy D. and Golden J.F., (2008). "The impact of superior– subordinate relationships on the commitment, job satisfaction, and performance of virtual workers". *The Leadership Quarterly*, pp. 77-88
- Torrington D., Hall L. and Taylor S., (2009). *Human Resource Management*, 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, London, UK,
- van Steenbergen, E. F., & Ellemers, N. (2009). "Is managing the work–family interface worthwhile? Benefits for employee health and performance". *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30, 617–642.
- Wakisaka, A. (2009), "Diffusion and Penetration of WLB Program," *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 4-13 (in Japanese).
- Wakisaka, A. (2009), "Diffusion and Penetration of WLB Program," *The Japanese Journal of Labour Studies*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 4-13 (in Japanese).
- Weiss H.M., (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: separating evaluation, beliefs and affective experiences, *Human Resources Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 173-194
- White, M., Hill, S., McGovern, P., Mills, C. and Smeaton, D. (2003). "High-performance' management practices, working hours and work-life balance". *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(2), 175-195.
- Yamamoto, I. and S. Kuroda (2014), *Economic Analysis of Working Hours: Prospects for a Working Style in a Super-Aging Society*, Nikkei Publishing Inc. (in Japanese).