International Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology

Connecting Researchers; Nurturing Innovations

IASET

A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG WORKING WOMEN IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT

V. P. T. DHEVIKA & O. T. V. LATASRI

Shrimati Indira Gandhi College Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

The main objectives of the study are to determine the factors affecting work-life balance and to find out the relationship between work-life balance and personal factors.. This study focuses on factors affecting the QWL of working women like stress, physical problem, relational problem, hangover, disturbed families decreased performance, physical problem and unethical practices. The sample consists of 150 respondents. Chi-square test, t-test and one-way ANNOVA were used to analyse the data.

KEYWORDS: Quality of Work Life, Working Women, Factors

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of globalization, the demands of workplace are ever-increasing and highly dynamic. Employees spend more time at the workplace rather than at home. Work-life balance can be defined as the perfect integration between work and life both not interfering with each other. In the current business world, people and organizations are working round the clock to meet the ever-growing demands. A slight delay in meeting the schedules or expectations is considered to be an organizational failure. To avoid delays and failures, employees are working hard and giving their heart and soul to achieve work-life balance which is creating an enormous pressure on them and hence they are forced to finish their jobs irrespective of time limit.

With the global labour market becoming highly competitive and companies outsourcing to reduce labour costs, employees feel compelled to put in longer hours to achieve, and preferably exceed, expectations to protect their jobs. As a result of this, the boundaries between work and home tend to get blurred. It is easy for work to invade the personal life making both work-life and personal life go out of balance. Thus, finding Work-Life Balance (WLB) in today's fast-paced world presents a major challenge to both employers and employees.

Statement of the Problem

The concept of work-life balance has gained considerable importance due to the demographic and sociological trends-changing employee perceptions of work, workforce diversity, changing role of men and women, and skill shortages. There has also been a considerable need felt for the introduction of the work-life practices by the organizations due to a shift in the interest of the employees from the extrinsic to intrinsic rewards. The demand for these practices is definitely increasing at an unprecedented rate.

With globalization being the buzzword, the employees are literally working 24*7 hours, particularly so in the BPOs, IT and other high-tech corporate, and this fact has steered the work-life balance issue into the forefront of the minds of many. The growth in technology has also made the implementation of work-life balance practices much easier by

making the work accessible, anytime and anywhere. The place and time of work is becoming more omnipresent as facilities like emails, voicemail, mobile phones and laptops have taken hold and have virtually made it possible for the employees to carry the work home. We are moving into a service-oriented economy that creates an ever-increasing demand and pressure on the workforce.

Though the work-life balance is an issue to be considered for both men and women, with the increasing participation of women workforce and with their domestic responsibilities towards child and elderly dependants, a major burden is placed on the employers' shoulders to take care of this section of the workforce. The working women are assuming more responsibilities than their male counterparts and with their participation in work increasing: there is a need for the organizations to come out with better work-life balance practices. This is one of the prime reasons why the organizations like IBM and Deloitte, the pioneering organizations in the work-life balance practices, introduced options like maternity leave, flexitime, and child-care facilities.

A trend which can be observed at the same point of time is the emergence of nuclear families and dual-career couples, which has made the focus of these practices been shifted to the men workforce as well. Interestingly, men are also talking about these issues in ways that were unimaginable less than 10 years ago and this is reflected in the way the companies are responding to their needs. Hence the study is made.

Objectives of the Study

- To determine the factors affecting work-life balance.

Hypothesis

- There is no significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

- There is no significant difference between occupation of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

- There is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

- There is no significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

- There is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Methodology

Pilot studies are conducted with a sample of 20 respondents. Both primary and secondary data are collected. Primary data are collected through questionnaire method and secondary data are collected through magazines, journal and internet. Convenient sampling methods are used based on the convenience of the respondents. Sample size consists of 150 respondents in Srirangam. Collected data are tabulated through SPSS and tools like t-test and f test are used in the study.

Table 1: Factors Influencing Quality of Work Life

Particulars	No. of Respondents (n=150)	Percentage (%)
1.Stress		
Low	84	56.0
High	66	44.0
Mean: 7.06 / Median: 7.00 / S.D.: 1.453 / Min.: 3 / Max.: 9		

Table 1: Contd.,		
2.Physical Problem		
Low	78	52.0
High	72	48.0
Mean: 19.52 / Median: 19.00 / S.D.: 6.871 / Min.:6 / Max.: 30		
3.Relational Problem		
Low	63	42.0
High	87	58.0
Mean: 9.20 / Median: 10.00 / S.D.: 2.773 / Min.:3 / Max.: 15		
4.Hangover		
Low	45	30.0
High	105	70.0
Mean: 8.74 / Median: 9.00 / S.D.: 1.859 / Min.:5 / Max.: 12		
5.Unethical Practices		
Low	93	62.0
High	57	38.0
Mean: 4.38 / Median: 4.00 / S.D.: 1.701 / Min.:2 / Max.: 9		
6.Disturbed Families		
Low	60	40.0
High	90	60.0
Mean: 5.88 / Median: 6.00 / S.D.: 1.687 / Min.:2 / Max.: 10		
7.Decreased Performance		
Low	84	56.0
High	66	44.0
Mean: 42.80 / Median: 42.00 / S.D.: 5.683 / Min.:34 / Max.: 55		
Overall QWL		
Low	66	44.0
High	84	56.0
Mean: 97.58 / Median: 99.00 / S.D.: 12.521 / Min.:70 / Max.: 124		

Table 1 shows that the most important factor influencing quality of work life is-"decreased performance" (mean = 42.80) followed by "physical problem"(mean=9.52) and "relational problem" (mean=9.20). The overall quality of work life is high with a mean value of 97.58

Table 2: T - Test Showing the Difference between Marital Status of the Respondents and Their Overall Quality of Work Life

Marital Status	Mean	S.D	Statistical Inference
1.Stress			
Married (n=108)	**7.11**	1.225	T=.690 Df=148
Unmarried (n=42)	6.93	1.930	.491>0.05 Not Significant
2.Physical Problem			
Married (n=108)	**19.72**	6.663	T=.577 Df=148
Unmarried (n=42)	19.00	7.438	.565>0.05 Not Significant
3.Relational Problem			
Married (n=108)	**9.53**	2.856	T=2.356 Df=148
Unmarried (n=42)	8.36	2.377	.020<0.05 Significant
4.Hangover			
Married (n=108)	**8.83**	1.827	.T=986 Df=148
Unmarried (n=42)	8.50	1.941	.326>0.05 Not Significant
5.Unethical Practices			
Married (n=108)	**4.42**	1.870	T=.422 Df=148

Unmarried (n=42)	4.29	1.175	.674>0.05 Not Significant	
6.Disturbed Families				
Married (n=108)	**6.17**	1.732	T=3.459 Df=148 .001<0.05 Significant	
Unmarried (n=42)	5.14	1.317		
7.Decreased Performance				
Married (n=108)	**43.89**	5.971	T=3.942 Df=148 .000<0.05 Significant	
Unmarried (n=42)	40.00	3.629		
Overall QWL				
Married (n=108)	**99.67**	12.407	T=3.386 Df=148 .001<0.05 Significant	
Unmarried (n=42)	92.21	11.272		

Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is less than table value (.001<0.05). So null hypothesis is rejected Table also shows that factors influencing QWL is high for married respondents than unmarried respondents.

There is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Table 3: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Occupation of the Respondents and their Overall Quality of Work Life

Occupation	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
.Stress						
Between Groups			1.736	2	.868	F=.408 .666>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	**7.15**	.779				
Private Employee (n=102)	7.06	1.501				
Part-time employees (n=9)	6.67	2.784				
Within Groups			312.724	147	2.127	
.Physical Problem						
Between Groups			22.121	2	11.060	F=.232 .793>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	**19.62**	4.875				
Private Employee (n=102)	19.02	7.206				
Part-time employees (n=9)	18.00	10.392				
Within Groups			7011.319	147	47.696	
Relational Problem						
Between Groups			46.781	2	23.390	F=3.128 .047<0.05 Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	9.31	2.764				
Private Employee (n=102)	8.97	2.719				
Others (n=9)	**11.33**	2.784				
Within Groups			1099.219	147	7.478	
.Hangover						
Between Groups			3.376	2	1.688	F=.485 .617>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	8.69	2.226				
Private Employee (n=102)	8.71	1.783				
Part-time employees (n=9)	**9.33**	.500				
Within Groups			511.484	147	3.479	
Unethical Practices						
Between Groups			3.005	2	1.503	F=.516 .598>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	4.23	2.071				
Private Employee (n=102)	**4.47**	1.603				
Part-time employees (n=9)	4.00	.866				
Within Groups			428.335	147	2.914	
Disturbed Families						

	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
Between Groups			12.093	2	6.047	F=2.159 .119>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	**6.23**	1.327				
Private Employee (n=102)	5.82	1.799				
Part-time employees (n=9)	5.00	1.500				
Within Groups			411.747	147	2.801	
Decreased Performance						
Between Groups			84.455	2	42.227	F=1.313 .272>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	41.54	5.529				
Private Employee (n=102)	**43.26**	5.565				
Part-time employees (n=9)	43.00	7.399				
Within Groups			4727.545	147	32.160	
Overall QWL						
Between Groups			37.411	2	18.706	F=.118 .889>0.05 Not Significant
Govt. Employee (n=39)	96.77	10.589				
Private Employee (n=102)	**97.91**	13.691				
Part-time employees (n=9)	97.33	4.000				
Within Groups			23321.129	147	158.647	

Table 3 shows that there is no significant difference between occupation of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value (p = .889>0.05). So the null hypothesis accepted. Table also shows that for government employee, stress (mean=7.15), physical problem (mean=19.62) and disturbed families (mean=6.23) are high. Whereas unethical practices (mean=4.47) and decreased performance are high for private employees. Relational problem (mean=11.33) hangover (mean=9.33) are high for part-time employees.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Income of the Respondents and their Overall Quality of Work Life

Income	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
Stress						
Between Groups			.460	3	.153	F=.071 .975>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	7.00	1.530				
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	7.08	1.461				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	7.00	1.532				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	**7.13**	1.378				
Within Groups			314.000	146	2.151	
Physical Problem						
Between Groups			35.842	3	11.947	F=.249 .862>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	**20.07**	8.455				
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	19.33	5.889				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	20.00	7.661				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	18.94	5.655				
Within Groups			6997.598	146	47.929	
.Relational Problem						
Between Groups			21.589	3	7.196	F=.934 .426>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	8.93	2.278				
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	9.00	2.414				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	8.88	3.768				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	**9.75**	2.847				
Within Groups			1124.411	146	7.701	
Hangover						
Between Groups			3.476	3	1.159	F=.331 .803>0.05 Not Significant
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	8.71	1.812				
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	8.67	1.821				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	8.50	1.615				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	**8.94**	2.067				

Within Groups			511.384	146	3.503	
Unethical Practices						
Between Groups			5.831	3	1.944	
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	4.21	1.279				F=.667 .574>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	**4.67**	1.724				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	4.13	1.650				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	4.44	2.020				
Within Groups			425.509	146	2.914	
Disturbed Families						
Between Groups			23.644	3	7.881	
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	5.29	1.852				F=2.875 .038<0.05 Significant
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	5.92	1.273				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	**6.38**	2.163				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	6.13	1.424				
Within Groups			400.196	146	2.741	
Decreased Performance						
Between Groups			439.054	3	146.351	
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	41.21	4.902				F=4.886 .003<0.05 Significant
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	43.17	5.824				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	**46.38**	5.686				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	42.13	5.568				
Within Groups			4372.946	146	29.952	
Overall QWL						
Between Groups			520.942	3	173.647	
Below Rs.5000 (n=42)	95.43	12.651				F=1.110 .347>0.05 Not Significant
Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)	97.83	12.344				
Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)	**101.25**	16.596				
Rs.15001 & above (n=48)	97.44	9.901				
Within Groups			22837.598	146	156.422	

Table 4 shows that there is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value (p=.347>0.05). So the null hypothesis is accepted. Table also shows that stress (mean=7.13), relational problem (9.75) and hangover (8.94) are high for the respondents earning an income of above 15000.Decreased performance (mean=6.38) and unethical practices (mean= 4.67) are high for the income group earning between 5001-10000

There is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Experience of the Respondents and their Overall Quality of Work Life

Experience	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
Stress						
Between Groups			8.428	2	4.214	
Below 5yrs (n=81)	**7.19**	1.621				F=2.024 .136>0.05 Not Significant
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	6.56	1.739				
11yrs & above (n=42)	7.14	.647				
Within Groups			306.032	147	2.082	
Physical Problem						
Between Groups			45.575	2	22.787	
Below 5yrs (n=81)	19.81	7.520				F=.479 .620>0.05 Not Significant
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**20.00**	6.373				
11yrs & above (n=42)	18.64	5.859				
Within Groups			6987.865	147	47.536	
Relational Problem						

	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
Between Groups			43.278	2	21.639	F=2.885 .059<0.05 Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	8.74	2.060				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**10.11**	3.446				
11yrs & above (n=42)	9.50	3.329				
Within Groups			1102.722	147	7.502	
Hangover						
Between Groups			2.328	2	1.164	F=.334 .717>0.05 Not Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	**8.85**	1.636				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	8.56	1.672				
11yrs & above (n=42)	8.64	2.346				
Within Groups			512.532	147	3.487	
Unethical Practices						
Between Groups			40.332	2	20.166	F=7.581 .001<0.05 Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	4.26	1.243				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**5.44**	2.207				
11yrs & above (n=42)	3.93	1.853				
Within Groups			391.008	147	2.660	
Disturbed families						
Between Groups			22.388	2	11.194	F=4.099 .019<0.05 Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	5.56	1.696				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**6.56**	1.450				
11yrs & above (n=42)	6.07	1.688				
Within Groups			401.452	147	2.731	
Decreased Performance						
Between Groups			801.968	2	400.984	F=14.699 .000<0.05 Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	42.04	5.515				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**47.67**	5.218				
11yrs & above (n=42)	41.14	4.604				
Within Groups			4010.032	147	27.279	
Overall QWL						
Between Groups			1811.088	2	905.544	F=6.178 .003<0.05 Significant
Below 5yrs (n=81)	96.44	12.395				
6 to 10yrs (n=27)	**104.89**	11.484				
11yrs & above (n=42)	95.07	11.923				
Within Groups			21547.452	147	146.581	

Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is less than table value (p=.003<0.05). So the null hypothesis is rejected. Table also shows that Physical Problem (mean=20.00), Unethical Practices (mean=5.44), Disturbed families (mean=6.56) and decreased performance (mean=47.67) are high for respondents having an experience of between 6-10 years.

Stress (mean=7.19) and hangover (mean=8.85) are high for the respondents having an experience of below five years.

There is a significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

**Table 6: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Educational
Qualification and Overall Quality of Work Life**

Educational Qualification	Mean	S.D	SS	Df	MS	Statistical Inference
1.Stress						
Between Groups			54.078	4	13.520	F=7.529 .000<0.05 Significant
HSC (n=12)	6.75	.866				
Under Graduate (n=18)	6.33	1.847				
Post Graduate (n=57)	**7.74**	1.027				

Professional (n=57)	6.84	1.544				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	5.50	.548				
Within Groups			260.382	145	1.796	
2.Physical Problem						
Between Groups			295.466	4	73.867	F=1.590 .180>0.05 Not Significant
HSC (n=12)	18.00	8.863				
Under Graduate (n=18)	16.17	9.269				
Post Graduate (n=57)	19.84	5.240				
Professional (n=57)	20.42	6.533				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	**21.00**	9.859				
Within Groups			6737.974	145	46.469	
3.Relational Problem						
Between Groups			35.987	4	8.997	F=1.175 .324>0.05 Not Significant
HSC (n=12)	**10.25**	.866				
Under Graduate (n=18)	8.83	2.995				
Post Graduate (n=57)	8.74	2.595				
Professional (n=57)	9.47	3.197				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	10.00	.000				
Within Groups			1110.013	145	7.655	
4.Hangover						
Between Groups			22.057	4	5.514	F=1.623 .172>0.05 Not Significant
HSC (n=12)	**9.75**	.866				
Under Graduate (n=18)	8.33	1.847				
Post Graduate (n=57)	8.95	1.777				
Professional (n=57)	8.47	2.105				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	8.50	.548				
Within Groups			492.803	145	3.399	
5.Unethical Practices						
Between Groups			17.814	4	4.453	F=1.562 .188>0.05 Not Significant
HSC (n=12)	4.50	.905				
Under Graduate (n=18)	4.00	1.029				
Post Graduate (n=57)	**4.63**	1.829				
Professional (n=57)	4.37	1.858				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	3.00	1.095				
Within Groups			413.526	145	2.852	
6.Disturbed Families						
Between Groups			48.287	4	12.072	F=4.661 .001<0.05 Significant
HSC (n=12)	6.00	1.044				
Under Graduate (n=18)	4.50	1.757				
Post Graduate (n=57)	6.00	1.464				
Professional (n=57)	**6.26**	1.847				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	5.00	.000				
Within Groups			375.553	145	2.590	
7.Decreased Performance						
Between Groups			704.908	4	176.227	F=6.222 .000<0.05 Significant
HSC (n=12)	38.75	4.070				
Under Graduate (n=18)	43.83	5.491				
Post Graduate (n=57)	40.95	4.470				
Professional (n=57)	**45.00**	6.141				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	44.50	6.025				
Within Groups			4107.092	145	28.325	
Overall QWL						
Between Groups			1351.882	4	337.971	F=2.227 .069>0.05 Not Significant
HSC (n=12)	94.00	11.465				
Under Graduate (n=18)	92.00	14.935				
Post Graduate (n=57)	96.84	10.196				

Professional (n=57)	**100.84**	13.151				
Diploma / ITI (n=6)	97.50	15.884				
Within Groups			22006.658	145	151.770	

Table 6 shows that there is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value (p=.069>0.05). So the null hypothesis is accepted. Table also shows that stress (mean=7.74) and unethical practices (mean= 4.43) are high for post graduate holders. Relational problem (mean=10.25) and hangover (mean=9.75) are high for HSC holders. Whereas unethical practices (4.63), disturbed families (mean=6.26) and decreased performance (mean=45.00) are high for professional.

There is no significant difference between educational qualification and overall Quality of Work Life.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

- Stress level of working woman is low in the study which shows that working women are able to handle stress and are relaxed and can understand the problem.

- Yoga and Meditation can be followed to be both mentally and physically fit.

- Working women to spend time to look after the spouse, parents and children's

- Hangover is high for the working woman. Working for long hours in the office, increases employee interaction. So they tend to stay in their professional world though they are physically at home. Professional anger is carried to their personal life.

- Working women should balance both work place and personal issues.

Work and personal life conflict occurs when the burden, obligations and responsibilities of work and family roles become incompatible Therefore, it is important for employees to maintain a healthy balance between personal and their professional lives. This will help them achieve their personal and professional goals as well the organization they are working for. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the modern organizations, especially educational institutions, should address the Work Life Balance related issues and problems among their staff, specifically women & take a holistic approach to design and implement policies to support the teaching staff to manage their work life balance which would add to the performance of these staff members.

Work-life balance is tool that companies need to use for increasing productivity and bringing out a balance in the work and individual life.

CONCLUSIONS

Work-life balance is an issue of great importance that has to be addressed by the organizations at the earliest. After all employees are the greatest asset and the organization performance is affected by employee performance. The HR department of the organization and the employees together must work out strategies to help attain work-life balance which makes the organization the happiest place to work in.

An effective work-life balance is essential for ensuring high productivity in the corporate world. Companies need to focus on well-organized programs so as to bring a balance in the work and individual life. To cope with the coming changes, an organization should adopt a strategic approach. Proper planning is to be made to identify the tasks and the risk

involved in achieving the desired goals. Further, programs are to be implemented as per the plans adopted. One should have the knowledge of basic elements which leads to better work-life balance. An organization should follow systematic process keeping in view the vision and mission for smooth flow of work-life balance. On the whole,

REFERENCES

1. Ford, R. (1973), Job Enrichment Lessons from AT&T. Harvard Business Review, 51(1), pp. 96-106.

2. Ballou, Brian and Dan Heitger, (2007) *Coordinating Risk Management and Performance Measurement*. A Bureau of National Affairs Research Portfolio. Monograph Forthcoming Fall 2007.

3. Hertz & Marshall, N.L. (2001), "Working Families: The Transformation of the American home", Berkeley, a*: University of California Press*.

4. Walton, R.E. (1975), "Criteria for Quality Work Life", *New York Press*

5. Roy, Rishu (1975), "Impact of Quality Work Life on Job Performance: A Study of Print Media   Employees", *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, pp.26-32. Roy, Rishu (2006), "Quality of Work Life as Determinant of Mental Health – A Study of Print   Media Employees", *SCMS journal of Indian Management, April-June* pp. 90-94.

6. Shamir, B. & Salomon, J. (1985), "Working at Home and Quality of Working Life," *Academy of Management,* Vol.10, pp.455-464.

7. Syeed and Shina (1981), "Measuring QWL in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Performance in Two Organization", Managerial Psychology, Vol.2, pp. 15-30.

8. Craig Demmer, (2002), "Stress and Satisfaction among Employees in AIDS Service Organization", *in New York, Evaluation and Health Professions*, Vol.25 (2), pp.225-235.

9. Peter L Cruise and Kuotsai Tom Liou (1994) Assessing Employee Attitudes in a Community-Based Aids Service Organization *September 1994 17: 273-289,*

10. A.K.M. Mominul Haque Talukder (2011), "A shifting paradigm of work life balance in service context – an empirical study", *Industrial journal of management and social sciences,* vol.5(1), pp.10-23.

11. Anna Beninger (2010), "women in Academia: A cross cultural prospective on work life balance", A research report, pp. 1-40.

12. A.G.V. Narayanan & R. Lakshmi Narayanan (2012), "An empirical study on factors affecting work life balance of IT professionals", *European Journal of Social sciences*, vol 31(3) , pp. 302-313.

13. Duxbury, L. (2004), "Dealing with work-life issues in the workplace: Standing still is not an option" The 2004 Don Wood Lecture in Industrial Relations.

14. Fisher, G.G. (2001), Work/Personal Life Balance: A Construct Development Study (Doctoral Dissertation, Bowling Green State University, USA), Retrieved February 7, 2008, from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No.3038411)

15. Haruko Noguchi (2009), "Do work life balance measures and work place flexibility matter? An empirical analysis

for female reinstatement choice after the child birth", *The Japanese Journal of Social Security policy,* vol 8(1), pp 1-15.

16. Hill et al (2001) Final Results from the *Hubble Space Telescope* Key Project to Measure the Hubble Constant.

17. Rana Zehra Masood & Seema Mahalwat (2012), "Impact of demographic variables on the critical factors of work life balance: An empirical study", *Journal of organizational management*, vol 1(1), pp. 1-13.

18. Santha lakshmi. k &Dr. N. Santhosh kumar, "work life balance of women employees-with reference to teaching faculties", *e-proceedings for International research conference and colloquium,* pp. 202-211.

19. Suchet, M., & Barling, J. (1986). Employed mothers: Interrole conflict, spouse support and marital functioning. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, pp.7.167-178.

20. Zimmerman. T.S. (2003), "Intimate partnership: Foundation to the successful balance of family and work", *The American journal of family therapy*, vol 31(2), pp.107-124.

21. Mirvis, P.H and Lawler, E.E. (1984) Accounting for the Quality of work life. *Journal of occupational Behaviour pp*. 5.197-212

22. Baba, VV and Jamal. m (1991) Reutilization of job context and job content and job content as related to employees quality of working life: A study of Psychiatric nurses. *Journal of organizational behaviourpp.* 12.379 - 386

23. Ellis N & Pompli a (2002) Quality of working life for nurses. Common wealth Dept of Health and Ageing Canberra.

24. Sirgy et al.'s (2001) measure of community Quality of life misirgy and Terri Cornwell. *Social indicators Research,* Vol.2

25. Hackman J & Oldham G (1974). The Job Diagnostic Survey. *New Haven: Yale University*.