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4.3. The Grand Summary
This chapter presents the results that were obtained after treating the data statistically using the tools of factor analysis, z-test, regression and ANOVA. The results are presented in two phases. Phase one, labeled as initial analysis, presents the results in terms of factors obtained through exploratory factor analysis. Phase two, labeled as final analysis attempts to establish relationship between the factors obtained.

4.1. Initial Analysis

4.1.1. Factor Analysis

In order to explore the suitability of the data for factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was conducted. KMO index of 0.50 and above and a significant Bartlett’s test is considered to be fit for factor analysis (Hair et al., 1989). After meeting the suitability criteria, factor analysis was undertaken using principal component method. The initial factor structures were further subjected to orthogonal rotation using varimax method. Factor loading of 0.3 was considered to be significant on basis of thumb rule loading criteria of 0.3 (Hair et al., 1989). To ensure absence of cross loading of an item, the criterion of difference of 0.2 between the highest and the second highest loading was followed (Stamper & Masterson, 2002). Since items measuring work-life balance, work antecedent, life antecedents and gender stereotypes were different, factor analysis for each construct was carried out separately.
4.1.1.1. Factor Analysis-- Work-life Balance

The KMO measure was 0.761 and Bartlett’s test was significant ($p<0.05$) thus, factor analysis was found to be suitable. The 19 items were factor analysed and 4 factors having eigen values more than 1 emerged explaining 52.96% of the total variance. Out of 19 items 4 items had cross loadings however, the difference in loading between the highest and the second highest item was greater than 0.20 and so all 19 items were retained. The factor loadings along with their labels are reported in Appendix II. The item wise description of the factor is explained in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Description of Factors of Work-life Balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>Part A – Statements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-life Interference</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 8, 9 &amp; 19</td>
<td>Reflects negative flow from work domain to life domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-work Interference</td>
<td>4, 15, 23, 25 &amp; 27</td>
<td>Reflects negative flow from life domain to work domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-Work Enhancement</td>
<td>11, 13, 24 &amp; 28</td>
<td>Reflects positive flow from life domain to work domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life Enhancement</td>
<td>6, 10, 20 &amp; 26</td>
<td>Reflects positive flow from work domain to life domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor that emerged was Work-life interference that denoted the negative spillover from the work domain to the life domain. 6 items loaded on factor 1. The second factor Life-work interference had 5 items that represented the negative flow from the life to work domain. Factor three Life-work enhancement having 4 items signified the positivity sent out from life to work domain. The fourth factor Work-life enhancement with 4 items represented the positive spillover from the work to life domain.
4.1.1.2. Factor Analysis- Work Antecedents

The KMO measure was 0.735 and Bartlett’s test was significant \( (p<0.05) \) thus, factor analysis was found to be suitable. The 27 items were factor analysed and 8 factors having eigen values more than 1 emerged explaining 68.78% of the total variance. Out of 27 items 3 items had cross loadings however, the difference in loading between the highest and the second highest item was greater than 0.2 and so all 27 items were retained. Appendix III provides the factor loadings and the labels of the factors. Item wise description of the factors is explained in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Description of factors of Work Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>Part B - Statements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>10, 12, 13,14 &amp; 15</td>
<td>Reflects advancement and skill enhancement opportunities at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>25, 26, 27 &amp; 28</td>
<td>Reflects the support given by superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>16, 17 &amp; 18</td>
<td>Reflects the satisfaction with the reward system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>29, 31 &amp; 32</td>
<td>Reflects the support received from colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>22, 23 &amp; 24</td>
<td>Reflects a concern for commuting time and strain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>Reflects the task and responsibility overload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Work Role</td>
<td>2,3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Reflects role ambiguity and conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>19, 20 &amp; 21</td>
<td>Reflects a concern for long work hours and time strain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first factor with 5 items that emerged was Development that denoted skill and advancement opportunities at work. The second factor Superior had 4 items that represented the support given by superior. Factor three Reward System with three items reflected the satisfaction with the prevailing reward system. The fourth factor Colleagues with 3 items represented the support received from the colleagues. Factor
five with 3 items denoted the time and energy strain experienced in commuting to work. Sixth factor Work Load with 3 items was about task and responsibility overload. Factor seven Work Role with 3 items divulged about ambiguity and conflict within work roles. The eighth and last factor Work Schedule reflected the experience of time overload.

### 4.1.1.3. Factor Analysis- Life Antecedents

The KMO measure was 0.659 and Bartlett’s test was significant ($p<0.05$) thus, factor analysis was found to be suitable. The 19 items were factor analysed and 6 factors having eigen values more than 1 emerged explaining 64.87% of the total variance. Out of 19 items 4 items had cross loadings however, the difference in loading between the highest and the second highest item was greater than 0.2 and so all 19 items were retained. Appendix IV provides the factor loadings and the labels of the factors. Item wise description of the factors is explained in Table 4.3.

### Table 4.3. Description of factors of Life Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>Part C – Statements</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>19, 21, 22 &amp; 23</td>
<td>Reflects activities undertaken for pleasure which are not part of work or house tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>16, 17, 18 &amp; 20</td>
<td>Reflects relationships with extended family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Household Responsibility</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Reflects activities undertaken for household functioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Care Responsibility</td>
<td>11, 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Reflects time and energy spent in fulfilling care responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Domestic Help</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>Reflects the support and dependence on domestic helpers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Partner/Parent</td>
<td>8 &amp; 9</td>
<td>Reflects the support of partner/parent in balancing the work and life domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first factor with 4 items that materialised was Leisure Activities. This factor included diverse leisure activities like entertainment, hobby and social interaction. The second factor Extended Family with 4 items represented the relationship with the extended family. Factor three, Household Responsibility having 4 items included all routine and non-routine activities undertaken for household functioning. The fourth factor Care Responsibility with 3 items represented the time and energy spent on care responsibilities. Domestic Help that emerged as the fifth factor indicated the support received from domestic helpers. The sixth and last factor Parent/Partner reflects the support given by partner or parent to maintain the balance between work and life domains.

4.1.1.4. Factor Analysis- Gender Stereotypes

The KMO measure was 0.761 and Bartlett’s test was significant \((p<0.05)\) thus, factor analysis was found to be suitable. The 12 items were factor analysed and 3 factors having eigen values more than 1 emerged explaining 52.49% of the total variance. Appendix V provides the factor loadings and the labels of the factors. Item wise description of the factors is explained in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Description of Factors of Gender Stereotypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>Part C – Statements related to gender</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gender Roles</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Reflects the opinion about division of roles between men and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Career of Women</td>
<td>8, 11, 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>Reflects a concern about the commitment to career progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Women’s Choice of Career</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Reflects the opinion about choice of career of women.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first factor that emerged was Gender Roles that reflected the opinions about roles of men and women. 6 items loaded on factor 1. The second factor Career of Women with 4 items represented the concerns about career progress of women. Factor three, Women’s Choice of Career with 2 items reflected the opinions about career choices made by women.
4.2. Final Analysis

The final results are classified and presented in three stages namely Layout of the Experiment, Details of the Results and Summary of the Results.

4.2.1. Layout of the Experiment

In chapter 2, hypotheses related to perceptual difference between men and women were framed. Similarly, based on previous literature and research findings the relationships between various factors of work-life balance were hypothesized. In this section the 7 problems having 46 hypotheses were tested using the statistical techniques such as Z-test and multiple regression analysis. In addition to hypotheses testing, this section also includes the ANOVA test that examined the relationship between factors of work-life balance and demographic, work and family characteristics.

4.2.2. Details of the Results

This section is further divided into five sections (Section A to E) for better comprehension and reading. In the first section, eighteen hypotheses (H01 to H018) were analysed using the statistical technique of z-test. These hypotheses were related to three research problems (problems 1 to 3) that aimed at exploring how work-life balance varied across gender. The remaining four sections with four research problems (problems 4 to 7) aimed at exploring the impact of factors of work-life balance and factors of work and life antecedents using regression analysis. In section two, eight hypotheses (H019 to H026) established the relationship between work-life interference and work-specific factors. In the third section eight hypotheses (H027 to H034) established the relationship between work-life enhancement and work-specific factors. In section four, six hypotheses (H035 to H040) tested the impact of life-specific factors on
life-work interference. In the last section, six hypotheses (H041 to H046) tested the impact of life-specific factors on life-work enhancement. The problem and null hypotheses wise results along with summary of results have been presented in the following sub-sections:

4.2.2.1. Section A

Problem 1: Do professional men differ from professional women on factors of work-life balance?

H01: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the factors of Work-life Interference.

Men (mean = 2.52)
Women (mean = 3.64)
F = 6.24
The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = -17.93$, $p < 0.05$)
Professional men and women differ significantly on the factor of Work-life Interference. Professional women experience more work to life interference than professional men.

H02: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the factors of Work-life Enhancement.

Men (mean = 4.01)
Women (mean = 3.68)
F = .08
The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = 5.69$, $p < 0.05$)
Professional men and women differ significantly on the factor of work-life enhancement. Professional men experience more work to life enhancement than professional women.

H03: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the factors of Life-work Interference.
Men (mean = 2.12)  
Women (mean = 2.94)  
F = 25.61  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -11.46, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and women differ significantly on the factor of life-work interference.  
Professional women experience more life to work interference than professional men.

H₀₄: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the factors of Life-work Enhancement.  
Men (mean = 2.61)  
Women (mean = 3.39)  
F = 1.24  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -11.04, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and women differ significantly on the factor of life-work enhancement. Professional women experience more life to work enhancement than professional men.

**Problem 2: Do professional men differ from professional women on work specific factors/antecedents of work-life balance?**

H₀₅: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the Development factor of work-life balance.  
Men (mean = 3.97)  
Women (mean = 3.60)  
F = 41.40  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = 6.04, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and women differ significantly on the work specific factor of development. Professional men perceive the work specific factor of development more important than professional women.

H₀₆: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the Superior factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 3.85)
Women (mean = 3.20)
F = 50.35
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = 9.14, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of superior’s support. Professional men perceive the work specific factor of superior’s support as more important than professional women.

H_{07}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the Reward System factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 3.58)
Women (mean = 2.81)
F = 21.41
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = 8.96, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of reward system. Professional men perceive the work specific factor of reward system more important than professional women.

H_{08}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the Colleagues factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 3.92)
Women (mean = 3.51)
F = 37.94
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = 6.10, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of colleagues’ support. Professional men perceive the work specific factor of colleagues’ support as more important than professional women.

H_{09}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the Commuting factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 2.73)
Women (mean = 3.38)  
F = 6.73  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -6.97, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of commuting. Professional women perceive the work specific factor of commuting more stressful than professional men.

\(H_{010}\): There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the \textit{Work Load} factor of work-life balance.  
Men (mean = 3.28)  
Women (mean = 3.64)  
F = 12.95  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -4.46, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of work load. Professional women experience more work overload than professional men.

\(H_{011}\): There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the \textit{Work Role} factor of work-life balance.  
Men (mean = 1.89)  
Women (mean = 2.67)  
F = 30.23  
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -11.07, p < 0.05)  
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of work role. Professional women perceive the work specific factor of work role to be more important than professional men.

\(H_{012}\): There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the \textit{Work Schedule} factor of work-life balance.  
Men (mean = 3.26)  
Women (mean = 3.56)
F = 2.14
The null hypothesis is rejected (z = -3.53, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the work specific factor of *work schedule*. Professional women perceive the work specific factor of work schedule to be more important than professional men.

**Problem 3: Do professional men differ from professional women on life specific factors/antecedent of work-life balance?**

H\textsubscript{013}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Leisure Activities* factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 3.26)
Women (mean = 3.37)
F = 0.07
The null hypothesis is accepted (z = -1.28, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women did not differ significantly on the life specific factor of *leisure activities*.

H\textsubscript{014}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Extended Family* factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 3.81)
Women (mean = 3.75)
F = 1.79
The null hypothesis is accepted (z = 0.83, p < 0.05)
Professional men and professional women did not differ significantly on the life specific factor of *extended family*.

H\textsubscript{015}: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Household Responsibility* factor of work-life balance.
Men (mean = 2.82)
Women (mean = 3.69)
The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = -12.65$, $p < 0.05$)

Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the life specific factor of *household responsibility*. Professional women undertake more household responsibilities than professional men.

$H_{016}$: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Care Responsibility* factor of work-life balance.

Men (mean = 3.41)

Women (mean = 3.75)

$F = 49.04$

The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = -4.92$, $p < 0.05$)

Professional men and women differ significantly on the life specific factor of *care responsibility*. Professional women fulfill more care responsibilities than professional men.

$H_{017}$: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Domestic Help* factor of work-life balance.

Men (mean = 3.87)

Women (mean = 4.41)

$F = 19.37$

The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = -8.17$, $p < 0.05$)

Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the life specific factor of *domestic help*. Professional women seek more support from domestic help than professional men.

$H_{018}$: There is no significant difference between professional men and professional women on the *Partner/Parent* factor of work-life balance.

Men (mean = 3.45)

Women (mean = 3.22)

$F = 5.77$
The null hypothesis is rejected ($z = 2.47$, $p < 0.05$)

Professional men and professional women differ significantly on the life specific factor of *Partner/Parent’s support*. Professional men seek more support from their partner/parent than professional women.
### Summary of Results (Section A)

Table 4.5. Z-test – Factors of Work-life Balance and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Significant (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Significant (NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Work-Life Interference</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>-17.93</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Work-Life Enhancement</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Life-Work Interference</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>-11.46</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Life-Work Enhancement</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-11.04</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>50.35</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>37.94</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>-6.97</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>-4.46</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Work Role</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>-11.07</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Household Responsibility</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>-12.65</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Caring Responsibility</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>-4.92</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Domestic Help</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>-8.17</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Partner/Parent</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.2. Section B

Problem 4: Do work specific factors/antecedents impact work-life interference of professional men and professional women?

H₀₁₀: Work specific factor/antecedent Development has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = 0.09 \]

\[ t = 3.78 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Work specific factor/antecedent development has significant positive impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₂₀: Work specific factor/antecedent Superior has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = -0.05 \]

\[ t = -4.97 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Work specific factor/antecedent superior’s support has significant negative impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₂₁: Work specific factor/antecedent Reward System has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = -0.17 \]

\[ t = -3.38 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Work specific factor/antecedent reward system has significant negative impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₂₂: Work specific factor/antecedent Colleagues has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = -0.01 \]
\[ t = -1.16 \]
Null hypothesis is accepted
Work specific factor/antecedent colleagues’ support has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ H_{023}: \text{Work specific factor/antecedent } \textit{Commuting} \text{ has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.} \]
\[ \beta = 0.27 \]
\[ t = 6.06 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent commuting has significant positive impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ H_{024}: \text{Work specific factor/antecedent } \textit{Work Load} \text{ has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.} \]
\[ \beta = 0.08 \]
\[ t = 5.66 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent work load has significant positive impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

\[ H_{025}: \text{Work specific factor/antecedent } \textit{Work Role} \text{ has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.} \]
\[ \beta = 0.19 \]
\[ t = 4.01 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent work role has significant positive impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.
H₀₂₆: Work specific factor/antecedent Work Schedule has no significant impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

β = 0.20

t = 4.35

Null hypothesis is rejected (p < 0.05)

Work specific factor/antecedent work schedule has significant positive impact on work-life interference of professional men and professional women.

Summary of Results (Section B)

Table 4.6. Multiple Regression: Work-life Interference and Work Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Influencing Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>(-) 0.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>(-) 0.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>(-) 0.01</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Work Role</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.3. Section C

Problem 5: Do work specific factors/antecedents impact work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women?

H027: Work specific factor/antecedent Development has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.26 \]
\[ t = 4.79 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent development has significant positive impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

H028: Work specific factor/antecedent Superior has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.04 \]
\[ t = 4.75 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent superior’s support has significant positive impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

H029: Work specific factor/antecedent Reward System has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.04 \]
\[ t = 6.78 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent reward system has significant positive impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

H030: Work specific factor/antecedent Colleagues has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\( \beta = 0.22 \)
\( t = 4.28 \)
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent colleagues' support has significant positive impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\( H_{031} \): Work specific factor/antecedent Commuting has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\( \beta = -0.06 \)
\( t = -1.22 \)
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent commuting has significant negative impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and women.

\( H_{032} \): Work specific factor/antecedent Work Load has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\( \beta = -0.03 \)
\( t = -5.64 \)
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent work load has significant negative impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\( H_{033} \): Work specific factor/antecedent Work Role has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\( \beta = -0.07 \)
\( t = -6.28 \)
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Work specific factor/antecedent work role has significant negative impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.
H_{034}: Work specific factor/antecedent Work Schedule has no significant impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = -0.12 \]

\[ t = -4.42 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected \( (p < 0.05) \)

Work specific factor/antecedent work schedule has significant negative impact on work-life enhancement of professional men and professional women.

Summary of Results (Section C)

Table 4.7. Multiple Regression: Work-life Enhancement and Work Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Influencing Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reward System</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Commuting</td>
<td>(-) 0.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Work Load</td>
<td>(-) 0.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Work Role</td>
<td>(-) 0.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Work Schedule</td>
<td>(-) 0.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2.4. Section D

Problem 6: Do life specific factors/antecedents impact life-work interference of professional men and professional women?

H₀₃₅: Life specific factor/antecedent Leisure Activity has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = -0.26 \]
\[ t = -5.14 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Life specific factor/antecedent leisure activity has significant negative impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₃₆: Life specific factor/antecedent Extended Family has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.15 \]
\[ t = 3.11 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Life specific factor/antecedent extended family has significant positive impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₃₇: Life specific factor/antecedent Household Responsibility has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.15 \]
\[ t = 3.01 \]
Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Life specific factor/antecedent household responsibility has significant positive impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.

H₀₃₈: Life specific factor/antecedent Care Responsibility has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.15 \]
\[ t = 3.13 \]
 Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Life specific factor/antecedent care responsibility has significant positive impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.

\(H_{039}: \) Life specific factor/antecedent Domestic Help has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = 0.04 \]
\[ t = 0.86 \]
 Null hypothesis is accepted
Life specific factor/antecedent domestic help has no significant positive impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.

\(H_{040}: \) Life specific factor/antecedent Partner/Parent has no significant impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
\[ \beta = -0.31 \]
\[ t = -6.30 \]
 Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)
Life specific factor/antecedent partner/parent’s support has significant negative impact on life-work interference of professional men and professional women.
Summary of Results (Section D)

Table 4.8. Multiple Regression: Life-Work Interference and Life Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Influencing Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>(-) 0.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Household Responsibility</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Care Responsibility</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Domestic Help</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Partner/ Parent</td>
<td>(-) 0.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adj. R Square = 0.65, df = 6,393, Sigf. F =.000
4.2.2.5. Section E

Problem 7: Do life specific factors/antecedents impact life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women?

H_{041}: Life specific factor/antecedent Leisure Activity has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = 0.07 \]

\[ t = 4.26 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected ($p < 0.05$)

A life specific factor/antecedent leisure activity has significant positive impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.

H_{042}: Life specific factor/antecedent Extended Family has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = 0.00 \]

\[ t = -1.05 \]

Null hypothesis is accepted

Life specific factor/antecedent extended family has no significant positive impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.

H_{043}: Life specific factor/antecedent Household Responsibility has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\[ \beta = -0.06 \]

\[ t = -6.20 \]

Null hypothesis is rejected ($p < 0.05$)

Life specific factor/antecedent household responsibility has significant negative impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.

H_{044}: Life specific factor/antecedent Care Responsibility has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.
\( \beta = -0.08 \)

\( t = -4.64 \)

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Life specific factor/antecedent care responsibility has significant negative impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.

H\(_{45}\): Life specific factor/antecedent Domestic Help has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\( \beta = 0.15 \)

\( t = 3.00 \)

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Life specific factor/antecedent domestic help has significant positive impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.

H\(_{046}\): Life specific factor/antecedent Partner/Parent has no significant impact on life-work enhancement of professional men and professional women.

\( \beta = 0.25 \)

\( t = 4.68 \)

Null hypothesis is rejected \((p < 0.05)\)

Life specific factor/antecedent partner/parents, has significant positive impact on life-work enhancement professional men and professional women.
Summary of Results (Section E)

Table 4.9. Multiple Regression: Life-Work Enhancement and Life Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Influencing Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td>(-) 0.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Household Responsibility</td>
<td>(-) 0.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Caring Responsibility</td>
<td>(-) 0.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Domestic Help</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Partner/ Parent</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adj. R Square = 0.52, df = 6,393, Sigf. F = .000
4.2.3. Relationship between Demographic Characteristics and Work-life Balance

In this part of final analysis the relationship between the four factors of work-life balance and the demographic, work and family characteristics were tested. Analysis of variance was carried out for each factor for this purpose. The ANOVA results are summarized in the Tables 4.10, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13.

Table 4.10. ANOVA test: Work-life Interference and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Significant (S) Non-Significant (NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>F (5, 394) = 3.14</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>F (7, 392) = 5.44</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>F (2, 397) = 15.30</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>F (6, 393) = 6.35</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 2.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 11.21</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Household Status</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 6.25</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 1.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.05

The ANOVA results indicated that except for demographic characteristics of profession, marital status and city, all other characteristics has significant impact on work-life interference. The results in case of presence of children was expected and in keeping with the results of the previous studies it showed that parents in comparison of non-parents experienced more work to life interference.
Table 4.11. ANOVA test - Work-life Enhancement and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Significant (S)</th>
<th>Non- Significant (NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>F (5, 394) = 2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>F (7, 392) = 2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>F (2, 397) = 5.31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>F (6, 393) = 1.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 1.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 0.73</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Household Status</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 4.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 1.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = 0.05*

The ANOVA results showed that except for education all other demographic characteristics were not having a significant relationship with work-life enhancement. The non-significance of income on work-life enhancement was difficult to understand since income from work was found to enhance the quality of life. Probably the dissatisfaction with the current income could be a reason of this. The significance of education in enhancing work to life seems to be related to respondents’ field of work. Since all respondents were professionals like doctors, lawyers, scientists, engineers and academicians the significance of education in enhancing life is evident.
Table 4.12. ANOVA test - Life-work Interference and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Significant (S)</th>
<th>Non-Significant (NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>F (5, 394) = 4.11</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>F (7, 392) = 2.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>F (2, 397) = 2.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>F (6, 393) = 2.86</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 0.69</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Household Status</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 2.65</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 1.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.05

The ANOVA results have depicted that barring the characteristics of profession all other characteristics do not have a significant association with life-work interference. The nature of work involved in different professions seems to be the reason for the significant relationship between profession and life-work interference. Since the sample includes professionals like doctors and lawyers who are forced to keep erratic hours a positive relationship is seen between interference and profession.
Table 4.13. ANOVA test - Life-work Enhancement and Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F-Statistic</th>
<th>Significant (S)</th>
<th>Non-Significant (NS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>F (5, 394) = 5.29</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>F (7, 392) = 5.55</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>F (2, 397) = 2.61</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>F (6, 393) = 3.86</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 3.13</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>F (1, 398) = 3.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Household Status</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 1.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>F (3, 396) = 0.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p = 0.05

The ANOVA results show that there is significant association between the factor of life-work enhancement and profession, age and income. Significant association between profession and indicates that though the nature of work increases interference it also gives a sense of satisfaction of being involved in a certain profession. Similarly income enables an individual to possess material resources which enhances the quality of life. In the sample majority of the respondents belong to the age group of 20 to 45. Hence it is possible that majority of them are in the growth phase of family and career lifecycle resulting in life-work enhancement.
4.3. The Grand Summary

1. The measure of Work-life Balance has yielded four factors. The factors identified are Work-life Interference, Work-life Enhancement, Life-work Interference and Life-work Enhancement.

2. Development, Superior, Reward System, Colleague, Commuting, Work Load, Work Role and Work Schedule are the eight factors that have emerged as Work Antecedents.

3. Leisure Activities, Extended Family, Household Responsibility, Care Responsibility, Domestic Help and Partner/Parents are the six factors that have emerged as Life Antecedents.

4. Gender Roles, Career of Women, Women’s Choice of Career are the three factors that have emerged while measuring Gender Stereotypes.


6. The Work Antecedent factors of Development, Superior, Reward System and Colleague are more important for men while, Work Antecedent factors of Commuting, Work Load, Work Role and Work Schedule are more important for women.

7. The Life Antecedent factors of Household Responsibility, Care Responsibility and Domestic Help were found to be more important for women while Life Antecedent factor Partner/Parents proved to be more important for men.

8. The Life Antecedent factors Leisure Activities and Extended Family have no significant difference for men and women.

9. Development, Commuting, Work Load, Work Role and Work Schedule have positive relationship with Work-life Interference while, Superior and Reward System has negative relationship with Work-life Interference.

10. The Work Antecedent factor Colleague has no significant effect on Work-life Interference.
11. Development, Superior, Reward System and Colleague have positive relationship with Work-life Enhancement while, Work Load, Work Role and Work Schedule have negative relationship with Work-life Enhancement.

12. The Work Antecedent factor Commuting has no significant effect on Work-life Enhancement.

13. Extended Family, Household Responsibility and Care Responsibility have positive relationship with Life-work Interference while, Leisure Activities and Partner/Parents have negative relationship with Life-work Interference.

14. The Life Antecedent factor Domestic Help has no significant effect on Life-work Interference.

15. Leisure Activities, Domestic Help and Partner/Parents have positive relationship with Life-work Enhancement while, Household Responsibility and Care Responsibility have negative relationship with Life-work Enhancement.

16. The Life Antecedent factor Extended Family has no significant effect on Life-work Enhancement.

17. The demographic characteristics of Age, Education, Income, Children and Household Status have significant relationship with Work-life Interference while, demographic characteristics Profession, Marital Status and City have no significant relationship with Work-life Interference.

18. The demographic characteristic Education has significant relationship with Work-life Enhancement while, demographic characteristics of Profession, Age, Income, Marital Status, Children, Household Status and City have no significant relationship with Work-life Enhancement.

19. The demographic characteristic Profession has significant relationship with Life-work Interference while, demographic characteristics of Age, Education, Income, Marital Status, Children, Household Status and City have no significant relationship with Life-work Interference.

20. The demographic characteristics Profession, Age and Income have significant relationship with Life-work Enhancement while, demographic characteristics of Education, Marital Status, Children, Household Status and City have no significant relationship with Life-work Enhancement.