6 DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. The first objective of the study was to examine the factors which influence the work life balance in Indian private financial sector. The second goal was to examine the unexplored relationship between actecedents, consequences and predictors of family interference with work and work interference with family.

Empirical findings on work-family tradeoffs are somewhat mixed. The majority of work-life balance research focuses on employees’ family responsibilities, there are also a number of studies that recognize commitments to friends and community groups, expanding the affected population to virtually all employees (e.g., Beauregard, 2006; Hamililton, Gordon, & Whelan-Berry, 2006; Tausiig & Fenwick, 2010). Interference between work and non-work responsibilities has a number of negative outcomes that have been well established in the literature. In terms of job attitudes, employees reporting high levels of both work-to-life and life-to-work conflict tend to exhibit lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Burke & Greenglass, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Behavioural outcomes of both directions of conflict include reduced work effort, reduced performance, and increased absenteeism and turnover (Anderson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Aryee, 1992; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Greenhaus, Collins, Singh, & Parasuraman, 1997; Wayne, Musisca, & Fleeson, 2004).

6.1 Work Interference to Family and Family interference to Work

Both work-to-life and life-to-work conflict have also been associated with increased stress and burnout (Anderson et al., 2002; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998), cognitive difficulties such as staying awake, lack of concentration, and low alertness (MacEwen & Barling, 1994), and reduced levels of general health and energy (Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996). While the majority of work-life balance research focuses on employees’
family responsibilities, there are also a number of studies that recognize commitments to friends and community groups, expanding the affected population to virtually all employees (e.g., Beauregard, 2006; Hamilton, Gordon, & Whelan-Berry, 2006; Tausig & Fenwick, 2010). The implications for organizations are clear: work-life conflict can have negative repercussions for employee performance. This view proposes that work-life balance practices will assist employees in balancing their work and family demands, which can in turn lead to enhanced employee productivity and significant business improvements. By enabling employees to schedule their time in order to better balance competing demands from work and from home, and by helping employees to procure third-party assistance with caregiving responsibilities, such practices are intended to reduce or eliminate levels of work-life conflict, and thereby augment employee performance and organizational effectiveness.

A number of researchers have found that use of flexible working hours is associated with lower levels of work-to-life conflict (Anderrson, Coffey, & Byerly, 2002; Hill et al., 2008) and nondirectional work-life conflict (Lee & Duxbury, 1998; Saltzstein et al., 2010). Thomas and Ganster (1995) found that perceived control served as a mediating mechanism by which family-supportive policies influenced a non-directional measure of work-life conflict, and O'Driiscoll et al. (2013) demonstrated that family-supportive organizational perceptions mediated the link between use of work-life practices and work-to-life conflict.

Work-family conflict was also positively related to emotional exhaustion and turnover intention, suggesting that when employees perceive that their work interferes with family life they are more likely to become “burnt out” and be inclined to quit their jobs. These results suggest that attempts to reduce employees’ perceptions of work interference with family could yield positive benefits for employees and organization. The inverse relationship between perceived organizational support (POS) and work interference with family, emotional exhaustion and turnover intention suggest that creating a supportive work environment may also have positive benefits for employees and organization.

Consistent with previous research, key work-related predictors of work interference with home were shown to be the number of hours respondents worked weekly, the
expectations held of respondents by others with regard to their role as an employee, and the amount of autonomy wielded by respondents over their work schedules. The number of hours spent in work activities contributes to employees’ work interference with home by reducing the amount of time available to them for fulfilling responsibilities associated with the home domain. Correspondingly, expectations from colleagues and superiors to prioritize the work role and take on additional job-related responsibilities create time pressures for employees that hinder their efforts to meet home-related demands. Previous research has demonstrated this effect for nondirectional measures of work-home interference (Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Higgins et al., 1992), but the current findings indicate that work role expectations have a direct effect on work interference with home rather than home interference with work.

6.2 Work Domain and Family Domain variables

Longer work hours were significantly correlated with difficulty in managing care of children; difficulty in obtaining and managing family leisure time; and work-to-family conflict. Not surprisingly, higher work hours were also associated with lower perceived work-life control. Given that working longer hours means that time commitments interfere with family life, it is not surprising that this factor was associated with reports of increased difficulty in managing family life, and consequently higher work family conflict.

Family management

Poorer work flexibility, difficulty in managing care of children within the family, and difficulty in obtaining and organizing family leisure time; and were significantly associated with higher relationship tension. In addition, they were also associated with poorer relationship sociability and partner companionship.

Gender

As Watanabe et al. (1997) observed, gender inequality constitutes a universal feature of the work-family interface. As elsewhere, employed mothers in India are primarily responsible for household and child-care responsibilities and therefore, "suffer from the double day that afflicts most working women in the West" (Parpart, 1990, 173-174). In a
study of Domenico, de Cola, and Leishman( 2011) reported women's suggestions for change and improvement centered on child-care arrangements and flexibility. Specifically, they indicated shorter working hours, part-time jobs some form of financial assistance for improved care, and provision of nursery schools. The findings of Di Domenico et al.'s (2011) study suggest an organizational and even societal role in assisting employed parents to combine their work and family roles. The rationale for the adoption of such policies has been based on the negative implications of work and family imbalance for work attitudes and behaviors such as low levels of commitment, lateness, absenteeism, turnover, and low productivity (Glass & Finley, 2002; Thomas & Ganster, 1995). Given the expense involved in implementing employer-supported child care, organizations should experiment with formal family-responsive policies such as parental leave (e.g., leave for emergency child care, illness) and flexible work arrangements (e.g., flextime) In addition to informal policies such as supervisor support. In a study of employed parents in Ghana, Aryee, Tan, & Debrah (2004) reported that Informal policies such as supervisory support and work schedule flexibility influenced the work outcomes of job satisfaction and psychological withdrawal behavior through perceived organizational support. In effect, the increasingly tenuous nature of the family-based social support system suggests an organizational role in assisting employed parents integrate their work and family responsibilities. A major limitation of research on the work-family interface is the focus on conflict or stress. Greenhaus, 2013 noted "Much of the research on the relationship between work and family has been somewhat negative in that, it tends to emphasize the dysfunctional consequences of work-family Interactions." Although conflict and stress are inherent in the operation of the work-family interface, there Is recognition of the social psychological benefits that stem from participating in the work and family domains (Barnett, 1998; Tholts, 1983). Based on the expansion/enhancement hypothesis, and in order to redress the conflict paradigm in research on the work-family Interface, there is a growing Interest in understanding how work and family experiences enrich the lives of individuals (Barnett, 1998; Frone, 2003; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999).
6.3 Work Life Conflict

Work-to-family conflict was positively and significantly correlated with work hours; relationship tension; family management (care of children); family management (leisure time); and family management (work flexibility). People who reported higher levels of work interference in family life (whether it be strain from work, or physical work hours), also reported increased relationship tension, and consequently poorer relationships with their partners (both sociability and companionship). In addition, they reported lower perceived work-life and work-family control.

**Work-life control**

General work-life control was significantly and positively correlated with relationship sociability and companionship with partner; and negatively correlated with relationship tension. Lower perceived work-life control was significantly associated with a poorer spousal relationship (increased tension, less partnership sociability; and poorer perception of partner companionship). Perceived low work-life control was also significantly associated with poorer family management work flexibility and increased difficulty in arranging care of children; and family leisure time. Work-family control was negatively associated with relationship tension. People, who perceived that they had low control over the impact of work on family, had higher levels of relationship tension.

The enhancement hypothesis posits that rather than lead to the depletion of an individual's psychological and physiological resources, involvement in multiple roles provides a number of benefits that may outweigh the costs leading to net gratification rather than strain. Because conflict and enhancement are inherent in participation in work and family roles, a better understanding of the work-family interface requires an integration of the scarcity and enhancement hypotheses or as Frone (2003) noted, should include both conflict and facilitation. He defined work-family facilitation as "the extent to which participation at work (home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills and opportunities gained or developed at home (work)." Frone (2003 J suggested a four-fold taxonomy of work-family balance along the primary dimensions of (1) direction
of influence between work and family roles (work to family versus family to work) and (ii) type of effect (conflict versus facilitation). Empirical research in both Western and non-Western contexts has since provided empirical support for Frone’s four-fold taxonomy of work-family balance (Aryee, Srlnivas, & Tan, In press; Grzyuracz & Marks, 2000; Wayne, Muslsca, &Fleeson, 2004).

The career aspirations and family plans of adolescents and young adults are also likely to be influenced by the nature of the linkages between gender, work, and family that they observe in the world around them. Among married couples in the United States, wives are more likely than husbands to have jobs characterized by the particularly stressful combination of high demands and low control (Menaghan, 2004); they are likely to be paid less than husbands, giving them less bargaining power at home (Rosenfield, 2010); and they are likely to have a greater share of the responsibility for housework (Hochschild, 2009). Not surprisingly then, employed women tend to have greater combined work and family demands than employed men (Duxbury, Higgins, & Lee, 2014; Shelton, 2010). Together, these conditions result in women being more likely to make work-related sacrifices to accommodate family needs than men.

Empirical findings on work-family tradeoffs are somewhat mixed. Demographic research using large, representative samples of Indian residents show that moving is more financially costly for married women than for married men, which suggests that husbands’ careers are typically the reason for moving, with wives more commonly losing their jobs or taking lower paying jobs as a result of moving (Jacobsen & Levin, 1997). Pixley and Moen (2013) found that both husbands and wives place the husband's career above the wife's career in making decisions that influenced work and family lives, including moving to another residence. In addition, men were more likely than women to have encountered career opportunities that required spouses to make a major change, such as move or change jobs. Furthermore, among those who encountered opportunities, men were more likely than women to have taken advantage of them. In contrast, a recent study by Milkie and Peltola (1999) found that men and women were equally likely to make career sacrifices, including turning down promotions, refusing to work overtime, and cutting back on work. Thus it may be that
the data are beginning to show a trend that reflects a much greater commitment to work by many working women. It seems likely that men and women may differ in the types of career sacrifices they are willing to make for their families, but that once engaged in their jobs, women are just as committed to work as are men. It is within this larger social context of work, family, and gender relations that young people are socialized to form expectations and plans regarding their future work and family lives.

Past research has also investigated young adults' expectations of combining work and family life. Some researchers have argued that the occupational choices of young women, more so than those of young men, are inextricably tied to their marriage and family plans (Spade & Reese, 1991). Most college women aspire toward both a career and motherhood (Murrell, Frieze, & Frost, 1991; Schroeder, Blood, & Maluso, 1992), and regardless of the status of their planned occupation, young women are still likely to report higher expectations than men for earlier marriage and childbearing (Barnett, Gareis, James, & Steele, 2003). Although some young women report a preference for role-sharing, dual-career families characterized by symmetrical relationships between husbands and wives (Spade & Reese, 1991), other young women report a preference for more conventional dual-earner families, where the female spouse maintains primary responsibility for parenting and home life (Hallett & Gilbert, 1997).

In contrast with demands associated with WFC, support resources seem to play a more complex role in the WFC process. Although some researchers have examined the direct effects of social support on WFC (e.g., Adams et al., 2001), others have considered more indirect effects such as antecedents to demands (e.g., Cohen & Wills, 2010), mediating relationships (e.g., Gore, 2014), and moderating relationships (e.g., Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1995). Although there is some evidence that social support has the strongest influence on WFC through its influence on antecedent stressors or demands the role of other forms of support resources has not been clarified. Given the mixed support for both direct and indirect models, it seems likely that coping resources may impact WFC in different ways and at different times.
6.4 Outcomes

Research on the meaning of work indicates that there is substantial variation in work centrality, the degree of general importance and value attributed to the role of working in one’s life (England, 1986; MOW International Research Team, 1987). The investigation of the WFC experiences of employees in five countries suggests that several cultural factors may influence this process. In an eight-country study, the United States had the fourth highest average work centrality score, Japan had the highest, and Britain the lowest (MOW International Research Team, 1987). In cultures where work is viewed as more important, family members may be more accepting of work being conducted in the home environment than employers are of family issues being attended to in the work setting. In other words, the family is more elastic than is the work domain (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 2001), and such elasticity could serve as a resource for employees. However, in cultures where work is regarded as less important, the family may not be so tolerant of work interference in the family domain, and the elasticity of the family domain may not serve as a resource.

Social and instrumental support in either domain may vary as a result of cultural differences. In more collectivistic societies that are group oriented, individuals may provide social support as a matter of duty or obligation (Triandis, 1995). Because of the importance of each individual to the collective, there may be more opportunities for people to receive social support. Similarly, collectivists may give more instrumental support to members of their own group. For instance, it is quite common in collectivist societies for grandparents or other relatives to help look after children. Support may also be influenced by gender role expectations. Where traditional gender roles are the norm, females will be expected to take on a heavier burden at home, even if they have a job outside, and males may be reluctant to provide any instrumental support to reduce the load. Moreover, cultural norms that put family before work, such as in the United States seem to be associated with a higher incidence of company-provided family-friendly benefits.

Because personal resources are by definition individually based and culture is an important influence on the individual, cultural differences also account for variations in
these resources. For example, life role values may be related to individualism and collectivism. Because collectivists are more group-oriented, they might on average put higher value on the family role. With respect to self-reliance, a personal resource that emerged from our focus groups, collectivists may have a greater tendency to be over dependents (i.e., rely on too many people and too much information), whereas individualists may tend more toward counter dependency (i.e., tendency to withdraw from social activity and work alone). In other words, it is possible that group-oriented collectivists may become even more dependent on others and that self-oriented individualists even more dependent on themselves.