

## **Organizational environment, Family Support, Child and Dependent care, Job Stress and Job Satisfaction as Antecedent to Work life balance**

**Prof.A.K Mishra\*, Shreya Kushwaha\*\***

Professor\*, Research Scholar\*\*

Department of Commerce

Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya

Bilaspur(C.G.)

### **Abstract**

**Purpose-** The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between selected variables and work life balance.

**Design/methodology/approach-** A structured surveyed questionnaire was used to study the gathered data collected from 157 respondents of working employees in several sectors. The data has been analyzed by using multivariate correlation analysis and regression analysis using SPSS.

**Findings-** The results indicated that (1) organizational environment does not have much influence on work life balance,(2) family support, child and dependent care is equally important in improving work life balance of employees,thus,having positive relation with work life balance,(3) job stress is negatively related with work life balance,(4)job satisfaction is the most important factors among the selected variables that increases work life balance of employees.

**Research limitations-** the study has considered only five factors for the research purposes. There are such more factors that lead to work life balance.

### **Introduction**

Work and individual life are the two important aspects for an individual engaging in work (Komal Saeed, 2014). The reality is that they are continuously juggling between their work life and personal life. According to the studies, work life balance of employees is highly affected by the organizational environment, support from the family and dependents in family, stress arising from job and satisfaction received from the job. Organizational environment, family support, dependents care and job satisfaction are having positive association with work life balance while job stress and work life balance are negatively coorelated.Job satisfaction and job stress are

considered to be originated from work life and personal life both. Both are affected by the selected variables for the study. Organizational environment has been altered with a fast pace leading to restructuring of jobs, heavy workload demand, workload pressure and insecurity of the job(Komal Saeed,2014).Job satisfaction plays a crucial role in enhancing work life balance of employees.it also affects the productivity of employees. A Job satisfied employee could be able to enhance his balance of life against an unsatisfied employee. A significant aspect in the association between balancing work and personal life with job satisfaction is the extent how employees are balancing their work and non-work activities (Beauregard, 2009).

To preserve a competitive edge, the majority of organizations have been developing certain policies and programmes for its employees coping with work life imbalance. According to a study, workplace support can boost up effectiveness and morale of the employees. The main purpose behind the study is to assess the association among selected variables of work life balance.

## **Literature Review**

Muhammad Irfan(2021), this study focused on examining the impact of Work Life Balance on job performance while taking job burnout as mediating and organizational support as moderating factors that directly or indirectly affects the Work life balance of individuals working in the organization. This study used regression analysis and found significant and direct relation between work life balance and job performance. If Work life balance increases job performance will also increase,and vice-versa.the positive relationship between job burnout and job performance can also be seen through this study.

Kumari Rashmi(2021), the study focused on investigating empirically about the mediating effect of Work life balance and its relationship between three important organizational job resources namely, job autonomy, supervisor support and co-worker support with measuring effects on job satisfaction experienced by frontline health professionals. The study found that all the three organizational job resources factors are positively and significantly affected.

Maiya(2014) through conducting empirical research in the Work life balance of working women in public and private sector as well; in which equal number of employees from both was selected for conducting survey. The work life balance has managed in various sub factors like personal, balancing, motivational, psychological factors with career advancement and organizational support. For sampling of data purposive random sampling taken from various senior level, middle level and line level of women employees. The study concluded that

women who are working are facing difficulty in managing their professional lives and private lives; having highly correlated with each other.

Raisinghani and Goswami(2014) ,the study reconsider few causes for assessing the imbalance between work life and personal life and the impact on both organizational level and individual level.A conceptual model is suggested to be tested by the empirical investigation.The model placed emphasis on the link between work and family and how the interference of both affect each other. The model also attempted to link various work-life conflict or imbalance components to both individual and organizational level.

A study was carried out in Pakistan by Nadeem & Abbas (2009) to examine the connection between work life and job satisfaction. Information is gathered from 157 public sector employees and the private sector via a survey. Data is examined using descriptive analysis, regression, and correlation. According to study, job stress is negatively connected with to work-related stress, family-work interactions, and workplace conflict.Overwork has little effect on job happiness. Positive Job autonomy and job satisfaction are correlated.

Carmen K. Fu and Margaret A. Shaffer (2001) examined how various forms of family interference with work (FIW) and work interference with family (WIF) conflict were impacted by family and job-specific characteristics.They discovered that parental demands and the amount of time spent doing household chores were significant factors in FIW conflict, while role conflict, role overload, and the amount of time spent doing paid work affected WIF conflict. Work-life conflict was moderately influenced by home support, superior support, and spouse support.

In his study, Janet (2003) explained that organisations have created a variety of work-life balance initiatives and discovered that profit-making businesses offer amenities like flexible work schedules, competitive pay, and advancement for men, women, and minorities, as well as long-term saving and profit-sharing programmes and resource services to assist with things like nursery and elder care.

The study was carried out by Rani, Kamalanabhan, and Selvarani (2011) to assess the connection between work-life balance and employee satisfaction. Through a questionnaire, information is gathered from 210 respondents in IT organisations.The analysis of multiple regression was used to determine the results.The findings showed that job satisfaction is positively correlated with work-life balance and negatively correlated with task at work, relationship with subordinate and supervisor, and work recognition.

The study was carried out by Mcnall, Masuda, and Nicklin (2010) to examine the connection between flexible work arrangements and job satisfaction. Data from 220 employees is gathered.Regression analysis is the process used to analyse data. According to the study's findings, employees will be more satisfied with their jobs if flexible work arrangements are offered.

Quarat-ul-ain, khattak, and Iqbal (2013) did a study to investigate the association between job satisfaction and role conflict as well as the effects of workplace stress on relationships in Pakistani employees working in the private banking industry. 350 employees were surveyed to gather information. An ANOVA test, correlation, and SPSS are used to analyze the data. According to study findings, role conflict has a positive correlation with work-related stress and a negative correlation with job satisfaction.

### Objectives:

- To ascertain the relationship among selected variables with work life balance.
- To ascertain the relationship between job stress and work life balance.

### Hypothesis:

HO<sub>1</sub>: There is no impact of Organizational environment on Work life balance.

HO<sub>2</sub>: There is no impact of Family Support on Work life balance.

HO<sub>3</sub>: There is no impact of Child and Dependent care on Work life balance.

HO<sub>4</sub>: There is no association between Job stress and Work life balance.

HO<sub>5</sub>: There is no impact of Job Satisfaction on Work life balance.

**Table 1: Demographic tables**

| Variables      | Categories | Number | Percentage |
|----------------|------------|--------|------------|
| Gender         | Female     | 79     | 50.30      |
|                | Male       | 78     | 49.70      |
|                | Total      | 157    | 100.00     |
| Age            | Below 25   | 26     | 16.60      |
|                | 25-35      | 103    | 65.60      |
|                | 35-45      | 21     | 13.40      |
|                | Above 45   | 7      | 4.50       |
|                | Total      | 157    | 100.00     |
| Marital Status | Married    | 50     | 31.80      |

|                         |               |     |        |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----|--------|
|                         | Unmarried     | 104 | 66.20  |
|                         | Others        | 3   | 1.90   |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| Work Experience         | Below 5       | 92  | 58.60  |
|                         | 5-10          | 43  | 27.40  |
|                         | 10-15         | 15  | 9.60   |
|                         | 15-20         | 3   | 1.90   |
|                         | Above 20      | 4   | 2.50   |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| Working Hours           | Less than 3   | 15  | 40.10  |
|                         | Less than 6   | 32  | 20.40  |
|                         | Less than 8   | 62  | 39.50  |
|                         | Above 8       | 48  | 30.60  |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| Annual Income           | Below 2 lakhs | 50  | 31.80  |
|                         | 2-4 lakhs     | 37  | 23.60  |
|                         | 4-6 lakhs     | 23  | 14.60  |
|                         | Above 6 lakhs | 47  | 29.90  |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| Family Type             | Joint         | 60  | 38.20  |
|                         | Nuclear       | 97  | 61.80  |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| No. of Dependents       | 1             | 66  | 42.00  |
|                         | 2             | 43  | 27.40  |
|                         | 3             | 24  | 15.30  |
|                         | Above 3       | 24  | 15.30  |
|                         | Total         | 157 | 100.00 |
| Dependent care done by? | Family        | 68  | 43.30  |

|  |          |     |        |
|--|----------|-----|--------|
|  | Servant  | 1   | 0.60   |
|  | Yourself | 88  | 56.10  |
|  | Total    | 157 | 100.00 |

The responds were collected from those persons who are employed and were from different job profiles like educational, banking, financial, corporate sectors and others. The structured questionnaire was formulated and distributed to employees working in those sectors. 157 (100 %) responses were recorded as satisfactory. Out of 157 respondents, 79(50.3 %) were females being in the slight majority while 78(49.7 %) were males. 26 (16.6 %) belongs to the age group of below 25 years; 103(65.6 %) being in the majority belongs to the age group of 25-35 years followed by the others. The respondents were mostly unmarried (66.2 %) followed by married respondents (31.8 %). As far as work experience is considered, 58.60 % were having work experience of below 5 years followed by 27.40% being the second greatest were having work experience between 5- 10 years. Among 157 respondents, 62 (39.5 %) having working hours of less than 8 followed by 48 (30.6 %) were working above 8 hours. As far as annual income is considered, being the majority; 50(31.8%) having less than 2 lakhs, 37(23.6%) were having their income between 2-4 lakhs, 23(14.6%) having between 4-6 lakhs and 47(29.9%) were having their annual income above 6 lakhs. Majority of the respondents belong to the nuclear family 97(61.8%) and only 60(38.2%) belonged from joint family. 66(42.0%) were having only 1 dependent in their home; 43(27.4%) having 2 dependents while 3 and above 3 dependents were having equal share as 24(15.3%). Among the respondents 88 (56.1%) said that dependents care are done by themselves whereas 68(43%) respondents agreed that dependents care are done by the members present in their family.

## Normality and Reliability Analysis

**Table:1**

|                     | N     | Mean<br>Statistic | Std.<br>Deviation<br>Statistic | Skewness  |            | Kurtosis  |            |
|---------------------|-------|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
|                     |       |                   |                                | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Std. Error |
| OE                  | 157   | 3.6446            | 1.01517                        | -.785     | .194       | .153      | .385       |
| FS                  | 157   | 3.8710            | 1.00264                        | -.854     | .194       | .139      | .385       |
| CDC                 | 157   | 3.2022            | .99885                         | -.376     | .194       | -.129     | .385       |
| JS                  | 157   | 2.9363            | .90985                         | .150      | .194       | -.153     | .385       |
| JSat                | 157   | 3.3041            | .99531                         | -.347     | .194       | -.251     | .385       |
| WLB                 | 157   | 3.2229            | .89097                         | -.059     | .194       | -.242     | .385       |
| Valid<br>(listwise) | N 157 |                   |                                |           |            |           |            |

For checking normality of data, the author has used Skewness and Kurtosis. The range of Skewness is -1 to +1; and the Kurtosis is -3 to +3; the above data lies within these range which shows normality of the data.

**Table 2:**

### Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | Cronbach's<br>Alpha Based<br>on<br>Standardized<br>Items | N of Items |
|---------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| .922                | .922                                                     | 5          |

The reliability of the questionnaire was evaluated by using Cronbach's Alpha by measuring internal consistency. It measures internal consistency by establishing if certain items are measured the same construct.

Therefore, Cronbach's Alpha was established for every objective in order to determine the consistent results. To establish reliability, Cronbach's Alpha should be greater than 0.7(Hair, et al., 2010). Thus, for all constructs the reliability coefficient were greater than 0.7. Thus, it states that constructs are reliable and consistent.

**Table 3:**
**Correlation Analysis**

|      |                     | OE     | FS     | CDC    | JS    | JSat   | WLB    |
|------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| OE   | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .538** | .488** | .195* | .564** | .441** |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .000   | .000   | .014  | .000   | .000   |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |
| FS   | Pearson Correlation | .538** | 1      | .467** | .181* | .406** | .441** |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   |        | .000   | .023  | .000   | .000   |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |
| CDC  | Pearson Correlation | .488** | .467** | 1      | .148  | .535** | .537** |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   | .000   |        | .064  | .000   | .000   |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |
| JS   | Pearson Correlation | .195*  | .181*  | .148   | 1     | .121   | -.107  |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .014   | .023   | .064   |       | .130   | .184   |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |
| JSat | Pearson Correlation | .564** | .406** | .535** | .121  | 1      | .623** |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   | .000   | .000   | .130  |        | .000   |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |
| WLB  | Pearson Correlation | .441** | .441** | .537** | -.107 | .623** | 1      |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000   | .000   | .000   | .184  | .000   |        |
|      | N                   | 157    | 157    | 157    | 157   | 157    | 157    |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlation coefficients are used to assess the strength and direction of the linear relationships among the variables. When variables are normally distributed, Karl Pearson correlation coefficient is used (Alex Aruldoss, 2021). The range lies between -1 to +1 from highly positive to highly negative correlation (MM Mukaka, 2012). To ascertain the relationships among selected variables, Pearson Correlation has been used. The method has also been chosen because five point likert scale has been used. The correlation coefficient of Organizational environment ( $r=.441$ ), family support ( $r=.441$ ), child/dependent care ( $r=.537$ ) are having moderately high positive correlation with work life balance. While Job stress ( $r=-.107$ ) is the factor which has highly negative correlation with work life balance. It implies that when Job stress will increase, the work life balance will decrease and vice-versa. This negative relation is also proved by many researchers. While Job satisfaction ( $r=.623$ ) is highly positive related with Work life balance. This shows that among all the selected variables job satisfaction affects the most to work life balance of employees.

**Table 4:**  
**Regression Analysis**

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics |          |     |  |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|--|
|       |                   |          |                   |                            | R Square Change   | F Change | df1 |  |
| 1     | .718 <sup>a</sup> | .516     | .500              | .63004                     | .516              | 32.195   | 5   |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant), JSat, JS, FS, CDC, OE

b. Dependent Variable: WLB

The model significantly explained 51.6% variance in the dependent variable while remaining explained by some other factors not considered in the study.

**Table 5:**
**Annova**

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 63.899         | 5   | 12.780      | 32.195 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 59.939         | 151 | .397        |        |                   |
|       | Total      | 123.837        | 156 |             |        |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: WLB

b. Predictors: (Constant), JSat, JS, FS, CDC, OE

**Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)** is a statistical formula used to compare variances among different variables. It is a test to determine whether the R-square is significantly greater than 0. If  $p < 0.05$  it determines that test is significant. In other words, in table 5 R-square is greater than zero, meant that selected predictors are able to explained the dependent variable, i.e., Work life balance. In table 4 and table 5 the overall regression model was significant;  $f(5, 151) = 32.195$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $R^2 = 0.516$ ; which means that all the selected predictors are explaining 51.6% to the Work life balance.

**Table 6:**
**Hypothesis Testing**

|       |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        |      |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| Model |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      | Sig. |
| 1     | (Constant) | 1.214                       | .260       |                           | 4.662  | .000 |
|       | OE         | .024                        | .067       | .027                      | .355   | .723 |
|       | FS         | .159                        | .062       | .179                      | 2.552  | .012 |
|       | CDC        | .216                        | .064       | .242                      | 3.373  | .001 |
|       | JS         | -.228                       | .057       | -.233                     | -4.011 | .000 |
|       | JSat       | .388                        | .066       | .434                      | 5.887  | .000 |

*Dependent Variable: WLB*

As shown in table 6, the hypothesis1 has been accepted as beta coefficient of Organizational environment ( $\beta=0.024$ ,  $p>0.05$ ) and the significance value is 0.723 which is greater than p-value. It implies that organizational environment does not impact much on work life balance.

Beta coefficient of Family support ( $\beta=0.159$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), Child and Dependent care ( $\beta=0.216$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), Job satisfaction ( $\beta=0.388$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) are significant and rejecting null hypothesis 2, hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 5. Thus, these three variables are positively related with work life balance.

Hypothesis3 of Job stress determines the value of beta coefficient  $\beta = -0.228$  and its value is less than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) which is significant and explained the highly negative correlation or negatively related with work life balance.

Overall, all underlying dimensions except first variable are positive and significant. Thus, the result of multiple regression analysis accepts the null hypothesis ( $H_{01}$ ) "There is no impact of Organizational environment on Work life balance" and proves that there is not that much impact of this variable on work life balance. The second, third and fifth Hypothesis, i.e.,  $H_{02}$ ,  $H_{03}$ ,  $H_{05}$  are rejected or accepts the alternative hypothesis that "There is no impact of Family Support on Work life balance"; "There is no impact of Child and Dependent care on Work life balance"; "There is no impact of Job Satisfaction on Work life balance" So, there is a relationship as expected. And the fourth hypothesis  $H_{04}$  "There is no association between Job stress and Work life balance" are totally rejected and states that it has highly negative association with work life balance.

Thus, the regression model analysis achieved a satisfactory level of goodness-of-fit in predicting the variance in relation to the five predictors or independent variables, as measured by the above-mentioned R,  $R^2$ , and adjusted  $R^2$ , F ratio, beta and t values.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation:**

The paper explains the influence of various factors on work life balance are evaluated in general context. Multivariate correlation and regression analysis had been used to analyze the statistical results shown in respective tables 3-6 which examined the association between selected predictors of the dependent variable. The correlation coefficient examined in table 3 shows that not much important relation between organizational environment as compared with other variables as family support, child and dependent care and job satisfaction which have moderately high positive correlation with work life balance. The other most important predictor, i.e., job stress, the result shows highly negative correlation with work life balance. It is proved by many studies also. Apart from this, few more significant conclusions are as follows:

The empirical analysis model summarized in table 4 and 5 reflects five independent variables explained 51.6% of the variance in the dependent variable.

The management of all sectors need to consider in their policies and programmes all the variables considered in this study to enhance the work life balance and job satisfaction of the employees in consequence of which the performance and productivity of the employees will be increased which is the essence for the development of any sector. This study was descriptive in nature and considered only five factors for work life balance in general context. The more factors should also be considered for strongly developing the future research purposes.

### **References**

- Saeed, K., & Farooqi, Y. A. (2014). Examining the relationship between work life balance, job stress, and job satisfaction among university teachers (A case of University of Gujarat). *International Journal of multidisciplinary sciences and engineering*, 5(6), 9-15.
- Beauregard, T. A., & Henry, L. C. (2009). Making the link between work-life balance practices and organizational performance. *Human resource management review*, 19(1), 9-22.
- Irfan, M., Khalid, R. A., Kaka Khel, S. S. U. H., Maqsoom, A., & Sherani, I. K. (2023). Impact of work-life balance with the role of organizational support and job burnout on project performance. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 30(1), 154-171.
- Rashmi, K., & Kataria, A. (2021). The mediating role of work-life balance on the relationship between job resources and job satisfaction: perspectives from Indian nursing professionals. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, (ahead-of-print).
- Maiya, S., & Bagali, M. M. (2014). An empirical investigation on work-life balance among working mothers: Emerging HRM interventions. *International journal of business and administration research review*, 1(5), 165-176.

- Raisinghani, M., & Goswami, R. (2014). Model of work life balance explaining relationship constructs. *Int J Appl Innov Eng Manage*, 3(2), 46-59.
- Nadeem, M. S., & Abbas, Q. (2009). The impact of work life conflict on job satisfactions of employees in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(5), 63-83.
- Fu, C. K., & Shaffer, M. A. (2001). The tug of work and family: Direct and indirect domain-specific determinants of work-family conflict. *Personnel review* <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005936>
- .Padma, S., & Reddy, M. S. (2013). Role of family support in balancing personal and work life of women employees. *International Journal of Computational Engineering & Management*, 16(3), 93-97. ISSN (Online): 2230-7893
- Saeed, K., & Farooqi, Y. A. (2014). Examining the relationship between work life balance, job stress, and job satisfaction among university teachers (A case of University of Gujarat). *International Journal of multidisciplinary sciences and engineering*, 5(6), 9-15.
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work-family enrichment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25, 381-396.
- Ul-Ain, Q., Khattak, M. A., & Iqbal, N. (2013). Impact of Role Conflict on Job Satisfaction, Mediating Role of Job Stress in Private Banking Sector. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(12), 711-722.
- F. Hair Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) An emerging tool in business research. *European business review*, 26(2), 106-121.
- Aruldoss, A., Kowalski, K. B., & Parayitam, S. (2021). The relationship between quality of work life and work-life-balance mediating role of job stress, job satisfaction and job commitment: evidence from India. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 18(1), 36-62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAMR-05-2020-0082>

Mukaka, M. M. (2012). A guide to appropriate use of correlation coefficient in medical research. *Malawi medical journal*, 24(3), 69-71.

Powell, G. N., Francesco, A. M., & Ling, Y. (2009). Toward culture-sensitive theories of the work–family interface. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 30(5), 597-616.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.568>

Voydanoff, P. (2008). A conceptual model of the work-family interface. In *Handbook of work-family integration* (pp. 37-55). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012372574-5.50006-5>

Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255-279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018402041002005>

Smith, J., & Gardner, D. (2007). Factors affecting employee use of work-life balance initiatives.

Mokana, M. K., & KUMARASAMY, P. M. (2016). Individual, organizational and environmental factors affecting work-life balance. *Utara: Universiti Utara Malaysia*.

Fatima, N., & Sahibzada, S. A. (2012). An empirical analysis of factors affecting work life balance among university teachers: the case of Pakistan. *Journal of International Academic Research*, 12(1), 16-29.

Abdulrahman, A., & Ali, W. (2017). The notion of work life balance, determining factors, antecedents and consequences: a comprehensive literature survey. *Education*.