Theories of Work-Life balance:

The intersection of work and life research is fundamentally challenged by a lack of commonly established basic language and key constructs; no single prevailing framework or perspective is universally established (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). The academic body of knowledge regarding work-life scholarship relies on a multiplicity of theoretical frameworks (Morris and Madsen, 2007), which include spill-over, compensation, resource drain, enrichment, congruence, work-family conflict, segmentation, facilitation, integration, and ecology theories (Clark, 2000; Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Frone, 2003; Frone, Russell and Cooper, 1992; Greenhaus and Powell, 2006; Zedeck and Mosier, 1990).

**Spill-over:** Spill-over is a process whereby experiences in one role affect experiences in the other, rendering the roles more alike. Research has examined the spill-over of mood, values, skills and behaviours from one role to another (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000), although the most of this research has focused on mood spill-over. The experiences resulting from spill-over can manifest themselves as either positive or negative (Morris and Madsen, 2007). In the literature, spill-over has also been termed as generalization, isomorphism, continuation, extension, familiarity, and similarity (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Staines, 1980; Zedeck, 1992). There are two interpretations of spill-over (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000): (a) the positive association between life and work satisfaction and life and work values (Zedeck, 1992) and (b) transference in entirety of skills and behaviours between domains (Repetti, 1987) such as when fatigue from work is experienced at home or when family demands interfere with work demands. In a study of spill-over, Williams and Alliger (1994) used experience sampling methodology to examine mood-related spill-over on a daily basis, finding suggested that working parents in their sample were more likely to bring work-related emotions home than they were to transfer family-related emotions to the workplace.

**Compensation:** Compensation theory refers to the efforts intended at countering negative experiences in one domain through increased efforts for positive experiences in another domain. An example would be a dissatisfied worker focusing more on family than work, thus reallocating human resources (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000).
According to Zedeck and Mosier (1990), compensation can be viewed in two broad categories: supplemental and reactive. Supplemental compensation happens when positive experiences are insufficient at work and are therefore pursued at home. Reactive compensation occurs when negative work experiences are made up for in positive home experiences (Zedeck and Mosier). In other words, according to compensation theory, there is an opposite relationship between work and life, so workers attempt to satisfy voids from one domain with satisfactions from the other (Clark, 2000). Tenbrunsel et al., (1995) also found a compensatory relationship between work and life roles for employed. Whereas Rothbard (2001) aver that women who experienced negative affect from family were more engaged with their work, consistent with a compensation story.

**Resource drain:** Resource drain theory refers to the transfer of resources from one domain to another; because resources are limited (time, money, and attention), available resources in the original domain are reduced (Morris and Madsen, 2007). Resources can also be shifted to other domains that are not work and family related, such as community or personal pursuits (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000).

**Enrichment:** Enrichment theory refers to the degree to which experiences from instrumental sources (skills, abilities, values) or affective sources (mood, satisfaction) improves the quality of the other domain (Morris and Madsen, 2007). Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined enrichment as "the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role" (p. 73) and reported that employees perceive that their work and life roles enrich each other. Zedeck and Mosier (1990) used the term instrumental to characterize this notion, which states that good work outcomes lead to good life outcomes and vice versa.

**Congruence:** Congruence theory refers to how additional variables that are not directly related to work or family influence the balance of multiple roles. While spill-over is a direct relation between work and family, congruence attributes similarity through a third variable, like personality traits, behavioural styles, genetic forces, and socio-cultural forces (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000; Staines, 1980; Zedeck, 1992). Based on congruence theory, a third variable such as intelligence or level of education could positively effect both work and life domains.
Segmentation: Segmentation theory refers to viewing work and life as separate domains that do not influence each other (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Segmentation has been used to describe the separation of work and life, such that the two roles do not influence each other (Edwards and Rothband, 2000; Staines, 1980; Zedeck, 1992). Since the industrial revolution, work and life have been inherently separate by time, space, and function. Piotrkowski (1979) expressed this process as what occurs when people actively suppress work-related thoughts, feelings, and behaviours in the life domain, and vice versa. As this has been proven no longer to be true (Kanter, 1977) and conceivably never was, particularly for female workers, segmentation is now referred to as the active process that people use to form and maintain boundaries between work and family. The literature also suggests the usage of the terms compartmentalization, independence, separateness, disengagement and neutrality to describe this theory (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Piotrkowski (1979) averts that some people may actively suppress work-related thoughts, feelings and behaviours while at home, and vice versa.

Facilitation: Facilitation theory refers to what occurs when the participation in one domain cultivate and enhances the engagement in another domain. This portability of augmentation can comprise skills, experiences, resources, and knowledge (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Grzywacz (2002), facilitation occurs because social systems naturally utilize available means to improve situations without regard for domain limitations.

Integration: Integration theory refers to the holistic view that a healthy system of flexible and permeable boundaries can better facilitate and encourage work-life and community-life domains (Clark, 2000). Morris and Madsen (2007) acknowledged that integration theory best portrays the incorporation of additional contextual elements, such as community, into the body of knowledge in regard to work and life. Integration calls for contemporary understandings that retool traditional work-life paradigms, making all stakeholders (employers, workers, and communities) active partners with equal voices in the formation of a holistic model of work-life balance (Morris and Madsen, 2007). Googins (1997) believed that an approach to work and family that includes all parties and shared responsibility will yield better results in both domains than solutions shaped in isolation.
Ecology: Ecological systems theory refers to the suggestion that work and life are a joint function of process, person, context, and time characteristics, and symptomatic of the fact that each and multiple characteristics yield an additive effect on the work life experience (Grzywacz and Marks, 2000). Ecology theory was later developed into the person-in-environment theory with the common thread among diverse person environment variants as the recognition that individuals and groups have vibrant relationships with their social, physical, and natural environments (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006).

Inter-role conflict: Inter-role conflict theory refers to what occurs when meeting the demands in one domain makes it difficult to meet the demands in the other domain (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). In the literature, this has also been termed opposition or incompatibility theory (Edwards and Rothbard, 2000). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) aver that an individual encounters role conflict when the sent expectations or demands from one role interfere with the individual’s capacity to meet the sent expectations or demands from another role (Kahn et al., 1964; Katz and Kahn, 1966; Metron, 1957). An example of role conflict is that of an employee who is at the same time pressured to work overtime while family members urge that employee to come home. Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) described eight propositions where the constructs are in conflict in relation to time, role strain, and specific behaviour, as follow: pressures must come from both work and family; self-identification with roles is necessary; role salience moderates relationships and is positively related to conflict level; conflict is strongest when there are negatives associated with non-compliance; directionality is based on conflict source; conflict is related to career success and stage; external support is related to conflict.

Job stressors- Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Role Overload:

Most work-life research analyzes work and life stressors as antecedents of work-life conflict and emphasizes the potential stress related with combining the roles of family and work. It is widely acknowledged that work-life conflict produces a variety of outcomes which are not good for the organization and for the individual as well (Allen et al., 2000, Frone et al., 1992a, b; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Job stressors are well documented as affects work-life conflict which includes role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. One work stressor that leads to work-family conflict is
role conflict. Role conflict is the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures, such that complying with one would make compliance with the other more difficult (House and Rizzo, 1972; Pandy and Kumar, 1997). Inter-role conflict, one specific type of role conflict, arises from opposing role pressures in diverse work-related roles, such as complying with two or more demands at the same time. For example, an employee experiences work conflict when two supervisors make simultaneous requests to execute important activities or responsibilities, all of which require attention at the same time. Intra-role conflict, another type of role conflict, occurs when the role pressures related with membership in one organization are in conflict with the pressures stemming from membership in other groups (Kahn et al., 1964). Such conflict occurs when an employee who values a particular role is constrained by membership with another role to spend less time than he/she would like in that role. For instance, conflict at work may draw an employee's time devoted to family-related activities away from the family domain, resulting in elevated levels of work-life conflict (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Frone et al., 1997). Work-related conflict has been found to directly and indirectly influence work-life conflict (Fu and Schaffer, 2001; Carlson, 1999; Aryee, 1992; Frone et al., 1992a, b). Frone et al. (1997) have confirmed the positive and significant relationship between role conflict and work-life conflict. Role conflict in the form of behaviour-based work-family conflict is problematic for both genders when asked to perform multiple roles at the same time. Empirical evidence supports the positive linkage between role conflict in both work and life domains and behaviour-based work-life conflict (Carlson, 1999). In their study of women entrepreneurs in Singapore, Kim and Ling (2001) averts work role conflict and worries about financial health of the business to be positively correlated to work-life conflict. Another work stressor that leads to work-life conflict is role ambiguity. Role ambiguity implies a lack of information required to perform a particular role, or a lack of clarity, and, hence, uncertainty concerning the expectations connected with the role (Kahn et al., 1964; Carlson, 1999; Gupta and Jenkins, 1985; Lewis and Cooper, 1988). Kahn et al. (1964) described role ambiguity as one of the key contributors to the stress experienced at work. Individuals who occupy work roles that are unclear, poorly defined, and too vague in their descriptions or statements would experience more anxiety, tension, stress, and subsequently work-family conflict. Ambiguity within the work role has been found to be positively associated with work-life conflict for a group of male sailors (Jones and Butler, 1980).
Aryee (1992) concluded that role ambiguity was significantly and negatively related to work-life conflict. Carlson et al. (2000) found that work role conflict was positively related to strain-based work interference with life, while work role ambiguity was positively related to both strain - and behaviour-based work interference with life. Elloy and Smith (2003) found that dual-career Australian couples experienced more work-life conflict and higher levels of work stressors than single-career couples. **Role overload** is also a direct predictor of work-life conflict. Role overload occurs when an individual takes on too many roles at one time. High levels of overload mean that an individual has too many role demands and obligations, but is unable to perform them all effectively (Barnett and Baruch, 1985). Individuals who perceive their workload to be high and to vary on a day-to-day basis would often complaint fatigue, tension, and depression. Such mental symptoms produce emotional strain, which then leads to higher levels of work-family conflict. Research evidence indicates that role overload has a positively related to work distress. Frone et al. (1997) found that work overload was significantly and positively related to work-life conflict, but significantly and negatively related to work performance. Role overload might be a major obstacle to women's career development and success. This is because female employees and managers have many role demands or responsibilities that pressure them to work harder and confirm competence (Judiesch and Lyness, 1999; Harlan and Weiss, 1980). Researchers have found the importance of role overload for women as well as for dual-career couples (Cooke and Rousseau, 1984; Elloy and Smith, 2003). Researchers have confirmed the relationship between women's self-efficacy in work and parental roles and work-family conflict and role overload (Erdwins et al., 2001; Ozer, 1995).

Numerous studies have affirmed the effects of job stressors on work-life conflict (Parasuraman et al. 1996, Fu and Schaffer, 2001). Job or work role stressors in turn are posited to affect individual career satisfaction and well-being. Studies on stress and work-family relationships indicate that work stressors contribute to job dissatisfaction, heightened life stress and declined career satisfaction (Parasuraman et al., 1996). Judge et al. (1994) exposed that job stress and job satisfaction, two measures of executive attitudes toward their work, were negatively and reciprocally related. The affect of job stressors on employee social behaviour and performance is well documented. It has long been established that, because work stressors produce
problems that are unavoidably transmitted from work to family and vice versa; they have their profound effect on employee’s personal satisfaction, job performance, and career development (Hertz, 1986; Sekaran and Hall, 1989). As such, they are hypothesized to lead to higher level of work-family conflict and to lower level of job/career satisfaction. Employees experience career satisfaction and success when the work environment offers them the flexibility to combine work and life (Josselson, 1996) and provides career development programs and opportunity capable of satisfying their career competencies and needs:

**Work-Life Conflict:**

Work-life conflict refers to the experience of conflict between work and life domain (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). Theoretical advancements (Duxbury et al., 1992; Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Gutek et al., 1991) suggest that we consider both the direction and form of work-life conflict. Kanter (1977) points out that while work certainly affects life, also life affect work. He concluded that “family situations can define work orientation; motivation; abilities, emotional energy, and the demands people bring the workplace” (p. 56). Research suggests that the experience of work interference with family (WIF) was reported almost three times more frequently than the experience of family interference with work (FIW) conflict among both genders (Frone et al., 1991; Gutek et al., 1991). Work life conflict is a “form of inter-role conflict in which the demands of work and life roles are incompatible in some respect so that the participation in one role is more difficult because of participation in the other role” (Voydanoff, 2005: 827). Work-life conflict is experienced when demands from one role domain interfere with participation or performance of the other role (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). When one gives extra time and energy into the work role (or the family role), the family role (work role) is assumed to suffer.

Two types of work-family conflict have been identified; work-interfering-with family (WIF) and family-interfering-with-work (FIW) (Frone et al, 1992). WIF conflict occurs when work-related activities spill over or interfere with home responsibilities (e.g. bringing work home and trying to complete them at the expense of family time) and FIW conflict arises when family-role responsibilities spill over or impede work activities (e.g. having to cancel an important meeting because a child is suddenly
taken ill). Although strongly correlated with one another, they are conceptually and empirically distinct constructs (Duxbury et al, 1994; Frone et al., 1992). While the best predictors of WIF conflict are work-related variables, the antecedents of FIW conflict are mainly family-related variables (Kinnunen and Mauno, 1998).

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) classified WFC into three types, i.e. conflict based on time, conflict based on stress and conflict based on behavior. Gutek et al has found out that all types of WFC are bidirectional, including work-to-family conflict, work interference with family (WIF) and family-to-work conflict, and family interference with work (FIW). So, six dimensions are formed correspondingly (Gutek, B. A. et al, 1991). Studies have demonstrated that both types of conflict are associated with health problems such as psychological strain (Kinnunen et al., 2006; Noor, 2003), depression and anxiety (Lapierre, and Allen, 2006), or lower sleep quality (Williams et al., 2006). As shown by previous studies, pressures arising from both the work and family roles can lead to conflict between these two domains. These pressures include time spent in work or family activities, stressors within the work or family domains, and more involvement in work or family life (e.g. Adams et al., 1996; Aryee et al, 1999; Beutell and Wittig-Berman, 1999; Frone et al, 1997). A large proportion of work-family conflict research is largely based on the measurement of strain-based and/or time-based conflict. A notable exception is Stephens and Sommers’s (1996) research on time-based, strain-based and behaviour-based conflict, although their focus was solely on work interference with family/life (WFI). A more extensive exploration of the Greenhaus and Beutell conceptualization was reported by Carlson and Kacmar (2000).

**Time-based predictors**

Time-based predictors signify role-related time commitments, that is the amount of one’s time that is spent involved in work or family/life related activities. Parasuraman et al. (1996) suggest that time commitments are an important direct predictor of work-family/life conflict because time is a inadequate resource and time spent in one role-related activity inevitably decreases the time that can be devoted to another role. Work hours have been consistently linked to difficulties in balancing work and personal life (Moen and Yu, 2000; Guerts et al., 1999; Batt and Valcour, 2003; Tausig and Fenwick, 2001). In the construction industry, employees are expected to work
long hours. Research suggests that long work hours are negatively related to family participation and positively associated to divorce rate (Aldous et al., 1979). In a study by Victoria et al., (2002) report work hours to be a significant predictor of quality in the marital relationship. Boyar et al. (2003, p. 179) define family responsibility broadly as “the obligation to care for others who are either formally or informally sanctioned family members”. Boise and Neal (1996) suggest that family responsibilities, irrespective of whether these responsibilities involve caring for a child or other family dependants, enhances the time requirements placed on the family.

**Strain-based predictors**

The second type of predictor of work-family/life conflict (strain-based issues) relates to role-related distress or dissatisfaction (Frone et al., 1997). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) suggest that various role characteristics can create strain or distress that undermines an individual’s ability or willingness to fulfil the responsibilities of another role. Subjective quantitative workload refers to an individuals’ subjective insight that they have too much work to do in the time available. Major et al. (2002) averts that overload occurs when the perceived magnitude of work overwhelms an individual’s perceived ability to cope. Emotional exhaustion is conceptually understood to be the core dimension of employee burnout (Maslach et al., 1996). Emotional exhaustion reflects feelings of reduced resources and exhaustion specifically related to one’s work. As such, it may be regarded as a type of work distress. Previous research also suggests that emotional exhaustion can have a negative impact on employees’ family lives (Westman and Etzion, 1995; Westman et al., 2001). In a study of technical, professional and managerial employees, both men and women report that having children in the household lowers their sense of control over managing work and family/life (Batt and Valcour, 2003). Tausig and Fenwick (2001) report that married couples without children enjoy more satisfactory work-life balance and that the presence of children – whether in single or two-parent households, dual earner or “traditional” single earner households – is significantly connected to perceptions of work-family conflict. It is argued that non-work problems can make it complicated for people to cope with the pressures of work and their performance at work might suffer (HSE, 2001).
Behaviour-based predictors:

The third type of predictor of work-family/life conflict (behaviour-based issues) which refers to the display of specific behaviour in one domain that are incongruous with desired behaviours within the second domain, where norms and role expectations in one area of life are incompatible with those required in the other domain. At work an individual may be expected to be aggressive, ambitious, hard-driving and task-oriented. Successful job performance may be contingent upon the demonstration of these behaviours. In contrast at home being loving, supportive and accommodating may be regarded as essential to developing and fostering a happy and healthy family life. Clearly these opposing expectations may create a tension between work and family behaviours, as well as obstructing the transition from one environment to the other.

Work-life balance practices:

Work-life balance practices/initiatives at the workplace typically include flexible working options such as flexible hours, tele-work, part time, term-time, job-sharing, as well as childcare and eldercare facilities, information or financial support pertaining to the non-work sphere of life, and various onsite services. Such interventions are typically termed as family-friendly policies (FFPs) or work-life benefits and policies (WLBPs) (Osterman, 1995; Scheibl and Dex, 1998). WLBPs include flexible work arrangements such as flexibility in scheduling time of arrival and departure to and/or from work, flexibility in choosing the place of work, leave in lieu of family reasons such as parental leave, direct financial assistance for child care and information services such as finding a childcare center for a new employee etc. Wise and Bond (2003) cite four main drivers for introducing work-life policies: recruitment, enables becoming an “employer of choice”, also countering negative work practices such as longer working hours; retention “more responsive to the workforce's changing and diverse needs”; supportive working environment – improving organisational culture with resultant heightened morale and motivation among staff and equality – improving access through inclusiveness.

Work-life balance programs listed by Konrad and Mangel (2000) were: on-site day care, near-site day care, sick childcare, emergency childcare, sick days of childcare,
on-site conveniences, extended maternity leave, gradual return to work, paternity leave, adoption leave, parental leave, spouse placement, supervisory training in work-family sensitivity, flex-time, job sharing, part-year work, part-time workforce, voluntary condensed time and part-time work for professionals. This measure was similar to the measure used by Osterman (1995), but more detailed since his measure included only nine distinctive work-life initiatives.

- **Compressed work week:** A compressed work week is an arrangement where an employee works the standard number of hours in a one or two week period, but compresses those hours into lesser work days thereby working longer hours at work (Enterprise One Insights, 2006). Compressed workweeks are suitable for employees who do not need to deal with incoming work on a daily basis or there are several employees doing the same job. Organization can reduce stress; employee absenteeism and turnover thereby increase employee morale and loyalty.

- **Flex-time:** Flexible working arrangements take a number of structures. These include the flexibility in working time arrangement, the number of hours worked and with regard to place of work (Papalexandris and Kramar, 1997). These day’s organizations adopt various kinds of flex-time policies such as flexible scheduling program, job sharing, part-time work, tele-working etc in workplace. Prior researches on flex-time examined that absenteeism and turnover could be reduced and employee’s job satisfaction was enhanced when implementing such flexible programs (Narayanan and Nath, 1982; Pierce and Newstrom, 1983). For employees, flexible working arrangement can facilitate the reconciliation of work and family needs and let individuals to balance both responsibilities and thereby achieve quality of life. Besides, Grover and Crooker (1995) also reported a negative relationship between this strategy and turnover intention. Therefore, it is believed that employees are more likely to stay in the organization when they were approved flexibility work schedule. Olorunsola and Ibegbulam (2003) conducted a study among Jamaican librarians, finding show that 78 per cent of respondents agreed that flexible working hours promote or appeal to one’s autonomy. Ball (1998) argues that new ways have to be found to attract and retain, “motivate and develop” library workers in the profession and one of these is to build up “competency
in balancing working and non-work”. The concept of flexibility especially in terms of working time (flexitime) and work location (flex place) are often looked as effective ways to achieve positive spill over and are essential to achieve work-family balance (Hill et al., 2001; Galinsky and Johnson, 1998; Thornthwaite, 2004).

- **Family Leave**: Family leave policies allow employees to be away from the workplace for varying period of time in order to deal with family responsibilities (Bond and Wise, 2003).

- **Employee Assistance Programs (EAP)**: Employee assistance programs are intended to recognize the interaction between peoples domestic and working lives and to offer confidential counselling to staff to address personal or other problems, including work-related stress that may be affecting their performance (Clemmet, 1998). The nature of today EAPs is different from organizations to organizations. The typically examples of EAPs included providing assistance in the areas of personal issues, relationship issues, eldercare, childcare, parenting issues, harassment, substance abuse, job stress, balancing work and family, financial or legal and family violence. Some EAPs providers are also able to offer other services including retirement or lay-off assistance, and wellness and health promotion and fitness while others may offer advice on long term illnesses, disability issues, counselling for crisis situation. Therefore, EAPs does not just limit on counselling services and may include life skills programs and fitness programs. It can help employees in managing stress and resolving personal problems as well. Carolyn and Cooper (1994) reported that EAPs are an important to improve employee mental and physical well-being so that they have enhanced performance at work and enhanced job satisfaction and reduced turnover intention.

- **Job sharing**: Is a very widespread form of work that has many constructive aspects and is also viewed as a family-friendly practice. It is an employee driven trend and is variously used “in response to the perceived need for more family friendly policies or as a means of tackling the unemployment crisis in some economies” (Gunnigle et al., 1998). According to Stennett (1994), job sharers can be more focussed and more motivated, showing “energy and enthusiasm”. Brocklebank and Whitehouse (2003) concluded that over 90 per
percent of job sharers are women – a reflection most likely of the traditional role of females in child and home care. Job sharing is much more extensive in the public sector. Hybrids of job-sharing may characteristically involve one full-time job with all responsibilities and benefits shared; others entail split weeks, split days or week-on week-off situations.

- **Job splitting:** It is similar to job sharing except that responsibilities and tasks are generally equally divided; both staff members are responsible for their own different tasks. This can be a useful approach in that it may make use of the particular skills of each employee, with a resultant net gain for employers. It also requires less co-ordination, although overlap of sometime can be advantageous for the employees.

- **Compressed hours:** Compressed working weeks, involve the reorganisation of work time into extended, but fewer, “chunks” during a working week. This could mean working hours being compressed into 3, 4 or 4.5 days a week, or 8, 9 days out of a fortnight. Another possibility is working four 10-hour days per week as opposite to five 8-hour days. This can be achieved by starting work early and/or finishing late, building up bonus hours which may then used to take a half-day or a full day's leave from work. The benefits of this type of flexible leave are savings on travel and traffic, and opportunities to put up days for rest, family or holidays. With these schemes, workers or groups of workers may start and finish work at different pre-arranged times within agreed limits. Although there is some discretion, staggered hours should ideally form part of a set timetable that does not differ from day-to-day. The benefits of a staggered working week can be seen in less traffic congestion, more time for work life balance and improved access to childcare and other facilities.

At present, establishment of work-life balance in the workplace is usually left to individual employers, amongst whom there is large variance in awareness, interest, commitment and resources to deal with it (Hyman and Summers, 2004).

**Theories in Support of Adoption of WLB Policies by Management**

Mainly there are four theories that explain the foundation behind the adoption of work-life policies by the management of organizations. Each of these theories
identifies a distinct set of predictive conditions (Felstead et al., 2002) and have received validation through its adoption by other researchers. These theories derive their explanatory powers from the organizational theory, namely, institutional theory, resource dependence theory and strategic choice theory. The following are the theories:

- **Institutional Theory**: This approach links management’s decision to adopt WLB practices to conform to normative pressures in the society (namely, organization size, ownership, industry, unionization levels and other factors that influence).

- **Organizational Adaptation Theory**: This theory connects the responsiveness of organizations to internal environmental factors (namely, proportion of female staff, skill levels, work processes and senior management values).

- **High Commitment Theory**: This theory regards the WLB practices as strategic HRM initiatives taken up in order to generate increased employee commitment to the organization.

- **Situational Theory**: This approach explains the adoption in terms of pressures to increase profitability and productivity and to deal with problems of employee recruitment and retention (Felstead et al., 2002).

**Importance of work-life balance practices:**

Individual and organizational benefits of such provisions include reduced work-family conflict (Thomas and Ganster, 1995), increased job satisfaction (Thompson and Prottas, 2005; Kossek and Ozeki, 1998; Fredriksen-Goldsen and Scharlach, 2001), organizational commitment (Kopelman et al., 2006) and organizational citizenship behaviour (Lambert, 2000). Theoretically, WLBPs create a sense of assurance for employees that their organization/employer is supportive of employee wellbeing and non-work needs. According to perceived organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), the feeling of supportiveness results into higher positive attitudes towards the organization and promotes employee participation and initiative through a felt obligation to give extra attempt in return for additional benefits (Lambert, 2000). The results of a meta-analysis by Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, and Neuman (1999) showed flexible work
schedules to be linked with less absenteeism and greater job satisfaction. Previous research shows that favourable working environments which promote work-life balance arrangements have potential benefits for both employers and employees (Auster, 2001; Drew et al., 2003; O'Connell and Russell, 2005). If employees obtain support in the workplace enabling them to integrate and balance time and effort across the spheres of work, family, and self, they can find self-fulfilment and satisfaction in their lives which can have positive outcomes for themselves and ultimately their employers (Auster, 2001 Drew et al., 2003). Enabling flexibility in when and where work is done both reduce work-family conflict and contribute to business outcomes (Bond, Thompson, Galinsky, and Prottas, 2003). Job flexibility is gaining acceptability at many companies as a dual-agenda way both to meet global business needs and to give greater opportunities to effectively integrate the escalating demands of work and personal/family life (Rapoport, Bailyn, Fletcher, and Pruitt, 2002).

A study of 153 employees in a large New Zealand organisation examined the effectiveness of various initiatives to improve the WLB (Smith and Gardner, 2007). Sixteen initiatives were introduced, and these included paid special leave to care for dependents, telecommuting, flexitime and elder care. These authors concluded that the most used initiatives were flexitime, time off to attend non-work events, paid special leave to care and time off for study. They also found that awareness of the initiatives correlated highly with use of the initiatives. Gender was also found to be statistically significant (females were more likely to use the options). Age, tenure number of dependents and partner status were not statistically significantly related to the uptake of the initiatives. De Cieri et al., (2005) established that the most frequently used strategies to improve the WLB included part-time work, study leave, flexible starting and finishing times, working at home on an ad hoc basis and job sharing. Research by Holland and Deery (2002) examining the role of flexible strategies in the workforce authenticate employee preferences for flexibility. The De Cieri et al., study (2007) study also examined the obstacle to the use of these options and found that insufficient involvement of and communication with senior management (p. 96) was one of the most consistently cited barriers along with the ineffective implementation of the strategies and the lack of communication with staff. When examining WLB initiatives in the tourism industry, Doherty (2004) found that none of the companies observed in a large selection of WLB organisations were from
tourism. Companies that were providing some strategies focused mainly on flexible working arrangements and used these as a means of attracting and retaining staff.

**Factors that impact the level and nature of work-life balance practices adopted:**

- **Company size** (Bond et al., 2005; den Dulk, 2005; Evans, 2001; Goodstein, 1994; Ingram and Simons, 1995; Tremblay, 2004, Morgan and Milliken, 1992, Konrad and Mangel, 2000, Bond et al., 2005).
- **Industry** (Goodstein, 1994; Ingram and Simons, 1995; Tremblay, 2004; Wood et al., 2003).
- **Geographical region** (Friedman, 2001; Morgan and Milliken, 1992, Goodstein, 1994).
- **Proportion of women in executive, management, and professional positions** (Bond and Galinsky, 1998; Ingram and Simons, 1995).
- **Proportion of qualified workers or knowledge workers** (Bond and Galinsky, 1998; Evans, 2001; Trottier et al., 1997; Konrad and Mangel, 2000; Osterman, 1995, Goodstein, 1994).
- **Need to foster a high level of commitment** (Budd and Mumford, 2006; Evans, 2001; Osterman, 1995).
- **Public sector and unionization** (Dex and Scheibl, 1999; Evans, 2001; Trottier et al., 1997; Ingram and Simons, 1995; Wood et al., 2003; Woodland et al., 2003).

**Problems with WLB practices:**

- Employees are unaware of WLB practices in their organization. While in some organizations work-life flexibility options may exist on paper, very few senior managers, male or female, they can avail themselves of them, as it would convey that they are not committed to their careers (Thesing, 1998). This undoubtedly has more impact on women than men, given the greater likelihood of women’s take up of these options to enable them to combine family and work responsibilities.
- Even managers are unaware of the WLB practices in the organization.
• Even the organizations having WLB practices their managers are reluctant in offering these benefits to the employees. At present, establishment of work-life balance in the workplace is generally left to individual employers, amongst whom there is large variance in awareness, interest, commitment and resources to deal with it (Hyman and Summers, 2004). Business results may be affected either positively or negatively depending on the company’s attitude towards family issues (Hammonds, 1996; Lawlor, 1994; Tanton, 1994; Moen, 1992). An example of negatively affected results is the cost of turnover. Replacing a valued female employee can cost up to 150% of her annual salary (Lawlor, 1994).

• Even if the employees are aware of the companies WLB they feel uncomfortable for availing the benefits as they perceive that utilizing the existing WLB practices will undermine their career prospects. Wajcman (1999) found that senior female managers were reluctant to take up work-life balance options because of concerns that they may be viewed as less suitable for managerial positions.

• Change in organizational culture and perception of the management towards WLB practices need to be changed. The Off the Treadmill study (Drew et al., 2003) points a challenge at the level of the organization in transforming its culture to one in which flexibility is beneficial to all; accessible on a fair and equitable basis, in accordance with organizational limits and managed in a professional, rather than an ad hoc manner. This can only be achieved by convincing those in senior management positions, in particular men, to actively promote and adopt such practices.

So establishing the WLB policies is not enough, as policies don’t change anything if the culture is resistant. Employees who fear that working flexibly or part time will have a negative effect on their career or their bonuses will inevitably feel wary of taking advantage of WLB practices.

To stimulate culture change, policies need to be backed up with change in systems and in the attitudes and capability of people. The organization needs to examine its:

• Processes for work organization- how it divides up work and responsibilities.
- Technology- for example, whether people at all levels can work effectively from home or how delivery routes are planned.
- HR systems- how processes such as appraisal, recruitment, succession planning and access to training either support or hinder WLB objectives.

Rome wasn’t built in a day, and so your WLB won’t be either. Keep your expectations and your promises to others in check. Take one step at a time. For example commit to going for a short jog twice weekly is better than a daily two-hour marathon which is just next to impossible. Adding up the small wins will encourage you to take bigger steps later on. Don’t get discouraged and keep going. Rely on the support of those around you. Let your friends and family know your goals, and ask to be reminded about them.

**Work-life balance practices in other countries:**

**USA**

There are large numbers of flexible work practices and hybrid work arrangements or what Hannabuss more appropriately calls “atypical” or “non-standard forms of employment”. Tregaskis et al. (1998) make the point that in the USA flexible working is often called “contingency” working and that this can have negative implication in terms of employer-led perceptions. A study of more than 1,000 U.S. companies revealed that about two thirds (68%) allow employees to change starting and stopping times regularly, although only one quarter (24%) allow this change on a daily basis (Galinsky and Bond, 1998).

**UK**

There is broad agreement that flexible work is where an employee is employed for less than 30 hours each working week (Hannabuss, 1998). Alongside the European Employment Strategy of produce a more flexible and adaptable workforce, developments in the UK legislative context have formalized requests for flexible working for certain employees, potentially contributing to the further decline of full-time “standard” jobs. In 2003, the UK government introduced legislation giving working parents with children under six years (or 18 years if children are disabled) the
right to ask and employers the duty to consider requests for flexible working (DTI, 2003). This right to request was extended in April 2009 to those who care for a child under the age of 17 years (or under 18 years if disabled) and the carers of adults who are in requirement of care. In terms of flexible working options, survey data disclosed that of all types of requests made, the first and second most popular requests are for part-time work: 30 per cent of women asked for a reduction in working hours and a further 19 per cent asked for reduced hours for a restricted period of time. Men were less likely to request a reduction in working hours but were more likely to seek out flexi-time, while retaining full-time hours (Holt and Grainger, 2005). Results from the second flexible working survey reports that 73 per cent of women and 63 per cent of men had requests fully agreed by their employer (Holt and Grainger, 2005). Only 65 per cent of employees surveyed in England in 2005 were conscious of this right to request (Holt and Grainger, 2005).

**Australia**

Some international (Blau and Robins, 1998; Michalopoulos and Robins, 2002) and Australian (Doiron and Kalb, 2005) research found a negative relationship between childcare costs and female employment. According to ABS (2005), 46 per cent of children aged between zero and twelve years received some type of regular childcare. In most cases paid employment represented the major reason for the use of childcare by Australian parents (ABS, 2005). There are a range of childcare arrangements in Australia: before and after- school care; long day-care (childcare centres); family day-care (government subsidized care delivered by paid individuals); informal care (delivered by relatives, friends and neighbours); paid, private childcare (nannies), and occasional care (government subsidized care delivered at childcare centres) (ABS, 2005). Almost 33 per cent of children used informal care (e.g., care by a grandparent), relative to 19 per cent of children that used formal care (before and after school care) (ABS, 2005).

Despite the Australian Federal Government providing some financial assistance for the costs of childcare, many families continue to voice concern at the high costs of raising children and the accessibility of childcare (Doiron and Kalb, 2005; ABS, 2005). Australian workplaces have adopted a variety of leave arrangements which take into account the family demands of working parents. These include: paid
maternity leave; paid parental leave (including fathers); unpaid parental leave; and
carers leave (short-term leave to care for relatives) (De Cieri et al., 2005; Whitehouse
et al., 2007). Research suggests that most parents are accessing some form of unpaid
maternity leave (Whitehouse et al., 2007). However, there is evidence signifying that
once parents return to work after the birth of a child, they may not right of apply for
leave arrangements for childcare (De Cieri et al., 2005; Pocock, 2005; Probert et al.,
2000).

Ireland

The numbers of part-time workers in Ireland has rocketed in recent years from 15 per
cent of the total workforce in 2000 to 20 per cent – over 350,000, in 2006, 70 per cent
of whom are female (CSO, Ireland). Job sharing is a very widespread form of work
that has many constructive aspects and is also observed as a family-friendly practice.
It is an employee driven trend and is widely used “in response to the perceived need
for more family friendly policies or as a means of tackling the unemployment crisis in
some economies” (Gunnigle et al., 1998). It is widely used in Ireland and across the
education and LIS sectors.

Brocklebank and Whitehouse (2003) claim that over 90 per cent of job sharers are
women – an indication most likely of the traditional role of females in child and home
care. One of the key findings in Ireland in relation to flexible working and family
friendly/work life balance is Off the Treadmill written on behalf of the National

The research brief of the authors was to: “gather information on the types of family
friendly policies in organisations, the level of availability and uptake of family
friendly working arrangements in Irish workplaces, attitudes to family friendly
working arrangements among employers, employees and work colleagues and to
identify existing research in this area”. Other successful government initiatives
include Work Life Balance Day, held on 1 March each year, a work/life balance web
site www.worklifebalance.ie, which includes a raft of practical information, ideas and
resources as well as consultancy services, checklists, toolkits and guidelines for
employee, union, and employers.
Sweden

Equal opportunities policy in Sweden is focused towards women's and men's availability patterns for family and work. The measures adopted have encouraged women's availability for employment on the same conditions as men but have also attempted to raise men's availability for the family, mainly through increased paternal leave (Bekkengen, 2002). The Swedish welfare state has been characterized as an individual earner career model wants both women and men to provide financial support and care for children and the home (Esping-Andersen, 1990).

In practice, there are still gendered patterns, particularly in relation to the family. A high percentage of women were employed in 2005 (80 per cent) compared with 86 per cent of men. However, a much elevated percentage of women work part-time (65 per cent) as compared to men (11 per cent).

Parents with children aged eight years or younger have a legal right to reduce their working hours by 25 per cent; though take-up is far more usual amongst women than men (SCB, 2006).

However a woman’s unpaid work hours decreased between 1990 and 2005, while the time spent by men on unpaid work was constant.

Hence, the gender difference in time availability for family was reduced, not because men were spending more time on household work but because of the reason women were spending less time. During the same period, time spent on paid work decreased for men but was stable for women (SCB, 2006).

The male breadwinner model is declining in favour of the adult worker family model of full-time paid work for both women and men, and equal participation in household chores (Duncan et al., 2003).

However, even in gender-equalitarian welfare regimes such as Sweden, women still have the major responsibility for family availability (Duncan et al., 2003; Gustafson, 2006).
Measurement for work-life balance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement used</th>
<th>Number of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Kacmar and Williams, 2000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Netemeyer et al., 1996</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frone, Russel and Cooper, 1992</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connolloy, 1983</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopelman et al., 1983 and Burley 1989</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burley 1989</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutek et al., 1991</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohen and Viveros-Long 1981</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke et al., 1979</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Rice 1990</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWING (Survey work/home interaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al., 1993 and 1999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slogan work-family research electronic Network (MacDermid 2000)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelloway et al., 1992; 1999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 2.1 Measurement for work-life balance. Source: Chang et al., (2010)

**Table: 2.2 Summaries of constructs over time for qualitative and quantitative studies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Quantitative Research</th>
<th>Qualitative Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>work-family or work-life</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work-family</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work-life</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/spill over/interference (Total)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spillover</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role overload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two directional conceptualization of conflict as a frame</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct validation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator (conceptualised not tested)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator (truly tested)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studied of both antecedents and consequences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but not conceptualized as a true mediator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale development and validation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance (including those measures as satisfaction, wellbeing and functioning)</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a goal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV- work and family satisfaction, well being</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation/enrichment/positive spill over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.2 Source:** Chang et al., (2010)
Hamilton, Gordon and Whelan-Berry (2006) conducted a study to examine work-life conflict of single women with no children. The data was retrieved from financial and health care organizations. Using Quantitative analysis such as mean and descriptive statistics, ANOVA, and chi-square in order to test the independent variables and the hypotheses proposed. The results established that non-married women with no children did suffer conflict, especially work-to-life conflict. Moreover, the results indicate that benefits related to work-life normally offered by associations are often considered less crucial and utilized less often by single women with no children than by working married women. Oplakta (2006) conducted a study to examine the role of women having leadership positions and working in educational institutions in developed countries. She thoroughly observed published researches relating to gender studies in education, educational administration and comparative education in many peer-viewed and refereed journals and concluded that there are still a number of exact impediments to the development of the careers of women in educational Institutions. Among the listed impediments were low levels of girl education, strong family responsibilities, restricted career encounters, high member of men compared to women faculty, and the embracing of “asexual” leadership style by the small number of women holding administrative positions in these countries.

Lo, Stone and Ng (2003) conducted a study to examine the kind of work-life conflict. Hong Kong women of high status faced and the strategies they used to manage work life conflict. The sample included married professional women with children who were interviewed face to face or over the telephone. The results showed the inefficiency of the coping strategies practiced by the respondents. Carnicer, Sanchez, Perez and Jimenez (2004) conducted a study in a Southern European country on work-life conflict using quantitative methodology that is questionnaire. The sample was composed of 1,182 Spanish employees. Bivariate analysis was applied to test the relationships between the antecedents, followed by multivariate regression analysis to analyze the significant level of antecedents in work-life conflict. The findings recommended that the two groups of factors are antecedents of work-life conflict. Although gender was not a determinant factor of conflict, however, some differences were found between men and women’s work-family conflict. In addition, family perceptions, such as the importance of family, job mental, physical requirements, job flexibility and gender roles had a strong consequence on work-life conflict.
Educational level and Functional mobility were antecedents of work-life conflict also. Their findings revealed that social benefits and job status did not have an effect on work life conflict. Wilson (2005) explored how women acknowledge the notion that they are receiving different and disparate handling in appraisal at two British Universities. The author used In-depth interviews and randomly selected 30 women from the total female academic interrelated community at each university. The first part of the analysis involved creating a sequence of analytical tables which condensed realistic information. The second part entailed listening to each interview to look for statements with respect to equality and differences. The results confirmed that, even though women do not perceive themselves as being different, men perceive them as having uncommon and lower qualities. Women are seen as “other” when appraised against the values and norms established by men. Lo (2003) studied married women holding professional positions with experience and the causes of work-life conflict. Lo also studied the family-friendly guiding principles in Hong Kong. One-hour personal interviews were conducted with 50 “married professional women” in order to explore the way they managed work and family. The findings suggested that the conservative family environment in Hong Kong led to a more demanding way of life for nearly all the interviewed professionals married females. The results exposed an apparent indication that women needs time flexibility to develop handling work-family issues. Thanacoody, Bartram, Barker and Jacobs (2006) investigated the Western and Indian cultural situation of female academics to achieve a thorough comprehension of the reason underlying their career development. The research took place at two different universities with diverse cultures one being in Australia and the other in Mauritius. Thirty women at diverse levels of academia were interviewed. The results showed that the impediments to advancement are astonishingly comparable in both universities despite their diverse cultural background. In addition, women from both cultures confronted major obstruction to career development in their academic positions. Jones and McKenna (2002) investigated women’s work-home conflict in a multinational IT companies using quantitative and qualitative methods. At first, a questionnaire was given to all women employees. All participants were then asked to join an on-site focus group. Four focus groups were consisted of 31 female employees in total. The findings exposed that women perceived work interfering with home as their major reason of conflict as a result of their being tired after working for long hours.
Researchers have shown that WFC and FWC are distinct constructs with discriminant validity (Gutek et al., 1991; Kossek and Ozeki, 1998; Netemeyer et al., 1996). While some researchers have taken the use of two independent measures to capture work interfering with family conflict (WFC) and family interfering with work conflict (FWC) (Carlson et al., 2000; Frone at al., 1992a; Frone et al., 1996; Gutek et al., 1991; Netemeyer et al., 1996) while some research carry on to use a global measure of work-family conflict (Carlson and Perrewe, 1999; Greenhaus et al., 1987; Parasuraman and Simmers, 2001; Yang et al., 2000). By measuring WFC and FWC separately, we see how work domain variables influence WFC and how family domain variables influence FWC (Frone et al., 1996; Gutek et al., 1991; Kossek and Ozeki, 1998).

**Linking work life balance to other hr issues:**

**Social Exchange Theory:** Blau (1964, p. 91) argues that “social exchange refers to voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are likely to bring and typically do in fact bring from others”. As Blau suggests, reciprocity is the key mechanism of social exchange theory. Plentiful workplace experiences (trust, justice, support, etc.) encourage the desire for reciprocity through contributing to the durability of the social exchange dynamic. Dyne and Ang (1998), social exchange is a relationship of mutually contingent, tangible and intangible exchanges. Social exchange theory recognizes circumstances under which individuals feel obligated to reciprocate when they personally benefit from another's actions (Lambert, 2000). Gouldner (1960) asserted that, under the norm of reciprocity, the receiver of benefits becomes morally obligated to recompense the donor. According to Lambert (2000), developments in social exchange theory suggest that work-family benefits may encourage employee participation and initiative through a felt obligation to give extra effort in return for additional benefits. Stevens et al., (2006) in his survey of employer’s attitudes and a companion investigation of employees’ attitudes found that 94% of employers and 95% of employees agreed that “people work best when they can balance their work and other aspects of their lives”.

Akerlof’s (1982) gift exchange model provides one possible reason why work-life programs may create added effort on the part of workers even though benefits are not contingent on individual contribution. The gift exchange model assumes that workers
build up sentiments for the firm. He suggested that such sentiments lead people to develop utility for giving gifts to the firm. One gift that workers can give to the firm is exerting discretionary effort to achieve beyond the minimum standards. Because giving gift is guided by the norm of reciprocity, the firm must respond with a gift of its own or else workers will restrain their efforts.

**Employer:**

**Improve productivity:** If a person cannot enjoy time away from their job because they are too tired or stressed, they will be less productive and less motivated at work. Previous research has found that WLB practices are positively related to both organizational and individual outcomes such as an organization’s financial performance, labour productivity (Perry-Smith and Blum, 2000; Konard and Mangel, 2000). Thompson et al., (1999) “by not fostering a more balanced work-family life for employees, organizations are contributing to tensions in the employees personal lives and the repercussions of which affect employee’s ability to concentrate and be productive and creative on the job”. **Attract new talent:** Studies have shown that the best way for the companies to attract and retain quality employees is to adopt WLB practices (Grover and Crooker, 1995; Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Parker and Allen, 2001; Greenhaus and Parasuraman; 1997, 1999; Hall and Parker, 1993; Lobel and Kossek, 1996; Lobel, 1999). Grover and Crooker (1995) found that people are more attached to organizations that offer work-family policies regardless of the extent to which individual employees benefit themselves. CollegeGrad.com suggests that “young people entering the workforce seek out companies that are willing to invest in their future. 70% of the job seekers said that they would rather work for smaller growth companies that offer competitive benefits and emphasize a balance between work activities and their personal lives. Large international companies were favoured by only 30% of would-be workers” (OfficePRO June/July 2006). **Retain valued employees:** The research by Karatepe and Uludag (2008) also tests, among others, the relationship between exhaustion and employees’ intention to leave the organisation. Their study found that frontline employees who had difficulty in spending time with their family or in keeping social commitments were likely to be emotionally exhausted. This, in turn, impacted negatively on their job satisfaction and ultimately influenced their intention to leave the organisation. Karatepe and Uludag discuss the
relationship between these personal employee dimensions and WLB and the implications of these findings are discussed in the next section. High job turnover is associated with low affective organisational commitment (Meyer et al., 2002), which reflects the degree to which employees feel part of the organisation and desire to exert effort for the organisation (Meyer and Allen, 1991). The benefits to employers are said to include increased performance (Hall and Parker, 1993; Mason, 1991), reduced turnover (Collins and Magid, 1989) and greater employee commitment (Tenbrunsel et al., 1995; Gordon and Whelan, 1998). WLB has emerged as a strategic issue for human resource management (HRM) and a key element of an organization's employee retention strategies (Cappelli, 2000; Lewis and Cooper, 1995; Nord et al., 2002). It has been argued that organizations need to be aware of the changing needs of employees and provide flexible WLB strategies in order to retain their employees (Bruck et al., 2002; Lambert, 2000; Macran et al., 1996). Improves employee loyalty: (Moore, 2007; Stopper et al., 2003; Breauh and Frye, 2007; Grover and Crooker, 1995; Lambert, 2000) avers that improving a company’s WLB practices not only leads to greater productivity but greater loyalty and job satisfaction among employees. Hobson et al., (2001, 41), for instance, say that “critical support provided by an employer can be expected to result in heightened efforts on the part of an employee to reciprocate. This could be in the form of increased motivation, productivity, attendance, commitment, loyalty and so forth”. Increases employee job satisfaction: Paille (2009) found in his recent meta-analysis that an increase in employee commitment raises organizational efficiency (for example, as revealed in a decreased tendency towards absenteeism and turnover, and an increase in organizational citizenship). Studies reveal that there is consistent relationship between access to or use of work-life policies and job satisfaction. Moreover, job satisfaction has been associated with reduced job stress, lower emotional exhaustion, fewer health related symptoms, and increased productivity. Individual and organizational benefits of such provisions include reduced work-family conflict (Thomas and Ganster, 1995), increased job satisfaction (Thompson and Prottas, 2006; Kossek and Ozeki, 1999), organizational commitment (Kopelman et al., 2006) and organizational citizenship behaviour (Lambert, 2000). Based upon their meta-analysis of data from 19 samples, Kossek and Ozeki (1999) estimated the correlation between work-family conflict and job satisfaction to be -.27. Increases commitment to the organization: Previous research found that WLB practices are positively related to employee commitment
and attachment (Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Grover and Crooker, 1995) and organizational citizenship behaviours (Lambert, 2000). They continue in the same (perhaps overly) optimistic vein: At a time when many corporate leaders lament the demise of employee commitment, loyalty and motivation, the value of effective work/life balance programmes cannot be underestimated. Such efforts clearly communicate that employees are valued as human beings. The resulting psychological bond has dramatic implications for corporate success (Hobson et al., 2001, 43). Literature has shown positive benefits of such interventions on job outcomes such as individual's degree of job satisfaction, level of commitment and engagement in organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB) (Kossek and Ozeki, 1998; Kopelman et al., 2006; Lambert, 2000; Thompson et al., 1999; Allen, 2001; Gordon et al., 2007; Thomas and Ganster, 1995; Hackman and Oldham, 1976; Meyer and Allen, 1997). Lower work-life conflict increases employee commitment to the organization (Aryee et al., 2005; Casper et al., 2002; Chang, 2008; Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Smith and Gardner, 2007). **Reduces absenteeism:** Donovan (2009) founded a fascinating change in employee’s absenteeism since the employers introduced work-life balance policies. In a survey conducted in 2000, she found that 39% of respondents revealed that their personal problems were the major reason of their being absent from work. After the implementation of work-life balance practices in their organization, the percentage of employee absenteeism has dropped each year and now it is just 18% employees who say that they have to stay away from work because of their family obligations. Work-family conflict is positively related to work absenteeism (Thomas and Ganster, 1995) and to turnover intentions (Netemeyer et al., 1996). Several researches report that work-life balance friendly firm that offers respective initiatives and epitomizes a supportive culture notices reduced absenteeism among employees (Boyar et al., 2003; Dex and Scheibl, 1999; Galinsky and Stein, 1990; Halpern, 2005). Work-life programs generate performance benefits for firms by enhancing recruitment and reducing absenteeism and turnover (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1997, 1999; Hall and Parker, 1993; Lobel and Kossek, 1996; Lobel, 1999). **Recruit and retain the best talent:** Organizations can enhance their ability to recruit and retain a top-quality workforce if they provide employee with flexibility and resources to help them combine work and family more easily (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1999; Lobel, 1999; Lobel and Kossek, 1996; Hall and Parker, 1993). **Reduces turnover intention:** Comparing the effects of both WFI and FWI on turnover intentions, Boyar et al.,
(2003) found that while both forms of conflict positively predicted turnover intentions, WFI produces slightly stronger relationship. Similarly, (MacEwen and Barling, 1994; Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Collins and Magid, 1989; Dagger and Sweeney, 2006; Mulvaney et al., 2006; Doherty, 2004; Maxwell, 2005; Griffeth et al., 2000; Steel, 2002; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Eby et al., 2005; Greenhaus and Powell, 2003; Shankar and Bhatnagar, 2007; Simon et al., 2004; Hughes and Bozionelos, 2005) reported that both directions of work-family conflict predicted withdrawal behaviours from both the work and family domains. Dupre and Day (2007) found that supportive management of personnel i.e. supervisory support, organizational support and work-life balance was indirectly related to health and to turnover intentions through the mediating influence of job satisfaction. **Promotes ethical behaviour among employees and also organizational citizenship behaviour improves:**

According to Deloitte and Touche, there is a relationship between work-life balance and ethical conduct on the job. “People who invest all of their time and energy into their work may unintentionally become dependent on their jobs for everything, including their sense of personal worth,” says Sharon L. Allen, Deloitte’s chairman of the board. “If they believe that an ethical dilemma will affect their professional success, it’s harder [for them] to make a good choice.” The company’s 2007 ethics and workplace survey reported that 91 percent of employed adults agree that workers are more likely to behave ethically at work when they have a good work-life balance (www.deloitte.com/us). Authors like Breaugh and Frye, 2007; Grover and Crooker, 1995; Lambert, 2000; Gordon et al., 2007; Kopelman et al., 2006; Wang and Verma, 2009 averts that work-life balance improves the organizational citizenship behaviour.

**Better organizational performance:** Organization performance can be seen as a function of several factors like reduced employee absenteeism, increased employee motivation and performance, improved organizational reputation, improved ethical behaviour among employees, and so on. Beauregard and Henry (2009) presents a comprehensive model of the mechanisms that link work-life integration and organizational performance arguing that reduced work-life conflict improves productivity which in turn saves costs. Similarly, researches done by Konrad and Mangel, 2000; Cappelli, 2000; Perry-Smith and Blum, 2000; Hall and Parker, 1993; Mason, 1991 found that balance in work and life domain improves the organizational performance. **Improved recruiting:** Work life balance issues seem to become a more and more prominent factor in employer choice, particularly in the face of the “war for

**Employee:**

**Life satisfaction:** Research suggests that a consequence of work-family conflict is reduction in both domain-specific and general life satisfaction. Numerous studies with a wide variety of occupational samples have demonstrated pathways between inter-role conflict and satisfaction across domains (Allen et al., 2000; Carlson and Kacmar, 2000; Kim and Ling, 2001). Judge and Ilies’s (2004) finding that mood at work is positively related to mood at home—a phenomenon referred to as “mood spillover” (Judge and Ilies, 2004; Williams and Alliger 1994)—demonstrates mood-based work-family spillover. Work life balance is related to higher life, marital and family satisfaction (Mauno and Kinnunen, 1999). Aryee et al. (1999) averts that lower and middle managers perceived conflict between life roles as related to lower life and family satisfaction. A meta-analysis showed a consistent negative relationship between work-family conflict and satisfaction with the job and with life (Kossek and Ozeki, 1998). **Improves relations:** Employees enjoy better relation with spouse, kids, friends, etc. **Happy employee:** Adams et al. (1996) found work-family conflict was negatively related to both job satisfaction and life satisfaction. In contrast, in their meta-analysis study based on 32 separate sample groups, Kossek and Ozeki (1998) reported negative relationships between job-life satisfaction and various forms or measures of work-family conflict. In particular, work stressors affect physical and psychological health (Perrewe et al., 1999; Grzywacz et al., 2000), produce strain symptoms such as anxiety, frustration, tension, and depression (Jones and McKenna, 2002; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985), and exert considerable influence on family life in the form of unpleasant moods. **Reduces tension:** Employees are said to benefit through greater job satisfaction (Judge et al., 1994; Ezra and Deckman, 1996; Saltzstein et al., 2001), reduced stress (Mason, 1993; Hand and Zawacki, 1994) and improved morale (Martinez, 1993; McCampbell, 1996). WLBPs create a sense of
assurance for employees that their organization/employer is supportive of employee wellbeing and non-work related needs. According to perceived organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986) and social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), the feeling of supportiveness results into higher positive attitudes towards the organization and promotes employee participation and initiative through a felt obligation to give extra effort in return for additional benefits (Lambert, 2000). We believe that employees in a collectivist culture like India are likely to expect being taken care of by their organizations as a return for their loyalty and hence, when provided with such supports may feel obliged towards their organizations. **Psychological well-being:** Work-life balance is associated with decreased psychological distress (Major et al., 2002; Stephens et al., 2001). Experiences of both types of work-family conflict produces increased depression levels (Allen et al., 2000) and this association is similar for both men and women (Frone et al., 1996). Frone et al., (1992a) reports that work-family conflict and family-work conflict leads to depression among employees. **Physical health:** Studies have showed that higher levels of WFC and FWC experiences relate to decreased levels of self-reported overall physical health as well as more physical and somatic health complaints on specific symptom checklists (Allen et al., 2000; Frone et al., 1996; Kinnunen and Mauno, 1998). Experiences of conflict also relate to self-reported nervous tension and fatigue as well as more self-reported sickness absence (Anderson et al., 2002; Donders, 2005; Frone et al., 1996). Moreover, in a cross-sectional study, Allen and Armstrong (2006) found that the links between WFC and FWC experiences on the one hand and self-reports of overall health and health disorders on the other were at least partially mediated by individuals’ physical activity levels, health food consumption or both.

The strain imposed by work-family conflict has also been linked to coronary heart disease (Haynes et al., 1984), decreased appetite and energy levels, increased fatigue, nervous tension and anxiety (Allen et al., 2000). Successful work-life integration is related to reduce physical and psychological complaints such as illness, burnout (Bianchi et al., 2005, Peeters et al., 2005). Jansen et al., (2003) and Demerouti et al., (2007) reported that work-family conflict was related to fatigue. Allen et al., (2000) suggested that there are three groups of outcomes of work-life balance: work-related outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intentions, absenteeism, performance and success), non-work related outcomes (e.g. marital, family, leisure
and life satisfaction, family performance) and stress-related outcomes (e.g. psychological strain, physical health, depression, burnout, substance abuse and work and family stress). Schieman (2003) averts that home-to-work conflict is associated positively with anxiety and depression. Prior research has amply demonstrated the stressfulness of work-family conflict and its negative effects on the psychological health and well-being of employed men and women (Bedeian et al., 1988; Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1986; Parasuraman et al., 1992; Voydanoff, 1988). Greater job satisfaction: Hyman et al., (2003) observed that employees who have access to family friendly arrangements often report greater job satisfaction. Effects of Work-Life conflict on marital satisfaction: Research studies conducted within a diversity of population, including dual-career couples, dual earner husbands and wives, single career husbands and their wives, and single earner fathers have provided strong support for the existence of a negative relationship between work-family conflict and marital well-being (Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Allen et al., 2000; Eby, 2005; Oudge et al., 2006; Barling, 1986; Bartolome and Evans, 1980; Macewen and Barlin, 1988; Small and Riley, 1990; Suchet and Barling, 1986).

Examples of outcomes associated with negative work-to-family spillover from the peer-reviewed academic literature include withdrawal from family interaction (Paden and Buehler, 1995), increased conflict in marriage (Bolger, et al., 1989; Crouter, et al., 1989), less knowledge of children's experiences (Bumpus, et., 1999; Crouter, et., 1999), less involvement in housework (Aldous et al., 1998; Crouter et al., 1989). The spillover of work into family showed that both men and women did not have enough time to spend with their families and moreover work pressure affected the quality of their family life (Pocock and Clarke, 2005; Greenhaus, 2003; Wittig-Berman, 1999).

Work-Life Imbalance increases health issues: Several researchers have reported that work-life imbalance leads to health issues (Grandey and Croteauzanzano, 1999; Polanyi and Tompa, 2004; Frone et al., 1997; Karasek et al., 1987; Kinnunen et al., 2006; Noor, 2003; Jansen et al., 2003; Demerouti, 2007; Lange, 2003; Sonnentag and Frese, 2003; Cassell, 1976; Hyman et al., 2003). Frone et al., (1996) reports that work-family conflict and family-work conflict leads to heavy alcohol usage.
Why Work-Life Imbalance/Areas being affected by work-life imbalance:

There has been so much and research on work-life imbalance during these past two decades because of the various being affected due to work-life imbalance. The following are the areas being affected or impacted by work-life imbalance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>Bacharach et al., 1991; Burke, 1988; Geurts et al., 1999; Allen et al., 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General strain and Stress</td>
<td>Lange, 2003; Sonnentag and Frese, 2003; Major et al., 2002; Gallinsky, 2005; Parasuraman and Simmers, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety and depression</td>
<td>Schieman et al., 2003; Eby et al., 2002; Lapierre and Allen, 2006; Kinnunen et al., 2003; Frone, 2000; Grzywacz and Bass, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ailments and lower energy level</td>
<td>Kinnunen et al., 2006; Noor, 2003; Jansen et al., 2003; Demerouti, 2007; Lange, 2003; Sonnentag and Frese, 2003; Hyman et al., 2003; Googins, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty food consumption</td>
<td>Allen and Armstrong, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destructive parenting and poor family life</td>
<td>Stewart and Barling, 1996; Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Allen et al., 2000; Eby, 2005; Oudge et al., 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>Eby et al., 2002; Frone et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Rice et al., 1992; Allen et al., 2000; Eby et al., 2002,2005; Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Hill, 2005;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Eby et al., 2002; Adams et al., 1996; Burke and McKeen, 1988; Rice et al., 1992; Sekaran, 1985; Bamundo and Kopelman, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee engagement</strong></td>
<td>Lockwood, 2006; Martel, 2003; Shankar and Bhatnagar, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality service</strong></td>
<td>Hogarth et al., 2000; Lach, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational citizenship behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Breaugh and Frye, 2004; Grover and Crooker, 1995; Lambert, 2000; Gordon et al., 2007; Kopelman et al., 2006; Wang and Verma, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Leonard, 1998; Tenbrunsel et al., 1995; Gordon and Whelan, 1998; Wiley, 1987; Adams et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loyalty</strong></td>
<td>Breaugh and Frye, 2007; Grover and Crooker, 1995; Lambert, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Greenhaus and Parasuraman; 1997, 1999; Hall and Parker, 1993; Lobel and Kossek, 1996; Lobel, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Perry-Smith and Blum, 2000; Konrad and Mangel, 2000; Cappelli, 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Literature:

**Employee turnover**

Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Dagger and Sweeney, 2006; Mulvaney et al., 2006; Doherty, 2004; Maxwell, 2005; Griffeth et al., 2000; Steel, 2002; Tett and Meyer, 1993; Eby et al., 2005; Greenhaus and Powell, 2003; Shankar and Bhatnagar, 2007; Simon et al., 2004; Hughes and Bozionelos, 2007

**Table: 2.3 Impact of work-life imbalance**

**Review of Literature on the Antecedents of Work-Life Imbalance and the Strategies for Improving Work-Life Balance:**

**Antecedents:**

**Job demands**

Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Rijswijk et al., 2004; Hill et al., 2004; Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Burke and Greenglass, 1999; Voydanoff, 1988; Burke, 2002; Higgins et al., 2000; Higgins and Duxbury, 1992; Burke and Greenglass, 2001; Simon et al., 2004; Guest, 2002;

**Work load**

Kubzansky and Kawachi, 2000; Major et al., 2002; Woodward, 2007;

**Work intensification**

Burchell et al., 2002; Pocock et al., 2001; Prober et al., 2000; Watson et al., 2003;

**Organizational rewards**

Major et al., 2002;

**Home demands**

Rijswijk et al., 2004; Abbott et al., 1998; Borrill and Kidd, 1994; Major et al., 2002; Guest, 2002;

**Childcare responsibility**

Dalton 1993; Benin and Nienstedt, 1985; Major et al., 2002; Jones and McKenna, 2002;
Long hours

Drew and Murtagh, 2005; Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Brett and Stroh, 2003; Grzywacz and Marks, 2000; Hooff et al., 2006; Burke, 2002; Higgins et al., 2000; Higgins and Duxbury, 1992; Saltzstein et al., 2001; Karasek et al., 1987; Rutherford, 2001; Greenberg and Grunberg, 1995; Major et al., 2002; Evenson, 1997; Hochschild, 1997; Hubbard, 1997; Shapiro, 1997; Jones and McKenna, 2002;

Work time control

Aryee et al., 1992; Fox and Dwyer, 1999; Frone et al., 1997; Greenhaus et al., 1987; Gutek et al., 1991; Izraeli, 1993; O’Driscoll et al., 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1996; Wallace, 1997, 1999; Geurts et al., 2009;

Job involvement

Major et al., 2002; Adams et al., 1996; Beutell and Wittig-Berman, 2008; Greenhaus, Parasuraman et al., 1989; Wley, 1987; Frone et al., 1992; Beutell and O’Hare, 1987;

Job-related travel

Hill et al., 2004;

Noxious environment

Schieman et al., 2003;

Routinized job

Schieman et al., 2003;

Autonomous jobs

Schieman et al., 2003;

Career stage

Luk, 2002; Whitehouse et al., 2007; Haden et al., 2008; Guest, 2002; Drew and Murtagh, 2005;

Work culture

Hyman et al., 2002; Divya et al., 2010; Guest, 2002; Bragger et al., 2005; Thompson et al., 1999; Thompson and Prottas, 2005; Voyeranoff, 2005; Major and Cleveland, 2007; Major et al., 2008;

Irregular work schedule

Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Burke and Greenglass, 2001; Simon et al., 2004; Karasek et al., 1987;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory support</td>
<td>Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Anderson et al., 2002; Burke and Greenglass, 1999; Duxbury and Higgins, 1994; Thomas and Ganster, 1995; Eby et al., 2002; Glynn et al., 2002; Allen, 2001; Goff et al., 1990; Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Moen and Yu, 2000; Thompson and Prottas, 2005; Major et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Liff and Ward, 2001;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Carnicer et al., 2004;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived financial needs</td>
<td>Major et al., 2002;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Drew and Murtagh, 2005; Poelmans et al., 2003; Wajcman, 1999;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>Ragins, 1989; Ganster and Schaubroeck, 1991; Geurts et al., 2009;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Beehr and McGrath, 1992; Caplan et al., 1975; McIntosh, 1991; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986; Kahn and Byosiere, 1991; LaRocco et al., 1980; Allen, 2001; Goff et al., 1990; Bailey and Kurland, 2002; Gajendran and Harrison, 2007; Glass and Finley, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Rijswijk et al., 2004; Brück and Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Mitchelson, 2009;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>Noor, 2002; Noor, 2006; Andreassi and Thompson, 2009;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholism</td>
<td>Aziz and Cunningham, 2008; Aziz and Zickar, 2006; Bone- bright et al., 2000; Zhang and Liu, 2011;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Rubab et al., 2008; Agarwal and Ferratt, 2000;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age  
Martins et al., 2002; Haden et al., 2008; Guest, 2002;

Gender  
Martins et al., 2002; Chapman, 2004; Haden et al., 2008; Guest, 2002; Wilson, 2005; Parasuraman and Simmers, 2001; Felstead et al., 2002; White et al., 2003;

Marital status  
Bando, 2002; Becker, 1981; Tsut suit, 2005; Jones and McKenna, 2002; Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Fu and Shaffer, 2001; Rotondo et al., 2003;

Professionals  
Drew and Murtagh, 2005; Poelmans et al., 2003; Wajcman, 1999;

Dual working couple  
Bharat, 2003; Rajadhyaksh and Bhatnagar, 2000; Komarraju, 1997; Sekaran, 1992;

Strategies:

Part-time work  
Rijswijk et al., 2004; Fast and Frederick, 1996; Higgins et al., 2000; Lero and Johnson, 1994; Voydanoff’s, 2002; Barnett, 1998; Hill et al., 2004

Work time control  
Keeton et al., 2007; Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Jansen et al., 2004; Roberts, 2007; Doherty, 2004

Flex-time  
Hill et al., 2004; Hill et al., 2001; Peterson, 1997; Frone and Yardley, 1994; Nelson and Hitt, 1992; Thomas and Ganster, 1995; Rau and Hyland, 2002, Lockwood, 2003; Bourhis and Mekkaoui, 2010; Hammer et al., 1997; Bicket et al., 2005; Galinsky and Johnson, 1998; Thornthwaite, 2004; Tausig and Fenwick, 2001; Ponzellini, 2006; Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; White et al., 2003; Smith and Gardner, 2007; Doherty, 2004; Deery and Jago, 2009; Bilal et al., 2010;

Flex-place  
Hill et al., 2001; Galinsky and Johnson, 1998; Thornthwaite, 2004;
Literature Review

Work from home  Allen and Wolkowitz, 1987; Felstead et al., 2002;

Personal leaves  Bourhis and Mekkaoui, 2010; De Cieri et al., 2005; Smith and Gardner, 2007; Ponzellini, 2006;

Family leaves  Bilal et al., 2010;

Job sharing  Ponzellini, 2006; De Cieri et al., 2005; Smith and Gardner, 2007; Doherty, 2004; Mulvaney et al., 2006; Deery and Jago, 2009;

Gym facility  Deery and Jago, 2009;

Childcare benefits  Wang and Walumbwa, 2007; Smith and Gardner, 2007; Ponzellini, 2006; Mulvaney et al., 2006; Deery and Jago, 2009;

Transformational leadership  Wang and Walumbwa, 2007;

Counselling  Erwin et al., 1994;

Sabbaticals  Mulvaney et al., 2006;

Organizational policies  Manning et al., 1996; Lobel, 1999;

Organization support programs  Frone and Yardley, 1994; Lo et al., 2003; Bilal et al., 2010;

Moving to position  Felmlee, 1995; Greenhaus et al., 1997;

that gives less

Work-family stress

Leaving workforce  Klerman and Leibowitz, 1999; Oppenheim-Mason and Duberstein, 1992;

Telecommuting  Raghuram and Wiesenfeld (2004);
Chapter 2


Attitudinal Impact: Olsen and Near, 1994; Hagedorn, 1994; Olsen et al., 1995; Smith et al., 1995; Lease, 1999;

Behavioural: Smart, 1990; Blackburn and Bentley, 1993; Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995; Hagedorn, 1996; Barnes et al., 1998; Perry et al., 2000; Johnsrud and Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004;

Outcomes

This table 2.4 is the extension of Deery (2009) table of antecedents, consequences and sources of work-life balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Codable Studies</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender of sample</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female only</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male only</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly female</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly male</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender balanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Characteristics</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed family types</td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents (targeted specifically)</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnered, with or without children</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Same-sex parents</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted occupations</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High skilled professional, technical or mechanical</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower skilled service/clerical workers</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual workers</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High skilled + low skilled service/clerical workers</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manual + high skilled + low skilled workers</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industries</strong></td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government, administration, defence</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and community</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance and insurance</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manufacturing</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property and business</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail trade</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal and other services</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation, cafes, restaurants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and recreational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling strategy** 240

**Probability**

| Population                        | 37 |
| Organisation/industry sample      | 104 |

**Non-probability**

| Contact list or student group     | 59 |
| Sowball                           | 12 |
| Purposeful/theoretical            | 25 |
| Convenience                       | 4 |
| Self-selection                    | 8 |

Table: 2.5 Summaries of samples in WLB. Source: Chang et al., (2010)
Models of Work-Life Imbalance:

Ahmad, A. (1996) tested this model proposed by Kopelman et al. (1983). The result concludes that work-family conflict lead to lower job satisfaction as well as family satisfaction and consequently affects life satisfaction. Work-family conflict is an important concern for an individual and the organizations alike as it has negative consequences on job satisfaction as well as family satisfaction and hence leads to reduced life satisfaction.

Figure: 2.1 Source: Ahmad, A. (1996)
Frone et al. (1997) found that predictors of work-family conflict domain-specific. Variables in the work environment (work overload and work distress) predicted WIF, while variables in the family domain (family distress and parental overload) predicted FIW. They also found that the two directions of work-family conflict exhibited domain-specific outcomes. FIW was negatively related to work performance, while WIF was negatively related to family performance. These results provided evidence that when employee’s obligations in one role interfere with the enactment of a second role performance in the second role suffers.
Ngah et al., (2009) tested a mediation model consisting of job satisfaction as the dependent variable, locus of control as the independent variable and work-family conflict as the mediator.

Results revealed that locus of control was related to work-family conflict and job satisfaction and work-family conflict was related to job satisfaction.

Results also indicated that work-family conflict partially mediates the relationship between locus of control and job satisfaction.
Deery (2008) has developed a framework to develop strategies for reduced employee turnover, with a focus on the role that balancing work and family plays in these strategies. It is a more holistic method of examining the causes or low employee retention as well as suggesting ways to improve job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is suggested that the organization can undertake a strategic approach to ameliorate employee turnover by firstly addressing the organizational and industry attributes. More equitable and flexible roistering of staff designed to alleviate the number of unsocial hours worked per employee is a strategy with the control of the organization. Provision of mentoring and a “budding” system of the on-the-job training would assist in the professional development of staff. Management need to be aware of the signs of employee stress and have the capacity to provide counselling and stress management activities such as time out and relaxation methods. Also
organizations need to monitor levels of stress and work-life imbalance of the employees through surveys.

Figure: 2.5 Source: Noor (2003)

Noor (2003) has developed the model, it shows that demographic, personality, and work and family-related variables influence well-being, either directly or indirectly via work-family conflict. The model is an extension of the model proposed by Frone et al., (1992) by incorporating two additional sets of variables, demographic and personality. This model gives a better representation of the complex relationships between the many variables that may exist in women’s work and family lives. Work related variables explained the most variance in the prediction of work-interfering
with family conflict and job satisfaction and personality variables explained the most variance in the prediction of family-interfering with work conflict.

**Figure: 2.6 Source: Berg, Kalleberg and Appelbaum (2003)**

Berg, Kalleberg and Appelbaum (2003) developed a framework on the ability of employees to balance their work and family lives depends on the characteristics of their jobs and workplaces, as well as on their family situations. Using data from a survey of workers across three manufacturing industries, they showed that a high-commitment environment- characterized by high-performance work practices, intrinsically rewarding jobs, and understanding supervisors- positively influences employees perceptions that the company is helping them achieve the work-life balance. They found that high-performance work practices- the opportunity to participate in decisions, informal training, pay for performance and good promotion opportunities- all have a positive effect on work-life balance. Job demands such as long weekly hours, involuntary overtime and conflict with co-workers reduces workers ability to balance work and family responsibilities. More participatory work systems have made workers more committed to their organizations and that organizational commitment mediates the effect of more participatory work systems on
work-family balance. The results also indicate that greater commitment to the organization increases workers ability to balance work and family responsibilities.

Figure: 2.7 Source: Ballout (2008)

Ballout (2008) proposed framework suggests that individual-specific variables will be more likely to predict family-to-work conflict and perceived career success, while work-specific variables will be more likely to predict work-to-family conflict and perceived career success. It also suggests that such domain-specific variables influence both work-family conflict and career-success.
Hughes and Parkes (2007) focused on mediating and moderating processes underlying the relationship between work hours and well being. Hierarchical regression analyses showed that, after controlling for demographic variables, neuroticism, and job demands, WIF mediated the effect of work hours on family satisfaction, although no evidence of mediation was found for the psychological distress outcome measure. Work-time control moderated the relationship between work hours and WIF; higher control buffered the effect of longer hours on WIF. Thus, the provision by employers of some flexibility and control over work hours may help to reduce the potential negative impact of long work hours on employees.

**Variables of Work**
- Work character
- Work stress
- Family friendly programs
- Highly-committed work

**Variables of Family**
- Family demand and stress
- Childcare responsibility
- Social support to family
- Connubial influence

**Variables of Individual**
- Gender
- Income
- Employment status
- Education level

**Variables of Individual (personality traits)**
- Self-efficacy
- Big five
- Workaholism

**Figure: 2.8 Source: Hughes and Parkes (2007)**
Figure: 2.9 Source: Zhang and Liu (2011)

Source: Zhang and Liu (2011) proposed this model on antecedents of WFC from aspects of individual, work and family. Findings and implications include the effects of individual factors like demographic and personality variables, the influences of work variables like work stress, family friendly programs and impacts of family variables like family demands and spousal interactions.

![Diagram of WFC model](image_url)

Figure: 2.10 Source: Luo Lu et al., (2010)

Luo Lu et al., (2010) explored the relation between work and family demands and resources, work-to-family conflict (WFC) and work and family outcomes in a cross cultural comparative context in Taiwanese and British employees. Data was collected from 264 Taiwanese employees and 137 British employees. Results show that for both Taiwanese and British employees work and family demands were positively related to WFC, whereas work resources, work and family demands were positively
related to WFC. Also WFC was negatively related to family satisfaction. They also found nation moderated relationships between work resources and WFC, WFC and work and family satisfaction. More specifically work resources had a stronger protective effect for Taiwanese than British in reducing WFC, whereas WFC had a stronger detrimental effect on role satisfaction for British than Taiwanese. They recommended that both culture-general and culture-specific effects should be taken into consideration in designing future WFC research and family-friendly practices.

**Figure: 2.11 Source: Boyar et al., (2003)**

Boyar et al., (2003) tested the full measurement and structural model of work-family conflict (WFC) and family-work conflict (FWC). They studied the antecedents and turnover intention of work-family conflict and family-work conflict. The results show that work stressors such as role conflict and role overload directly lead to work-family conflict and work stressors also indirectly lead to increased work-family conflict and
averts that work-family conflict and family-work conflict has negative impact on turnover intentions of the employees.

Figure: 2.12 Source: Parasuraman and Simmers (2001)

Parasuraman and Simmer studied the impact of work and family role characteristics on work-family conflict and indicators of psychological well being among self-employed and organizationally employed women and men. Results show that employment type and gender have independent main effects on several of the variables. Self-employed person enjoy greater autonomy and schedule flexibility at work and report higher level of job involvement and job satisfaction than those employed in organizations. They also experience higher levels of work-family conflict and lower levels of family-work satisfaction than organizational employees, trade-offs exist between the costs and benefits of self-employment and that business ownership is not a panacea for balancing work and family role responsibilities.
Determinants of Work-Life Imbalance:

**Demographic variables:**

**Gender:** There exist a mixed literature on gender and work-life balance. Studies on gender confirm that inequalities still persist (Watanabe et al., 1997; Blau et al., 2006; Hardy and Adnett, 2002; Felstead et al., 2002, p. 57). Although women’s participation in the workforce is widely accepted, women still continue to carry the major burden of family or “caring” responsibilities (Chapman, 2004; Whitehouse et al., 2007). The issue of gender lies at the heart of work-life imbalance. Evidence that suggests that there are differences between male and female employees in the factors that contribute to their experience of work-life imbalance (Whitehouse and Brocklebank, 2003). According to the Expansionist Theory (Barnett and Hyde, 2001), gender-roles are expanding: women are more active in professional work life, whereas men are more active in family life. As the consequence of this trend, maintaining a balance between work and family responsibilities has become a challenge for working people. Although both men and women may experience work-family conflict, women report more conflict than men due to them spending more combined time on work and family activities (Frone et al, 1992; Hammer et al., 1997; Lundberg et al., 1994). Whereas, Woodward (2007) found that women reported high workloads, requiring long working hours, which consumed time and energy otherwise available for other relationships and commitments and their own leisure.
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Figure: 2.13 Source: Moen and Yan Yu, (2000)

As there exists mixed literature on gender in relation to work-life imbalance. So, the current research tries to find out the role of gender in work-life imbalance.

Career stage:

There is a mixed literature on career stage of an individual and its affect on work-life imbalance. Some literature suggests that work-family balance may be achieved by senior staff and managers who have better autonomy and discretion, and greater access to resources that sustain a balance between work and family (Whitehouse et al., 2007). While other research (Poelmans et al., 2003, 276) concludes that managers may play a crucial but contradictory role, “as both victims of work-family conflict, primary sources of resistance or support for these policies and practices, and agents in their implementation.” Drew and Murtagh (2005) found that senior management were often frustrated with working long hours. Senior managers felt unable to control their working time and to work “normal hours” or take parental leave (Drew and Murtagh, 2005, 277). Those in early career stage have so many goals to pursue and have lots of challenges when they start their career. The researcher feels that they find it difficult to manage their work and family domains. The current research tries to find out the relation of career stage with work-life imbalance.

Income: Those managers and professionals who have good salary package may be able to minimize work-life conflict by taking paid help such as cleaners and nannies to enable work-life balance (Graves et al., 2007; Blau et al., 1998; George and Brief, 1989; Schneer and Reitman, 1993). Liff and Ward (2001) conclude that those who high salary package are better able to balance their work and life domain as compared to their counterparts. Some researchers have not found any significant correlation between income and work-life imbalance (Frone et al, 1997), while others have
discovered positive correlation between income and WIF, but that of FIW is not apparent (Frone, 2000). In addition, some researchers showed opposite points to this, the study of Voydanoff (1988) indicated that high-income people feel less shortage of time compared to low-income ones. Their presuming economic strength probably helps to satisfy them on time demand. The current research tries to find out the relation of income on work-life imbalance.

Marital status:

There is mixed research on marital status and work life imbalance. Research indicates that work-life imbalance is more predominant among those who are married and with children and compared to those without children and that employed parent have multiple roles that compete for their time and effort (Holahan and Gilbert, 1979; Pleck, 1979; Higgins et al., 1992). While some other research concludes that work-life balance is an issue that pertains to all individuals who are in paid work, regardless of whether they have family responsibilities or not (Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Fu and Shaffer, 2001; Rotondo et al., 2002). Wilson (2004) found that singles face more work-life imbalance as compared to males as they have no excuse to say no for work and the bosses feel that they are free from family responsibilities and prefer to give all that extra work to them. The existing literature on marital status and work-life imbalance is mixed so the current research tries to find out the relation between marital status and work-life imbalance in Indian context.

Childcare responsibility:

Childcare responsibility is usually measured by number of children in a family and ages of children. Grandey and Cropanzano (1999) achieved a research result indicated that the correlation of the number of children to FIW is high to 0.45. Santos and Cabral-Cardoso (2008) found that the tension and conflict between work and life is more among women and particularly among those with dependent children. Jones and McKenna (2002) concluded that work-life conflict is affected by the marital status and presence of children and reported that work-interference with life is more among mothers with children as compared to non-mothers. Work-life balance predictors might be measured by “having children at home, experiencing disagreements or tension with spouse, and high involvement or time demands from family members”
Studies of domestic work and care-giving consistently show that women spend more time on such tasks as compared to men (Moen, 1992; Bullock, 1994; Fagenson, 1993). Pre-school children need their parents to pay much more time and efforts. Infants and pre-school children have the highest requirements of time and energy from their parents (Bedeian et al., 1988). Mothers of younger children have more work-interference with life and life-interference with work as compared to mothers who have older children (Aryee, 1992, Bedeian et al., 1988). The current research tries to find out the relation between marital child care responsibility and work-life imbalance in Indian context.

**Family type:**

There is a mixed research on the relation between family type i.e. joint or nuclear family and work-life imbalance. Complexity and pressures begin in the home and extended family environment (Blegen, et al., 1988); as the number of members in a household increases, the number of schedules that must be coordinated also increases. Grzywacz and Marks (2000) found that those with big-sized family have higher family-interference with work than others. The individual, who spends a lot of time on family and takes on more exceptions as family role, will feel lack of working time and energy for work. High-level family demand may require individuals spend more time on family chores, which definitely spills over to work role, and thus increase FIW (Rijswijk et al., 2004; Major et al., 2002; Guest, 2002). While some other researcher’s state that family members can provide instrumental help (taking over household tasks) and empathy, love, and advice (Daalen et al., 2006). The current research tries to find out the relation between the type of family i.e. nuclear or joint family on work-life imbalance.

**Long working hours:**

A considerable amount of research showed that work demands such as number of hours worked, workload and shift work were positively and strongly associated with WFC (Burke, 2002; Higgins and Duxbury, 2001; Higgins and Duxbury, 1992; Saltzstein et al., 2001; Voydanoff, 1988). Working long hours, evenings and weekends restrains the time that employees have for family activities. Barbara Pocock (2003) picks up on moodiness at home that results from working excessively long
hours, the guilt that parents feel for not attending their children’s significant events at school and the fraying of community fabric as workers time to run local clubs disappears: “Grumpy people do not make great lovers, fathers, mothers, drivers, neighbours or golfers”. In a daily diary study, Van Hooff et al., (2007a) showed that working overtime during the evenings was associated with higher levels of work-life imbalance in both men and women. The current research tries to find out the does long working hours leads to work-life imbalance among faculty members of higher education Institutions of Delhi.

**Individual trait variables:**

**Emotional stability:**

These findings suggest that those with increasing tendencies towards maladjustment and emotional instability are also experiencing increasing perceptions of WFC, Bruck and Allen (2003) found a negative relationship between agreeableness and time-based WFC and between conscientiousness and FIW after controlling for demographic variables and Type A personality traits. Similarly, Wayne et al (2004) found a negative relationship between WIF and both agreeableness and conscientiousness, and a negative relationship between FIW and conscientiousness. Emotional stable person remains calm in time of work pressure and family stress and is better able to manage his work and life domains effectively.

**Locus of control:**

Locus of control is one’s perception of the degree of control she or he has over events in life (Rotter, 1966). Rotter identified internal locus of control individuals as people who tend to perceive outcomes of their behaviours has resulted from their own efforts. They take the responsibility of their own behaviour and do what they think to be right. And people with external locus of control tend to believe that whatever happens in their life is not because of them but because of some other influential people. Internal locus of control seems to take more initiative, are interested to change, and actively manage outcomes in their lives. Locus of control is the individual’s generalized belief concerning the extent to which outcomes are determined by internal (e.g., personal effort and ability) as opposed to external variables (e.g., fate, chance, or powerful
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Internals show higher work motivation and satisfaction, less anxiety, and higher expectancy that effort leads to performance (Spector, 1994), and they hold more positive attitudes than externals when task difficulty is high (Gul et al., 1994). Several studies have examined the relationship between locus of control and work-family conflict (Noor, 2002, 2003). Noor investigated the effects of locus of control on work-family conflict and found that individuals with an external locus of control (those who attribute the causes of events in their lives to factors other than themselves) reported experiencing more work-family conflict. Similarly, Andreassi and Thompson (2009) found that internal locus of control was negatively related to work-family conflict.

**Spiritual inclination:**

People increasingly desire to experience spirituality not only in their personal lives, but also their work where they spend a large amount of time (Neck and Milliman, 1994; Ray, 1992; Maynard, 1992). The quote “we are not human beings with a spiritual experience, but rather spiritual beings with a human experience” is stated more widely now than ever. Hope is an integral part of spirituality, the feeling that things will get better and we are in this world to do good. Spirituality provides employees meaningfulness, integrity, honesty, humility, respect, fairness, caring & concern, listening, appreciating others and reflective practices (Reave, 2005). Spirituality also helps individuals to stay calm, in peace even in the times and turbulence and gave them a feeling of hope, being of service, humility and forgiveness (Kriger and Hanson, 1999). According to (Vicari, 2003), majority of experts claim that individual's personal life and life at work is strongly influenced by the spiritual dogmas. Also, spirituality is correlated to increased joy, serenity, job satisfaction, life satisfaction and commitment (Burack, 1999; Fry, 2003, 2005; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003a; Kouzes and Posner, 1995; Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002; Paloutzian et al., 2003; Reave, 2005).

**Workaholics:**

Oates (1971) first created the term workaholic to describe a person whose enhanced necessity to work hinders various life functions (Bonebright et al., Porter, 2001). Workaholics receive fulfilment from working, possess an inner need to work, and
desire the “emotional rush” that comes from working hard (Bonebright et al., 2000). The term “workaholism” originated from the assumption that excessive working is derived from an inherent “addiction” that includes obsessive and compulsive tendencies (McMillan et al., 2001). Researchers agree on qualifying workaholism as work addiction. Workaholism can lead to interpersonal relationships and lead to marital dissatisfaction. Carroll and Robinson, (2000) found that women married to workaholics reported higher marital estrangement and fewer positive feelings towards their husbands. Porter (2001) found that the spouses of workaholics felt ignored, unloved, and emotionally/physically abandoned. Spence and Robbins (1992) found women to be significantly more likely to feel driven to work, to have more work environment, to experience more work stress, and to allocate more time to the job. Their findings suggest that women have a greater tendency to show at least some characteristics of workaholism, perhaps owing to the more competitive work environment and the higher expectations placed upon them in order to succeed in the workplace. Individuals who are very committed to their job may be more likely to work longer hours and/or more likely to continue to work whilst unwell (Ala-Mursula et al., 2006). Workaholics have higher levels of work stress and the inner pressures and drive for these individuals to work. As employees get more engaged in work, their ability to balance the demands of work and personal life increasingly suffers (Bonebright et al., 2000). “Workaholics” who are characterized as those who choose to work long hours even when they may not need to do so and they tend to do so at the expense of other activities. Peiperl and Jones (2001) viewed workaholism similar to alcoholism. Robinson (2000a) proposes a rather stringent definition reflective of what he views as the “true workaholic”. He defines workaholism as “an obsessive-compulsive disorder that manifests itself through self-imposed demands, an inability to regulate work habits, and an over indulgence in work to the exclusion of most other life activities” (Robinson, 2000a).

**Self-efficacy:**

Research showed that self-efficacy is significantly correlative with work-family conflict (Bemas and Major, 2000). Hennessy's research (2007) not only supported this result, but also found the regulating effect of self-efficacy between work-family conflict and family satisfaction. Chen Hua and Tan Kaiyi et al (2007) proposed that
all factors of self-efficacy are significantly negatively correlated with work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW). Cinamon (2006) studied the relationship among WFC, self-efficacy, gender and family background, and found that self-efficacy is negatively correlative with WIF and FIW. Yu Shuguang (2008) made elaborate classification of WFC. He found out that general self-efficacy is negatively correlative with stress-based WIF, behaviour-based WIF, time-based FIW, stress-based FIW and behaviour-based FIW, but positively correlative with time-based WIF.

**Big Five personality:**

Bruck and Allen (2003) found that conscientiousness is not significantly correlative with work-family conflict; they also found that conscientious people experience less FIW. After controlling the effect of negative affectivity and Type A personality, conscientiousness still has significant and negative prediction effect on FIW. Shafiro's (2004) research showed that conscientiousness is correlated with the following four types of conflict: time-based FIW, stress-based FIW, behaviour-based WIF and FIW. High conscientious people experience less the above conflicts than low conscientious ones. Wayne (2004) claimed that high conscientious people experience comparatively low WIF and FIW.

**Perfectionism:**

Perfectionists are people who believe they must think and act without flaw, often scolding and punishing themselves when they don’t meet this unattainable goal. This approach of life leaves a trial of frustration and breeds only more problems. Perfectionists remember the past with regrets, don’t enjoy the present as much as they might and dread the future. Perfection can’t be attained in this lifetime. The person who seeks to be perfect is always doomed to fail. Perfectionism is not the healthy pursuit of excellence. There are big differences between perfectionists and those who are seen as healthy achievers (Anthony and Swinson, 1998). Perfectionists are full of anxiety and fear of disapproval and rejection. These emotional reactions are linked to the stress response, experienced when an individual is presented with situations that he or she sees as having a threat attached to them (Cooper, 2007).
Proactive personality:

Bateman and Crant (1993) asserted that a prototypical proactive personality is an individual who is relatively unconstrained by situational forces and who effects environmental changes. Proactive individuals tend to identify opportunities and act on them, show initiative, and persevere until meaningful change occurs. In contrast, less proactive individuals are passive and reactive, preferring to adapt to circumstances rather than to change them. In the context of work–family balance, individuals with proactive personalities will take steps to elicit support and/or engage in role restructuring or negotiation to minimize work–family conflict and promote work–family facilitation.

Neuroticism:

One of the Big Five personality dimensions, has been noted to constitute the negative pole of self-esteem (Judge et al., 1998) and represents the core trait of negative affectivity (Watson and Clark, 1984). Costa and McCrae (1988) described neurotic individuals as being prone to anxiety and as possessing a tendency to be fearful of novel situations and susceptible to feelings of dependence and helplessness. Empirical research has linked neuroticism (Grzywacz and Marks, 2000; Wayne et al., 2004) and negative affectivity (Carlson, 1999) to work–family and family–work conflict and to work–family facilitation (Wayne et al., 2004). Neuroticism operates as a negative cognitive lens through which life experiences are interpreted. The negative cognitive style of neurotic individuals inhibits efforts to elicit social support to cope with stress or initiate actions that will facilitate the integration of work and family roles.

Optimism:

Zellars and Perrewe (2001) found extraversion to be related to emotional support. On this basis, and given the natural tendency of extraverted individuals to remain optimistic. As a disposition, optimism rests on the expectation that one will have positive outcomes in life even if one is at present facing adversity (Carver and Scheier, 1999). Optimism has been shown to be related to problem-solving coping in that stressful situations are perceived to be controllable, and positive reframing in that such situations are perceived to be uncontrollable (Scheier et al., 1986). Central to dispositional optimism is confidence, a generalized positive expectation about
outcomes that propels optimists into action and helps them remain engaged in effort (Carver and Scheier, 1999). Anderson (1996) found optimism to be positively related to coping and negatively related to negative effect.

**Work and family related variables:**

Years of work experience, spousal support, family support, social support, supervisory support, organizational policies, social life within the organization, social life outside the organization, job demand, job control, career satisfaction, dual working couple, spouse in teaching profession.

**Spousal support:**

Spousal support has been found to reduce role-strain through its impact on perceived stressors (Carlson and Perrewe, 1999) and to increase marital quality (Dehle et al., 2001; Julien et al., 2003) and general well-being (Dehle et al., 2001). Dehle et al. (2001) found that spousal support is important for both marital satisfaction and individual functioning. Individuals who reported higher rates of spousal support were more likely to report higher levels of marital satisfaction, fewer symptoms of depression, and more manageable stress levels. Prior findings have illustrated that a spouse's support can negate work-family conflict (Erdwins et al. 2001, Lee and Choo 2001, Kirrane and Buckley 2004, Lapierre and Allen, 2006; Eby et al., 2005; Matsui et al., 1995). In examining physiological responses to a conflict interaction with one's spouse, Heffner, Kiecolt-Glasser et al., (2004) found that cortisol and mood levels were affected by spousal support. Spousal support can be emotional or instrumental (Lee and Choo 2001, Kirrane and Buckley 2004). Spouse contribute in areas like earnings and financial management (Kate, 1998), home and family responsibilities (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Bonney et al., 1999), career management and support (Gordon and Whelan-Berry, 2004; Hertz, 1999) and interpersonal support (Becker and Moen, 1999).

**Family support:**

Grzywacz and Marks (2000) showed that family support has significantly negative correlation with FIW. Families and particularly noted for supplying feedback and guidance, mediating problem solutions, serving as a haven for rest and recuperation,
validating an individual’s identity, and contributing to emotional mastery (Caplan et al., 1975). Families can also provide tangible resources like nuclear family may provide income beyond that earned by the individual. Financial resources may also be available from one's extended family, along with childcare assistance (Parish and Hao, 1991), help with shopping, and coverage for events like repair calls and vet visits (Caplan et al., 1975). There is growing consensus that emotional and instrumental support plays a vital role in regard to work-family conflicts (Behr and McGrath 1992; Caplan et al., 1975; McIntosh, 1991; Kaufmann, and Beehr, 1986). Adams et al. (1996) found that family-based social support was negatively associated with family interfering with work, a dimension of work-family conflict. These relationships also provide support that reduces work-family conflict by reducing time demands and stress (Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1994; Seers et al., 1983). King et al., (1996) found that family members can support employees in their efforts to manage work and life domains by providing emotional sustenance and instrumental assistance. Emotional sustenance helps in preventing family interference with work (Lapierre and Allen, 2006)

**Supervisory support:**

Now-a-days lots of emphasis is being given to supervisory support in work-life balance literature (Stinghambler and Vandenbergh, 2004; Beehr et al., 2003; Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Anderson et al., 2002; Baral and Bhargava, 2010; Moen and Yu, 2000; Thompson and Prottus, 2005; Major et al., 2008). Allen (2001) defined a family-supportive supervisor as one who “is sympathetic to the employee’s desires to seek balance between work and family and who engages in efforts to help the employee accommodate his or her work and family responsibilities” (p. 417). Studies found that supervisory support was an important source of support in coping with problems associated with WFC (Anderson et al., 2002; Beehr et al., 2003; Burke and Greenglass, 1999; Duxbury and Higgins, 1994; Thomas and Ganster, 1995). Supervisor support is also crucial for work-family enrichment (Beutell and Wittig-Berman, 2008; Wadsworth and Owens, 2007; Aryee et al., 2005) since, supervisors can alleviate most of the work related tension and strain (Beehr et al., 2000), which may potentially provide the energy and confidence (Marks, 1977) to participate in family related activities. Even the success of work life balance practices is dependent
on supervisor’s attitude, skills and behaviour (Glynn et al., 2002). O’Driscoll et al. (2003) demonstrated that employees with greater supervisor support reported less psychological strain than co-workers with less support from their supervisors. Moen and Yu (2000) found that having a supervisor who is understanding and supportive leads to higher scores on positive indicators of life quality (coping/mastery) and lower scores on negative indicators of life quality (work/life conflict, overload, and stress) for both men and women.

**Organizational policies:**

Perceived organizational support (POS) is currently the most extensive form of support considered in the human resource management literature. POS was initially developed by Eisenberger and his colleagues (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001) and subsequently by other researchers (Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne et al., 1997). When employees perceive their employer as supportive, their commitment to the organization increases. An individual's perceptions concerning available support, rather than its actual availability, may be a stronger predictor of effective coping or achievement of desirable outcomes (Cohen and Syme, 1985). Allen (2001) found that employees who perceived their organization as less family-supportive experienced more work-life imbalance, less job satisfaction, less organization commitment and greater turnover intention. Baltes et al., (1999) and Duxbury and Higgins (2001) found that work-life balance practices like flextime, childcare and eldercare support helps in balancing the employees work and family domain and also enhances the workplace performance.

**Social life within the organization:**

Employees differentiate support from the organisation and the support they receive from their immediate work group or supervisor (Allen, 2001; Jahn et al., 2003; Self et al., 2005). Both the immediate manager and peers are sources of social support that help relieve occupational stress and reduce turnover (Buunk and Verhoeven, 1991; Savery, 1988; Bailey and Kurland, 2002; Gajendran and Harrison, 2007). Kram (1985) found that peer relationships at work vary from those who exchange information about work and the organisation to those who provide confirmation and emotional support. Ducharme and Martin (2000) found evidence that the social
support of peers enhances the job satisfaction of all workers. If employees enjoy a good social life i.e. relation with the seniors and peers, they feel good about working in such organizations. Social gathering where employees family is also invited are perceived good by the employees. Ducharme and Martin (2000) found evidence that the social support of peers enhances the job satisfaction of all workers. Supportive relationships make career advancement and success more likely. Work-based relationships may be instrumental in supporting career advancement in managerial roles (Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992) and creating feelings of inclusion in professional roles (Gersick et al., 2000; Mor Barak and Levin, 2002) that indicate career accomplishment. Waltman (2001) reported that women faculty report less connected to their peer and the university community and less able to develop in multiple directions.

**Social life outside the organization:**

Working families' participation in community organizations and informal neighbourhood and friendship relationships provides important re-sources in their efforts to coordinate their work and family responsibilities and activities (Bookman, 2004). Studies avert that those who good friend circle, friendly neighbourhood are better able to balance their work and life domain.

**Job demand:**

A considerable amount of research showed that work demands such as number of hours worked, workload and shift work were positively and strongly associated with work-life imbalance (Burke, 2002; Higgins et al., 2000; Higgins and Duxbury, 1992; Saltzstein et al., 2001; Voydanoff, 1988; Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Rijswijk et al., 2004; Yildirim and Aycan, 2007; Guest, 2002). According to Bond et al., (1997) job requirements, such as mandatory overtime, shift work, on-call requirements, and evening/weekend/holiday coverage impose on one’s personal time. Researchers have also proved that job demands such as a high work pressure, emotional demands, and role ambiguity may lead to sleeping problems, exhaustion, and impaired health (Doi, 2005; Halbesleben and Zellars, 2006). According to World Health Organization, mental health problems due to work pressure are expected to become the second most common cause of disability and death by 2020 (Harnois and Gabriel, 2000).
Work time control:

Work time control can be described as the individual’s autonomy regarding issues such as starting and finishing times, breaks, days off, vacations, and the number of work hours (Costa et al., 2001). Hughes and Parkes (2007) showed that work time control was not only directly and inversely related to WFI (Jansen et al., 2004), but also indirectly: high work time control buffered the adverse effects of long work hours on WFI.

When facing a high degree of workload, particularly when working under high time pressure, individuals have to work fast and have to invest a lot of effort in order to accomplish their tasks (Frese and Zapf, 1994; Hockey and Earle, 2006). There is considerable evidence that work time control may alleviate the negative effect of work time demands on health and work–family balance (Ala-Mursula et al., 2006; Tucker and Rutherford, 2005; Van der Hulst and Geurts, 2001; Geurts et al., 2009). As Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) report, "Faculty members are dedicated to their work, and they love what they do" (p. 518). Important is their perceived control of their career development (Olsen et al., 1995), their high degrees of autonomy (Tack and Patitu, 1992), and the challenge they take from their work (Manger, 1999).

Job involvement:

Job involvement has to do with the degree of importance people allocate to work involvement (Higgins et al., 1992; Adams et al., 1996) and to involvement in family roles (Williams and Alliger, 1994).

It represents the degree to which a person's job is central to his/her self-esteem or sense of identity (Kanungo, 1982; Lodahl and Kejner, 1965). Social identity theory states that people can invest in various social roles which define their own identities and the roles they occupy in a social environment (Mael and Ashforth, 1995; Ashforth, 1998). More specifically, individuals with high job involvement may find it more difficult to comply with the demands of other roles, as has been found in past work-life balance research (Martire et al., 2001; Bruck et al., 2002; Major et al., 2002; Beutell and O’ Hare, 1987; Frone and Rice, 1987; Greenhaus, and Kopelman, 1981; Parasuraman et al., 1989; Wley, 1987; Frone et al., 1992).
Job involvement may lead to work interfering with family, which in turn leads to less time and energy devoted to family roles, thereby making it more difficult to comply with pressures associated with family roles.

**Career satisfaction:**

Choices for continued personal growth and development, such as continuing education (Schor, 1991) and career changes, can also complicate balancing work and life. Those with higher career demands will have difficulty in balancing their work and life domain till the time they accomplish what they desire from their career.

**Professionals:**

Research findings concerning the ability of professionals and managers to balance work and family are also mixed. (Tausig and Fenwick, 2001; Drew and Murtagh, 2005; Poelmans et al., 2003; Wajcman, 1999) reported that a professional occupation was negatively associated with work-life balance.

In contrast there are researches that state that some managers and professionals may be able to minimize work-life conflict by purchasing support such as cleaners and paid help to enhance work-life balance (Graves et al., 2007). Moreover, professionals and managers may have more access to greater flexibility relative to other workers enabling them to better cope with the heavy work and family demands (Eaton, 2003; Rau and Hyland, 2002). There is some evidence to suggest that highly educated women in well-paid jobs are “best placed to access supportive policies” (Whitehouse et al., 2007).

**Dual working couple:**

Dual working couples are where both husband and wife work in paid work. Economic pressures have significantly increased the need for dual-earner families to the point that the majority of families now require two breadwinners to meet rises in the cost of living.

In India, the demographic changes are seen in the form of increasing number of women in the workforce (Census of India, 2010) and increasing number of nuclear as well as dual earner families (Bharat, 2003; Rajadhyaksh and Bhatnagar, 2000;
Komarraju, 1997; Sekaran, 1992), which put pressure on both men and women to manage their work and family obligations. There is a 40% increase in women in paid labour force (Dutta and Singh, 2003; Jain, 1992; Nath, 2000). This movement from the private to the public domain and their increased presence in the world’s workforces have challenged traditional notions of the locus of responsibility for childcare and for the care of members of families and communities (Calas and Smircich, 1989; Chhachhi and Pittin, 1996; Greer, 1970). Also there are researches which averts that husbands of employed women engage more in family roles than the husbands of non-employed women (Barnett and Baruch, 1987; Pleck, 1985)

**Persistence second shift:**

Though there is an increase in the number of working women in India, but they have to perform the household activities even after having a tiring day at office. Studies on domestic work and care-giving consistently show that women spend more time on such activities than men (Moen, 1992; Bullock, 1994; Fagenson, 1993). As a result, many health problems may occur such as malnutrition, chronic fatigue, stress and premature aging (Smyke, 1991; Marshal, 2001).

Employees tend to undertake domestic responsibilities irrespective of their employment status; the so-called second shift remains stubbornly intact. Previous research suggests that the movement of women into the workforce, longer working hours and work intensification have resulted in less time for family, recreation and community (Pocock, 2003, 2005). Those who have more work to do at home also will have difficulty in balancing their work and life domain (Rijswijk et al., 2004; Abbott et al., 1998; Borrill and Kidd, 1994; Major et al., 2002; Guest, 2002)

**Same-same career couple:**

Martin et al. (1975) of female sociologists wrote that “those faculty in same-same career couples were proportionally more successful at obtaining the PhD, achieving higher academic ranks, gaining more promotion, avoiding demotions, and practicing longer professional careers. The 'same-same' couples also had the highest joint productivity in the publication histories” (Butler and Paisley, 1980, 227). Hall and Hall (1979) provide a further explanation to this observed compatibility, by
contending that it is easier to understand the spouse's commitments and provide needed support.

**Community:**

An individual’s community ties can be important sources of socio-emotional and resource support. “Community ties are so important because they provide individuals with a network to help with schooling decisions, getting a job and personal problems that may arise” (Blau et al., 1998, pp. 296). Veiga (1983) found that managers who highly valued their community ties were less impatient with their careers, more satisfied generally and less frustrated with their careers. Community ties are an important source of support that can help individuals cope with work-life imbalance.

**Self-employment:**

Self-employed generally report greater freedom, autonomy, and opportunity for self-fulfilment than organizationally employed women and men (Eden, 1975; Mannheim and Schiffrin, 1984; Naughton, 1987). Being one’s own boss provide individuals the freedom and flexibility to structure the workday according to their preferences, and thereby added control over the work situation (Loscocco, 1997). Self-employment reduces the level of work-family conflict (Greenhaus et al., 1989), enabling the owners to manage the conflicts between work and home more effectively and increase psychological well-being (Greenhaus et al., 1989; Loscocco, 1997; Loscocco and Leicht, 1993).

**Leader-member exchange:**

High level of leader-member exchange relationships between supervisors and subordinates are marked by reciprocal influences as well as mutual trust, loyalty, respect, and positive affect (Liden and Maslyn, 1998; Liden et al., 1993). Bernas and Major (2000) in his path model showed a negative effect of leader-member exchange and work interference with family. Also Golden (2006) in his study of teleworkers from a large high technology firm found the expected negative relationship between leader-member exchange and work interference with family.
Organizational support programs:

Offering workplace family-supportive programs such as flex time, child care assistance thereby mitigating the effect of work-family conflict on organizational responsibilities (Frone and Yardley, 1994). Thompson et al realized (Thompson, CA. et al, 1999) that many family friendly programs (such as flex time, work share, etc) can correspondingly reduce the work-life imbalance. The flexible work schedule is considered as an organizational prevention method aiming at allowing employees to accommodate the total set of demands in their professional as well personal lives (Nelson and Hitt, 1992). The concept of flex time is not new as one can find it way back in Hawthorne studies during 1920s and 1930s, flex time and flexible working hours (Ronen, 1981) are extended to telecommuting these days (Caudron, 1990). Flex time attempts to reduce the work-family conflicts to a greater extent because the participants can maintain a positive family-and work-related self image. Chen Weizheng et al (2007), Chinese scholars, claimed that the implementation of work share can relieve the WFC and promote the work-life balance. Meta-analysis showed (Gajendran and Harrison, (2007) that telecommuting has little effect on WFC, but the effect is positive.

Level of education:

Sanik (1993) found out that level of education influences WFC. Maybe since that level of education can intensify the behaviour of estranging family and joining organizations. Higher educated persons would obtain more opportunities of promotion or out-of-town work, which increases the possibility of WIF (Adams et al, 1996). Level of education is also interactive with gender. Camicer (2004) discovered that higher educated males experience higher FIW, while lower educated females feel lower. On the contrary, level of education has no apparent influence on WIF.
Determinants of Work-Life Imbalance Among Faculty Members of Higher Education Institutions in Delhi:

**Determinants of WLI:**

**Demographic Variables:**
- Gender
- Marital Status
- Career Stage
- Family Type
- Childcare Responsibility
- Age

**Individual Trait Variables:**
- Emotional Stability
- Spiritual Inclination
- Locus of Control
- Workaholism

**Work and Family Related Variable:**
- Years of Work Experience
- Supervisory Support
- Job Demand
- Job Time Control
- Satisfaction with Teaching Career
- Social Life Within Institution
- Social Life Outside Institution
- Spousal Support
- Family Support
- Dual Working Couple
- Same-Same Career Couple
- Persistence Second Shift

**Impact of WLI:**
- Job Satisfaction
- Life Satisfaction
- Health
- Performance
- Relation with Spouse
- Quality Time with Family
- Free Time for Self
- Time for Friends, Hobbies

*Figure No 2.14*
This model has been framed on the basis of thorough literature review. The model shows that demographic, individual trait and work and family related variables that affect the work life imbalance. The inclusion of these different sets of variables gives a better understanding of the various variables that affect work-life imbalance of working professionals. Lots of researchers have studied personality variables as the determinants of work-life imbalance (Hughes and Parkes, 2007; Rijswijk et al., 2004; Bruck and Allen, 2003; Wayne et al., 2004; Mitchelson, 2009; Aziz and Cunningham, 2008; Aziz and Zickar, 2006; Bonebright et al., 2000; Zhang and Liu, 2011; Rubab et al., 2008; Agarwal and Ferratt, 2000).