

International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies

Research Article / Survey Paper / Case Study

Available online at: www.ijarcsms.com

Measuring Work-life Balance in India

Dr. Smita Singh

Institute of Management Sciences

University of Lucknow

Lucknow – India

Abstract: The present study strives to develop a reliable and valid scale to measure the work/life balance among the working professionals in north India. The data collected from a sample of 114 service sector professionals, on analysis, resulted in a 24-item scale with Cronbach alpha value 0.908 and the reliability of subscales ranging from 0.968 to 0.798. The validated instrument comprises of four dimensions operationalised as Work Spillover in Personal Life, Personal Life Spillover in Work, Work/Life Behavioural Enhancers and Work/Life Behavioural Constrainters. The construct validity of the scale is provided by means of content, convergent and discriminant validity. Lastly, the paper discusses the issues of applicability of the scale.

Keywords: scale development, spillover, work/life balance, work/life conflict.

I. INTRODUCTION

The term work/life Balance coined in 1986 in USA, has evolved around the idea of balancing work, life and family responsibilities. The interlinked concepts of work/life balance, work/family balance, work/life conflict, work/family conflict have gained prominence in the recent years due to the changes in the society and the workplace. The stereotype of the male breadwinner is no longer relevant as more and more women are venturing out to work and support the family (Charlesworth *et al*, 2002; Rajadhyaksha and Bhatnagar, 2000). With workplaces becoming more gender balanced (Bardeol *et al*, 2000), the ‘degendered’ workplace, ‘equally cohabited by men and women’ (Zetlin and Whitehouse, 1998), is exploring Work/life Balance and Work/life Conflict as conditions equally applicable to both men and women. Research on work/life conflict has reported the variable has influencing job satisfaction, turnover, organisation commitment and absenteeism (Frone, Russell, and Cooper, 1992; Higgins, Duxbury, and Irving, 1992; Parasuraman *et al* Greenhaus, Rabinowitz, Bedeian, and Mossholder, 1989)., thus, making it a much investigated and relevant topic for behavioural research. The term has three vital components – ‘work’, ‘life’ and ‘balance’. In simple terms, “work” is normally conceived of in this context as including paid employment while “life” includes activities outside work. According to Skinner and Pocock (2008), ‘life’ activities outside the domain of paid work include, family, friends and community, thus, subsuming ‘family’ issues. The term ‘balance’ too, lends itself to a variety of meanings. Clark (2000) defines balance as “satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home with a minimum of role conflict”. A simplistic definition of balance may be “sufficient time to meet commitments at both home and work”.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

It is only in the recent years that the term ‘work/life Balance’ has replaced the term ‘Work/family Balance,’ which was in use earlier. The term work/life now extends to include other life activities like study, exercise, community work, hobbies, care of elderly as well and not just the care of dependent children as was recognised under the term ‘work/family.’ Similarly, the concept of family has broadened to encompass extended families, shared parenting, single parent families and a wide range of social support networks and communities. According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), ‘work/life balance is out of kilter when the pressures from one role make it difficult to comply with the demands of the other leading to work/life conflict.’ Defined as ‘a form of interrole conflict’ wherein pressures from the work and family domain are mutually incompatible (Frone, 2003).

Work/life Conflict has traditionally been measured uni-directionally (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). However, the researchers, have now started recognising Work/life Conflict as a bi-directional concept viz. work interference with family and family interference with work (Duxbury, Higgins, and Mills, 1992; Frone *et al*, 1992; Gutek, Searle, and Klepa, 1991). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) identify three forms of work– family conflict (a) time-based conflict, (b) strain-based conflict, and (c) behavior-based conflict, which Gutek *et al* argued, as each having two directions viz. (1) time-based WIF, (2) time-based FIW, (3) strain-based WIF, (4) strain-based FIW, (5) behavior-based WIF, and (6) behavior-based FIW. Time-based conflict occurs when time devoted to one role makes it difficult to participate in another role, strain-based conflict suggests that strain experienced in one role intrudes into and interferes with participation in another role, and behavior-based conflict occurs when specific behaviours required in one role are incompatible with behavioral expectation in another role (Greenhaus and Beutell, 1985). Notwithstanding the bi-directional nature of the construct, research provides evidence to support the conceptualization that work-family and family/work conflict were relatively unique constructs (Ford, Heinen and Langkamer, 2007; Hennessy and Lent, 2008) which need to be explored in their own right.

The second part of work/life conflict relates to the set of theories that focus on the interface between work and family. Further there have been studies focussing on facilitation relationship between work and family domains. It has been termed as positive work-family spillover (Almeida, *et al*, 2002; Crouter, 1984) or work-family enhancement (Barnett, 1998; Voydanoff, 2002). Work-family facilitation is defined as ‘the extent to which participation at work (or at home) is made easier by virtue of the experiences, skills and opportunities gained or developed at home (or work)’ (Frone, 2003, p. 145).

Among the factors affecting work/life balance, excessive time spent at work, schedule conflicts and fatigue (Ahmad, 1996), perceived effects of job demands, participation in home duties, relationship with spouse and involvement in social activities (Bedeian *et al*, 1988), ambiguity about norms, overload of role obligations, low rewards for role conformity (Duxbury and Higgins, 1991, 1992), structural and emotional interference (Jackson *et al*, 1985) and role overload, job/person conflict, job/family conflict and family/job conflict (Wiley, 1987) were identified. This study adapted the measures of time, strain and behaviour based dimensions from some of the most widely used scales viz. time and strain based conflict items (Kopelman *et al*, 1983; Frone *et al*, 1992; Gutek *et al*, 1991).

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Need for the Study

Work/life balance is gradually becoming a major issue in India. This qualitative study focuses on developing a scale for measuring work/life balance of professionals, keeping in mind their highly challenging and insecure job profile and the need for measuring their work/life balance.

The concept of work/life conflict and work/family conflict were developed in the West and has been studied quite vigorously in Western countries (Greenhaus, and Beutell, 1985; Frone, 2000; Frone *et al*, 1997; Thomas and Ganster, 1995, Higgins, and Duxbury, 2001; Kossek and Ozeki, 1998; Gutek, Searle, and Klepa, 1992). However, there is a notable lack of information on the concept in Eastern countries (Wesley and Muthuswamy, 2005) and whatever studies have been undertaken in the area of work/life balance and work/life conflict in India, are characterised by a glaring and distinct lack of focus (Rajadhyaksha and Smita, 2004). It is noted that issues of interdependence and encroachment of work family domains on each other are not confined to western countries like USA and Canada alone (Lewis *et al*, 1992), there is a need to explore it in other countries as well. The differences in attitudes, values and behaviours between the employees in west and those belonging to the countries in the East is very much evident (Black and Porter, 1991; Ralston *et al*, 1993), making it imperative to study the work/family constructs from the point of view of emerging economies like India, where the institution of family is very strong and where of late women participation in professional sphere is on the rise (Chandra, 2010).

Studies in India as well as in neighbouring countries have primarily depended upon foreign scales for evaluating work/life conflict and work/life balance. Bhargava, S. and Baral, R. (2009) in their study on the 'Antecedents and Consequences of Work-Family Enrichment among Indian Managers' and Rajadhyaksha, U. and Velgach, S. (2000), for their study 'Gender, Gender Role Ideology and Work Family Conflict in India' have used items from the Carlson, Kacmar and Williams (2000) measure on Work-to-Family Enrichment and Family-to-Work Enrichment to ascertain work/family conflict. Similarly, Noor, S. and Maad, N. (2008) in their study of Work Life Conflict, Stress and Turnover Intentions among Marketing Executives in Pakistan, Ahmad's 1998 on Gender Differences in the Boundary Permeability between Work and Family Roles and Malhotra and Sachdeva (2005) for Social Roles and Role Conflict: An Inter-professional Study among Women, have all used scales developed and validated outside India. Hence, it was felt that a scale measuring work/life balance in context with the Indian perceptions and setting was much needed. The authors have come across just one scale measuring work/life balance constructed in Indian setting post liberalisation and globalisation of the Indian economy. Wesley, J. R. and Muthuswamy, P. R. (2005) developed a Work-Family Conflict scale with five items each for Work Family Conflict and Family Work Conflict. Their population for study was teaching faculty at self-financing engineering colleges in Coimbatore, India. The study concentrated on work interference with life and life interference with work and does not include the Behavioural component that is included in the present scale.

The gaps identified above necessitated undertaking the present study on work/life conflict. The study examines a bi-directional work/life construct in the Indian context. After completing the literature review, an empirical study was undertaken aimed at developing and validating a scale for measuring work/life balance among professionals working in India..

B. Item Generation

The study focuses on understanding the work/life related issues for working professionals. Thus, focused group discussions were held with randomly chosen employees drawn from four areas, viz. 10 managerial level employees of a private sector company, 12 academicians, 7 social sector professionals and 15 public sector employees to identify factors considered relevant to Work/Life Balance by professionals working in the city of Lucknow, India. Each focussed group lasted for an average of 60 minutes and yielded a list of about 100 variables which were thought to impact Work/Life Balance. This list was subjected to further screening and refinement through in-depth discussions with Human Resource practitioners and industry experts and an item pool of 45 items was constructed, constituting the WLB dimensions. A posteriori the choice of factors seemed pretty similar to those proposed in writings on Work/Life Balance.

C. Sampling

As the population of professionals is infinite, purposeful sampling (Yin 1994) was used. The study was conducted in North India and the sample was drawn from five sectors namely, banking, insurance, education, public health and telecommunications by non probability convenience sampling based on sampling strategies described by Patton (Pg. 169-186; 1990). 4 banks, 3 insurance firms, 5 educational institutions, 1 public health research organisation and 2 telecommunications firms, all in North India, were covered. A deliberate attempt was made to represent different age groups as also to include respondents from different vocations, both public and private sector undertakings as well as full and part-time work status, so as to reduce systematic bias in sampling, the other aim being to enhance the generalisability of results (Young, 1993).

A total of 250 questionnaires were personally administered and of these 228 were found fit for analysis as they were complete in all respects. The entire sample, thus, represents banks professionals (n=50), insurance firms (n=44), 5 educational institutions (n=50), 1 public health research organisation (n=40) and 2 telecommunications (n=44). Post data collection, it was cross checked for double entries and missing responses, a master chart prepared and fed into Excel sheets. It was further prepared for analysis by coding and analysed using SPSS 19.0. The demographic profile of the respondents is given in table 1.

TABLE I
Demographic profile of respondents (WLB scale development)

Variable	N= 228	Percent age
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	150	65.8
Female	78	34.2
<i>Marital Status</i>		
Single	55	21.9
Married	174	76.3
Divorcee/Widowed	4	1.8
<i>Educational Status</i>		
Graduate	08	3.5
Post Graduate	44	19.3
Professional/Doctorate	176	77.2
<i>Type of Organisation</i>		
Private sector	120	52.6
Public sector	108	47.4
<i>Work status</i>		
Full time	208	91.2
Part-time	20	8.8

D. Data Reduction

Factor Analysis was done to identify the underlying factors and to group the constructs into manageable factors. Since, the appropriateness of data for factor analysis needs to be established, the sampling adequacy test was performed through Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic. Table II provides the SPSS output of data for factor analysis. Since, KMO values greater than 0.6 is considered as adequate (Kaiser and Rice, 1974), hence, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy with value of 0.801 was acceptable. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (3752.653, df. 276, Sig.0.00) show that the values are significant and hence, acceptable implying that non-zero correlations existed at the significance level of 0.000, it provided an adequate basis for proceeding with the factor analysis.

TABLE II
KMO and Bartlett's Test results for work/life balance scale for professionals in India

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.822
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3582.408
	Df	276
	Sig.	0.000

The Principle Components method for extraction was employed with the Varimax Rotation with Kaiser Normalisation. The rotation converged in six iterations, and factors with Eigen values greater than one were retained (Hair et al, 2009). Further, in order to assess the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, the communalities derived from the factor analysis were reviewed. These were all relatively large (greater than 0.5, falling in the range 0.650 to 0.915), suggesting that the data set is appropriate (Stewart, 1981). This final version having twenty four items was finalised for the scale (Table III). It has three items which were reverse scored during data interpretation. To interpret the factors and construct the final version, only those variables having a loading at least 0.55 on a single factor were considered. Factor loadings of 0.55 or greater are "Practically significant" for sample size 100. (Hair et al, 2009, Pg 152).

IV. CONSTRUCTION OF SCALE

The screening test extracted four factors with Eigen values greater than 1 ranging from 1.511 to 10.628, which shows the importance of each factor and their relative explanatory power. These four factors accounted for 79.947 percent of the total variance.

These are operationalised as:

Factor 1 – Work Spillover in Personal Life (WSPL),

Factor 2 – Personal Life Spillover in Work (PLSW),

Factor 3 – Work/Life Balance Enhancers (WLBE) and

Factor 4 – Work/Life Balance Constrainers (WLBC).

The first factor included 13 items relating to Work Spillover in Personal life namely job interference in personal life, neglect of personal life/duties due to work related duties, personal/family time being infringed upon by work responsibilities.

The second group, with 5 items, related to Personal Life Spillover in Work namely demands of personal life interfering with work-related activities, having to postpone things at work because of demands on time at home, inability to do things at work because of the demands of one's personal life and family related strain precluding proper discharge of work responsibilities.

The third factor Work/Life Balance Enhancers had three items loading on it, namely, the problem solving approach used at job also being effective in resolving problems at home, things proving effective at work also helping one be a better parent and spouse.

The fourth factor, Work/Life Balance Constrainers had significant loadings of 3 items such as behavioural response to interpersonal problems, behavioural effectiveness and inability to behave in the same manner at home as well as workplace.

TABLE III
Component loadings after Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalisation for WLB Measurement Scale.

Component loadings after Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalisation for Work/Life Balance Measurement Scale Subscale/Items	Factor			
	I	II	III	IV
Work Spillover in Personal Life (WSPL)				
Work demands interfere with personal life	0.934	0.093	0.141	- 0.045
Work keeps one away from family more than liked.	0.918	- 0.162	- 0.109	0.083
Rushed in doing the job	0.910	0.082	0.076	- 0.059
Time taken by job makes it difficult to fulfil family obligations	0.900	- 0.142	0.129	0.127
Work takes up time meant to be spent with family.	0.874	- 0.139	- 0.004	0.115
Personal chores cannot be done due to job demands	0.867	0.096	0.165	0.201
Job duties force changes in plans for family activities.	0.832	0.247	- 0.012	0.161
Job related strain leads to changes in family activities.	0.821	0.149	0.271	0.184
There is no time to finish job	0.796	0.240	0.224	- 0.016
The strain of attempting to balance responsibilities at work and home is often felt	0.734	- 0.173	- 0.028	0.419
Work demands lead to irritability in personal life.	0.674	- 0.124	0.411	0.526
The tension of balancing responsibilities at home and work often result in feeling emotionally drained.	0.663	- 0.143	0.257	0.512
Job demands make it difficult to maintain the kind of relationship with spouse and children/ family as one would like	0.644	- 0.182	0.433	0.479
Personal Life Spillover in Work (PLSW)				
Official work cannot be completed due to family demands.	0.168	0.867	0.284	- 0.066
Home life interferes with responsibilities at work.	- 0.060	0.866	- 0.175	0.128
Put off things at work due to family demands on time.	0.089	0.861	- 0.005	- 0.148
Family related strain interferes with job related duties.	- 0.118	0.812	- 0.194	0.103

The demands of family or spouse/partner interfere with work-related activities.	0.007	0.787	0.203	- 0.082
Work/Life Balance Enhancers (WLBE)				
The things that make one effective at work also help in being a better parent and spouse	- 0.090	- 0.092	- 0.946	- 0.087
What works at home seems to be effective at work as well and vice-versa	- 0.261	- 0.115	- 0.883	- 0.198
The problem solving approach used in job is equally effective in resolving problems at home	0.007	0.125	- 0.738	- 0.300
Work/Life Balance Constrainers (WLBC)				
Behaviour effective at work is counter-productive at home	- 0.045	0.009	0.069	0.903
The response to interpersonal problems at work and home is different from each other.	0.319	- 0.053	0.332	0.751
It is not possible to act similarly at home as at work	0.283	0.126	0.355	0.558
Eigen value of the factor	10.62	3.963	3.085	1.511
Percent of variance explained by the factor before rotation	44.28	16.51	12.85	6.296
Percent of variance explained by the factor after rotation	37.61	16.28	13.65	12.39

All four factors were used to constitute the subscales and analysed. The results are shown in Table III. The four factors combined explained 79.95 percent of variance both before and after rotation.

A. Reliability

Reliability of the Work/Life Balance scale and the constituent subscales was estimated by analyses of internal consistency and Cronbach alpha coefficient (Cronbach 1951). The scale reliability is fairly good at 0.908, with subscale reliability of 0.968 for subscale I (WSPL), 0.898 for subscale II (PLSW), 0.883 for subscale III (WLBE) and 0.798 for subscale IV (WLBC). For a measure to be acceptable, coefficient alpha should be above 0.7 (Nunnally 1978). Hence, the reliability of the scale comes out to be quite good and above the acceptable value (Table IV).

TABLE IV

Description and reliability analysis of subscales for Work/Life Balance Measurement Scale.

Statistics	Subscale			
	WSPL	PLSW	WLBE	WLBC
Number of items	13	5	3	3
Mean	4.049	2.333	4.646	4.327
Variance	3.131	1.232	1.405	1.282
Cronbach's Alpha (Scale reliability = 0.908)	0.968	0.898	0.883	0.798
Lowest inter-item correlation	0.420	0.524	0.609	0.418
Highest inter-item correlation	0.934	0.730	0.911	0.706

WSPL=Work Spillover in Personal Life, PLSW=Personal Life Spillover in Work,
WLBE=Work/Life Balance Enhancers, WLBC=Work/Life Balance Constrainers.

B. Validity

1) *Convergent Validity*: Fornell and Larcker (1981) proposed three procedures to assess the convergent validity of a set of measurement items in relation to their corresponding constructs. These are (1) item reliability of each measure, (2) composite reliability of each construct and (3) the average variance extracted. The item reliability of an item was assessed by its factor loading onto the underlying construct. Hair et al., (2009) suggested that an item is significant if its factor loading is greater than 0.50. As shown in table III, the Eigen values of all constructs exceeded 1.00 and the percent of cumulative variance explained by these four constructs was 79.947%. The factor loadings of all the items in the measure ranged from 0.644 to 0.946. This exceeds the threshold set by Hair et al., (2009) and demonstrates convergent validity at the item level. The composite reliability of each construct was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Nunnally (1978), Robinson et al., (1991) and DeVellis (2003) suggested that an alpha value of .70 should be considered an acceptable measure of reliability. As shown in table IV, the reliabilities of all

the constructs range from 0.798 to 0.968 and is well within the range suggested by Nunally (1978), Robinson *et al.*, (1991) and DeVellis (2003).

The final indicator of convergent validity, average variance extracted, is a more conservative test of convergent validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). It measures the amount of variance captured by the construct in relation to the amount of variance attributable to measurement error. Convergent validity is judged to be adequate when average variance extracted equals or exceeds 0.50 (i.e. when the variance captured by the construct exceeds the variance due to measurement error). As shown in Table V, the convergent validity for the proposed constructs of the research model is adequate as the AVE for each of the Work/Life Balance sub-scales is more than 0.5, indicating an adequate convergent validity.

2) *Discriminant Validity* : Discriminant validity is assessed to measure the extent to which constructs are different. At the item level, Barclay *et al.*, (1995) suggested that discriminant validity is present when an item correlates more highly with items in the construct it intends to measure than with items belonging to other constructs. In this study, an acceptable level of discriminant validity at the item level was found. At the construct level, discriminant validity is considered adequate when the variance shared between a construct and any other construct in the model is less than the variance that construct shares with its measures (Fornell *et al.*, 1982). The variance shared by any two constructs is obtained by squaring the correlation between the two constructs. The variance shared between a construct and its measures corresponds to average variance extracted. Discriminant validity was assessed by comparing the square root of the average variance extracted for a given construct with the correlations between that construct and all other constructs. Table V shows the correlation matrix for the constructs. The diagonal elements have been replaced by the square roots of the average variance extracted. For discriminant validity to be judged adequate, these diagonal elements should be greater than the off-diagonal elements in the corresponding rows and columns. Discriminant validity appears satisfactory at the construct level in the case of all constructs. This indicates that each construct shared more variance with its items than it does with other constructs. Having achieved discriminant validity at both the item and construct levels, the constructs in the proposed research model are deemed to be adequate.

TABLE V
Inter-construct correlation matrix* and AVE for WLB scale

	WSPL	PLSW	WLBE	WLBC
WSPL	(.819)			
PLSW	0.011	(.839)		
WLBE	-0.340	-0.051	(.860)	
WLBC	0.457	0.004	-0.485	(.751)

* = $p < .01$;

Diagonal in parantheses: square root of average variance extracted from observed variables (items);
Off-diagonal: correlation between constructs.

V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Guttek *et al* (1991) identified a total of six dimensions of work/life conflict, which were used by Carlson *et al* (2000) to construct a scale for measuring all the six dimensions. The other existing scales (Frone *et al*, 1992, Netemeyer *et al*, 1996, Guttek *et al*, 1991) are other frequently used work/life scales, which have been constructed and validated outside India. Studies conducted in India have primarily been theoretical in nature (Rajadhyakasha and Smita, 2004; Prasad 2006; Chandra 2010) or have made use of scales developed in the West. The construct of work/life conflict developed in Western countries has a majority of studies conducted there itself with only a few noteworthy studies conducted in the East. These, too, have been in China and Hong Kong. Therefore, there is a dearth of reliable work/family and work/life constructs in countries 'where family as an institution is very strong and female participation in on the rise' (Wesley and Muthuswamy, 2005). These six dimensions provide a comprehensive measure of work/life conflict and hence, should ideally be a part of any scales designed for measuring the same.

The present study deals with all the six dimensions investigated in the Indian context integrated within the Work Spillover in Personal life and Personal life Spillover in Work. Work Spillover in Personal Life has the two dimensions of time (work

interference with personal life) and strain (work interference with personal life) based conflict built into the sub-scale. Similarly, the time (Personal life interference with work) and strain (Personal life interference with work) based conflict items are present within the Personal Life Spillover in Work sub-scale. reason for avoiding the term interference is intentional. The spill over can be both, either positive or negative in nature, hence, can either lead to enhancement or serve as constrainers.

Differences and similarities between the scale developed in this study and that developed by Pleck (1979), Burke (1980), Bohlen and Viveros-Long (1981), Kopelman (1983), Burley (1989), Gutek et al (1991), Netemeyer et al (1996) and (Carlson, 2000) was undertaken. Burke, Weir and DuWors (1980), Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connely (1983), Bohlen and Viveros-Long (1981) and Pleck (1979) constructed scales incorporating items that measured work/family conflict in general, failing to distinguish between work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict. Kopelman, Greenhaus and Connely (1983) gave a scale with eight items to assess the extent of interrole conflict occurring between work and family roles. This work/family scale does not distinguish between work to family interference nor between family to work interference, it is a general scale for measuring work/family conflict as a whole and does not discriminate between time, strain and behaviour based conflict. Gutek, Searle and Klepa (1991) developed a measure that uses a total of eight items of which four measure work demand interference with family responsibilities and the other four measure the extent to which family demands interfere with work responsibilities, without distinguishing between time, strain and behavioural conflicts. The Work/Family Conflict and Family/Work Conflict scale of Netemeyer et al (1996) while using separate sub-scales to measure bi-directional conflict again fails to distinguish between time, strain and behaviour based conflict.

The scale developed in the current study has items measuring both time and strain based conflict. Further behaviour based conflict is also taken into account. While on one hand some of the scales developed outside India (Carlson, et al, 2000) have given separate sub-scales for time (FIW), time (WIF), strain (FIW), strain (WIF), behaviour (FIW) and behaviour (WIF), the current scale does not have separate sub-scales for time and strain. This can be treated as being unique to the Indian setting. While items for both time (FIW), time (WIF), strain (FIW), strain (WIF) were included, both time (FIW), and strain (FIW) loaded on one factor, which was subsequently named as Personal Life Spillover on Work (PLSW) and similarly items for time (WIF) and strain (WIF) loaded on together on the factor named as Work Spillover in Personal Life (WSPL). The behaviour based conflict when explored during focussed group discussions came out more in terms of either enhancing or constraining the work/life effectiveness of the individual. Hence, instead of considering it as a behaviour based conflict, the factors with significant loadings of behavioural conflict items were identified as Work/Life Behavioural Constrainers (WLBC) and Work/Life Behavioural Enhancers (WLBE).

Implications for constructing a scale and studying work/life conflict stem from the impact it has on job satisfaction and productivity. Workplace stress has been identified as a major contributing factor to a wide range of adverse behaviours, including increased cigarette smoking, the abuse of alcohol and other drugs, accident proneness, violent behaviour, and eating disorders (Quick et al, 1997). Very little research has been done specifically on the behavioural consequences of work-life conflict, but work by Frone, Russell and Cooper (1993; 1997) has strongly suggested a connection with increased alcohol consumption. Given the persistent, and often irreconcilable, time demands of the work and family roles, it is not surprising that work-life conflict has been shown to be a significant contributor to depressed mood (Duxbury et al, 1991; Frone, Russell, and Cooper, 1992; Frone, Russell, and Cooper, 1997; Higgins et al, 1992; Thomas and Ganster, 1995). Control over the work-family interface has been shown to significantly reduce the likelihood of symptoms of depression. (Thomas and Ganster, 1995). It has also been observed that improvements in the quality of work-life (e.g., increased work-time or work-location flexibility) will produce corresponding improvements in the quality of life as it makes it easier for employees to reduce the strains of managing the modern family (Duxbury and Higgins, 1998). Generally, the research has supported these contentions. High work-life conflict has consistently been associated with a reduction in overall life satisfaction (Aryee, 1992; Duxbury and Higgins, 1998;

Rice, Frone and McFarlin, 1992). Hence, arises the importance of studying the work/life conflict and designing a scale for measuring the same.

VI. CONCLUSION

Work/life balance is an emergent issue in the expanding Indian economy. Achieving a good balance between work and family commitments is a growing concern for contemporary employees and organisations. There is now mounting evidence-linking work–life imbalance to reduced health and wellbeing among individuals and families. It is not surprising then that there is increasing interest among organisational stakeholders (e.g. CEOs, HR directors) for introducing work–life balance policies in their organisations (Nath and Patra, 2010). According to Rajadhyaksha and Smita (2004), work and family research in India appears to have followed two separate and disconnected paths. One is the route charted out by women’s studies centres that has looked at structures of patriarchy within the country and how these contribute to the subordination of women at work and at home. Their focus has been on rural and underprivileged women. The other path of psychosocial research conducted from a role theory perspective has largely examined work and family relations within urban settings. There has been little cross-pollination between these two streams marked by lack of cross-references in published research studies. Further, research in the area of Management, where it is most needed, has been sparse and lacking in depth. The current study aims at filling up this gap.

Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge the patronage of Dr. Ritu Narang, my Doctoral guide at the Department of Business Administration, University of Lucknow. Dr. Narang inspires through her own hard work and her attitude to succeed against all odds.

References

1. G.A. Adams, L. A. King, and D.W. King, ‘Relationships between job and family involvement, family social support, and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1996, Vol. 81(4), pp. 411-420.
2. A. Ahmad, Work-family conflict among married professional women in Malaysia, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 1996, Vol. 136(5), pp. 663-665.
3. A. Ahmad, Gender Differences in the Boundary Permeability between Work and Family Roles, *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity*, 1998, Vol. 6(1), pp. 43-49.
4. S. Aryee, V. Luk, A. Leung, and S. Lo, “Role stressors, work-family conflict and well-being: an examination of the effects of spouse support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong-Kong,” *Academy of Management Proceedings 1998*, San Diego.
5. A. G. Bedeian, B. G. Burke, and R. G. Moffett, Outcomes of work-family conflict among married male and female professionals, *Journal of Management*, 1988, Vol. 14 (3), pp. 475-491.
6. S. Bhargava, and R. Baral, Antecedents and Consequences of Work-Family Enrichment among Indian Managers, *Psychological Studies*, 2009, Vol. 54, pp. 213-225.
7. S. L. Boyar, J. C. Carr, D.C. Mosley, Jr., and C. M. Carson, The Development and Validation of Scores on Perceived Work and Family Demand Scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 2007, Vol. 67, pp. 100-113
8. K. A. Burley, Family variables as mediators of relationship between work/family conflict and marital adjustment among dual career men and women *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1995, Vol. 135 (4), pp. 483-497.
9. V. Chandra, Women and Work-Family Interface: Indian Context, *Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 2010, Vol. 1(2), pp. 235-258.
10. R. K. Chiu, Relationships among role conflict, role satisfactions and life satisfaction: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 1998, Vol. 26, pp. 409-414.
11. R. G. Cinamon, A. Weisel, and K. Tzuk, Work_Family Conflict Within the Family: Crossover Effects, Perceived Parent_ Child Interaction Quality, Parental Self-Efficacy, and Life Role Attributions, *Journal of Career Development*, 2007, Vol. 34, pp. 79-85.
12. M. C. Clarke, L.C. Koch, and E. Jeffrey Hill, The Work-Family Interface: Differentiating Balance and Fit, *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 2004, Vol. 33(2), pp. 121-140
13. L. E. Duxbury, and C. A. Higgins, “Work-Life Balance in the New Millennium: Where Are We? Where Do We Need to Go?,” 2001, Work Network, Canadian Policy Research Networks, Inc.
14. L. E. Duxbury, and C. A. Higgins, Gender differences in work-family conflict, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1991, Vol. 76 (1), pp. 60-74.
15. M. T. Ford, B. A. Heinen, and K. L. Langkamer, Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2007, Vol. 92, pp. 57-80.
16. C. Fornell and D. F. Larcker (1981), Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 1981, Vol. 18(1), pp. 39-50.

17. M. R. Frone, 'Work-family balance' In: J. C. Quick and L. E. Tertrick (eds.) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*. Washington, D.C: American Psychology Association, 2003, pp. 143-162.
18. M. R. Frone, M. Russell, and M. L. Cooper, Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: testing a model of the work-family interface, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1992a, Vol. 77 (1), pp. 65-78.
19. M. R. Frone, M. Russell, and M. L. Cooper, Prevalence of work-family conflict: are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable?, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1992b, Vol. 13 (7), pp. 723-729.
20. S. A. E. Geurts, M. A. J. Kompier, S. Roxburgh, and L. L. Houtman, Does work-home interference mediate relationship between workload and well-being?, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 2003, Vol. 63 (3), pp. 532-559.
21. S. J. Goff, M. K. Mount, and R. L. Jamison, Employer supported child care, work-family conflict and absenteeism: a field study, *Personnel Psychology*, 1990, Vol. 43, pp. 793-809.
22. J. H. Greenhaus, and G. Powell, When Work and Family are allies: A Theory of Work and Family Enrichment, *Academy of Management Review*, 2006, Vol. 31(1), pp. 79.
23. J. H. Greenhaus, and N. J. Beutell, 'Organizational and Family Social Support and Work-Family Conflict', *Academy of Management Journal*, 1985, Vol. 10, pp. 76-88.
24. B. A. Gutek, S. Searle, and L. Klepa, Rational versus gender role explanations for Work-family conflict, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1991, Vol. 76 (4), pp. 560-568.
25. J. F. Hair, W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, R. E. Anderson, and R. L. Tatham, *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Pearson Education, 6ed. 2009.
26. K. D. Hennessy, and R. W. Lent, Self-Efficacy for Managing work--Family Conflict : Validating the English Language Version of a Hebrew Scale, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 2008, Vol. 16, pp. 370-384
27. C. A. Higgins, and L. E. Duxbury, Work-family conflict: a comparison of dual career and traditional career men, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1992, Vol. 13(4), pp. 389-411.
28. T. A. Judge, J. W. Boudreau, and R. D. Bretz Jr., Job and life attitudes of male executives, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1994, Vol. 79(5), pp. 767-782.
29. S. Malhotra, and S. Sachdeva, 'Social Roles and Role Conflict: An Interprofessional Study among Women', *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 2005, Vol. 31(1-2), pp. 37-42.
30. R. G. Netemeyer, J. S. Boles, and R. McMurrian, Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1996, Vol. 81(4), pp. 400-410.
31. S. Noor, and N. Maad, 'Examining the Relationship between Work Life Conflict, Stress And Turnover Intentions among Marketing Executives in Pakistan', *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2008, Vol. 3(11), <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijbm/article/viewFile/958/927>, accessed 7 October 2010.
32. S. Parasuraman, and J. H. Greenhaus, Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research, *Human Resource Management Review*, 2002, Vol. 12, pp. 299-312.
33. G. Prasad, *The Great Indian Family: New Roles, Old Responsibilities*. India: Penguin, 2006.
34. U. Rajadhyaksha, and S. Velgach, 'Gender, Gender Role Ideology and Work Family Conflict in India', *AOM Papers*, 2000, http://www.workfamilyconflict.ca/cms/documents/38/GRI_paper-AOM2009.pdf accessed 7 November 2010.
35. U. Rajadhyaksha, and S. Smita, 'Tracing a Timeline for Work and Family Research in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2004, Vol. 24(2), pp.1674-1680.
36. R. W. Rice, M. R. Frone, and D. B. McFarlin, Work-non-work conflict and the perceived quality of life, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 1992, Vol. 13(2), pp. 155-168.
37. M. Rosenbaum, and E. Cohen, Equalitarian marriages, spousal support, resourcefulness, and psychological distress among Israeli working women, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 1999, Vol. 54, pp. 102-113.
38. N. Skinner, and B. Pocock, Work-life conflict: Is work time or work overload more important?, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 2008, Vol. 46(3), pp. 303-315
39. J. R. R. Wesley, and P. R. Muthuswamy, Work-Family Conflict in India – An Empirical Study, *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, October-December 2005
40. K. Williams and G. M. Alliger, Role stressors, mood spill-over, and perceptions of work-family conflict in employed parents, *Academy of Management Journal*, 1994, Vol. 37(4), pp. 837-868.

AUTHOR(S) PROFILE



Dr. Smita Singh, received her PGDBA (Major-Human Resource and Minor-Marketing) from Jaipuria Institute of Management in 1999 and thereafter completed her M.A. in Anthropology with a specialization in Physical Anthropology from the University of Lucknow in 2002. Post this she was associated the Lucknow project center of the Johns Hopkins University as Human Resource Manager and Research Associate. Her PhD is in the area of Work-Life Balance from the Department of Business Administration, University of Lucknow. She is currently associated as faculty with the Institute of Management Sciences, University of Lucknow. As part of her research interests, she has presented and published papers in national as well as international conferences and journals, notable among these being the Cross-Cultural Conference at Kona (Hawaii) in December 2011 and getting the 6th position in the case study competition conducted by ISB-Ivey League in 2011.