

**THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE NATURE OF WORK-LIFE AND THE
BALANCE BETWEEN INTERCEDING JOB OF OCCUPATION STRESS, WORK
SATISFACTION AND WORK RESPONSIBILITY**

Emil Joseph

Assistant Professor Department of Commerce

Yuvakshetra collage, Palakkad, Kerala, India

Abstract

Reason - The motivation behind this study is to research the connection between the nature of work-life (QWL) and Work-Life Balance (WLB).

Plan/technique/approach - Utilizing an organized study instrument, this paper assembled information from 445 respondents in a cosmopolitan city in southern India. First psychometric properties of the device were tried, and afterwards, progressive relapse was utilized as a measurable method for breaking down the information.

Discoveries - The progressive relapse results demonstrated that QWL is (1) adversely connected with work pressure, (2) connected with work satisfaction and (3) decidedly connected with work responsibility. The outcomes likewise demonstrated that (1) job pressure is adversely connected with WLB, (2) work satisfaction is decidedly connected with WLB, and (3) work responsibility is connected with WLB. The outcomes likewise show the intercession of occupation stress, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility in the connection between QWL and WLB halfway.

Research restrictions/suggestions - Since the current exploration depends on self-report gauges, the limits of social allure predisposition and normal technique inclination are intrinsic. Nonetheless, adequate consideration is taken to limit these impediments. The exploration has suggestions for human asset chiefs in work associations. Possible ramifications - This study adds to both rehearsing commanders and the writing on human assets of the executives. The review proposes that businesses should know about the significance of work-life and the balance between serious and fun activities in accomplishing authoritative viability.

Social ramifications - The review is supposed to add to the government assistance of the general public as far as distinguishing the predecessors of balance between serious and fun activities.

Innovation/esteem - This study gives new bits of knowledge about the impacts of QWL on WLB through intervening factors. This is a calculated model created and tried and the first of its sort in Quite a while.

Keywords: Nature of work life, Balance between serious and fun activities, Occupation fulfilment, Occupation stress, Occupation responsibility

INTRODUCTION

Two ideas getting expanding consideration by analysts in the traditional way of behaving and human assets on the board are the nature of work-life (QWL) and the balance between fun and serious activities (WLB). The present associations should seek the best ability; for employees who hope to have the option to oversee both their work and nonwork jobs effectively. A superior comprehension of QWL and WLB is hence significant as they have been found to correspond with factors, for example, representative prosperity, execution and hierarchical citizenship conduct (Abdirahman et al., 2020; Pradhan et al., 2016; Singh and Chaudhary, 2019; Thakur what's more, Sharma, 2019). Associations that offer WLB drives and where employees are viewed as having a high QWL are bound to have the option to draw in and hold labourers (Beauregard and Henry, 2009; Konrad and Mengel, 2000). QWL is "the nature of the connection among employees and the absolute workplace" (Feldman, 1993). It is a multi-layered build and incorporates employer stability, preparing and professional success, strengthening, reward frameworks and the general workplace. QWL is pointed toward keeping up with representative satisfaction, trust in the association, collegiality and participation among employees, acknowledgement of workers at work, and protected workspace (Saraji and Dangahi, 2006). Specialists fight that QWL is a good workspace that improves satisfaction by furnishing employees with remunerations, work well-being and security, and vocational open doors (Lau et al., 2001). Surviving examination upholds that QWL lessens representative turnover (Louis and Smith, 1990) and increments hierarchical responsibility (Bala et al., 2019; Daud, 2010). There is developing examination proof that unfortunate working circumstances, expansion in responsibility, irregularity of work, absence of contribution in navigation, and unfortunate associations with managers are significant obstructions in the improvement of

QWL in associations (Ellis and Pompli, 2002). Late examination on QWL in a wide range of nations, including Egypt (El Badawy, Chinta and Magdy, 2018), Thailand (Dechawatanapaisal, 2017), UAE (Jabeen et al., 2018), Malaysia (Surienty et al., 2014), Sri Lanka (Ramawickrama et al., 2019), Iran (Hashempour et al., 2018), Ghana (Ojedokun et al., 2015), Nigeria (Kwahar and Iyortsuun, 2018), Philippines (Ong et al., 2019) and India (Bala et al., 2019) support that QWL is vital and has positive results.

Review of literature

The balance between serious and fun activities (WLB) is another significant build that hierarchical analysts have been tending to for many years. It has been characterized as a harmony between the close to home, conduct and time requests of paid work and individual and family obligations (Slope et al., 2001). A changing hierarchical scene has developed an interest in balancing strenuous and fun activities. Further, conditions in labour markets, changes in segment profiles of employees, expansion in working hours, and conditions in the home climate expect workers to keep a cheerful harmony between work and life (Helmle et al., 2014). WLB is supposed to be accomplished when there is congruity (not struggle) between work and life (Lawson et al., 2013; Semlali and Hassi, 2016). Work incorporates every one of the exercises performed by a representative in associations. However, life contains exercises unrelated to work, including family tasks, childcare, grown-up endless care of advanced-age guardians, and relations. It is battled that employees are sound and add to associations by working extended periods when there is a balance between serious and fun activities (Joo and Lee, 2017; Nielsen et al., 2008). A few scientists reported that QWL is fundamentally and decidedly connected with the mental prosperity of workers (Hardjanti et al., 2017). A concentrate by Chan and Wyatt (2007) uncovered that WLB is connected with hierarchical responsibility and worker prosperity. Grawitch et al. (2007) detailed that when employees are happy with the working environment, the positive results included worker inclusion, development, advancement, acknowledgment and mental prosperity. It is additionally critical to recall that hierarchical responsibility is likewise emphatically connected with representative prosperity (Jain et al., 2009). Accessible experimental proof recommends that singular prosperity benefits the two associations and society; benefits association by expanded inspiration, efficiency and diminished non-appearance and turnover; benefits society on the

grounds that mental soundness of people brings about family satisfaction (Burke, 2000; Grady et al., 2008).

Reasoning and inspiration for the current review

In spite of extensive examination QWL and WLB, the exploration connecting these two is extremely scanty. Most examinations (Bhatt, 2018; Dechawatanapaisal, 2017; Surlenty et al., 2014; Veeraiah and Manchala, 2012) that have included both QWL and WLB have thought about WLB a part or aspect of QWL. All the more explicitly, prior analysts have specialists have concentrated on the forerunners of WLB and results of QWL of employees in associations (Bataineh, 2019; Soomro et al., 2018). An exhaustive writing survey uncovers that there is no particular model integrating these two pieces. Scientists have recommended that QWL is adversely connected with work pressure, and decidedly connected with work satisfaction and responsibility (Guthrie, 2012). Some recorded that WLB brings about representative socialization with local area, improves efficiency following the conventional speculation that "blissful laborer is a useful laborer" (Helme et al., 2014; Joo and Lee, 2017). Human asset the board researchers moreover battle that solid employees work for extended periods of time and add to the progress of association (Nielsen et al., 2008). Accessible exact proof recommends that employees encountering greater of work-life feel less pressure at work, which at last improves work satisfaction and life satisfaction (Koubova and Buchko, 2013; Shaffer et al., 2016). While the past examinations have talked about the significance and results of balance between serious and fun activities, there is extensive hole in associating the two develops WLB and QWL. The current review is pointed toward overcoming any barrier looking at the connection among WLB and QWL by creating and testing a calculated model. All the more explicitly, interceding job of three significance factors, in particular, work pressure, work satisfaction and occupation responsibility in the connection among QWL and WLB balance is analyzed. One more inspiration for our review is the emphasis on India. The vast majority of the examinations India managed estimating different parts of QWL and systems for development, for example, independent work groups, work upgrade and advancement, powerful pioneer conduct, professional stability and hierarchical equity (Harsish and Subhashini, 2014). The job of working environment adaptability was underscored to further develop QWL in Indian setting (Rastogi et al., 2018). However concentrates on zeroed in on the drivers of QWL as far as working circumstances, HR mediations, hierarchical responsibility, shockingly no concentrate to date has endeavored to look at the impact of QWL on WLB.

It is additionally vital to take note of that larger part of QWL and WLB studies were led regarding Western and European nations (for example USA, Netherlands, Turkey) there is a deficiency of studies to look at the connections among QWL and WLB in Indian setting (Havlovic, 1991; Kanten and Sadullah, 2012; Janes and Wisnom, 2011). We needed to investigate whether employees in India see similar develops QWL and WLB similarly as workers in western world as the functioning circumstances and climate in India is fundamentally not quite the same as different nations. In this sense, this is exploratory examination. At last, India, being second most populated country with low pay rates, has drawn in a few western organizations to begin their tasks through reevaluating and it is important to concentrate on the view of QWL and WLB in the quickly evolving development driven economy. To summarize, we created and messaged a reasonable model on workers in the public transportation area in India. The proposed model broadens our ongoing comprehension of QWL and WLB in more than one way. In the first place, rather than concentrating on WLB as a part of QWL, the connection between them as two separate factors is inspected. Second, speculations and discoveries are utilized to make sense of the relationship of QWL and WLB through three arbiters, to be specific, work pressure, work satisfaction and occupation responsibility. The hypothetical foundation for the proposed model will be examined straightaway.

Hypothetical groundwork of the exploration

spillover hypothesis: Maslow's ordered progression of requirements (Maslow, 1954), accomplishment inspiration hypothesis (McClelland, 1961), two-factor hypothesis (Herzberg, 1966) and presence relatedness-development hypothesis (Alderfer, 1972) are the fundamental underpinnings of the need satisfaction hypothesis. As per the need satisfaction hypothesis, employees whose essential necessities are satisfied through work environment encounters will get satisfaction from the positions they perform (Sirgy et al., 2001).


Overflow hypothesis (Frischman, 2009) places that one space will affect different areas. For instance, in the event that workers are fulfilled at occupations, it might affect wellbeing, family, companions, partners, and so on. As Sirgy et al. (2001) make sense of, there are two kinds of overflow, in particular, level and vertical. Even overflow is worried about the impact one space might have on the adjoining areas. A basic model is that the impact of occupation satisfaction might be felt in life satisfaction. At the point when we sort out the spaces in a progressive system (life satisfaction addressing the upper area, family, relaxation, and local

area address lower spaces), with the impact of one area affecting the other area in an upward direction, it is called vertical overflow. Overflow is "universal as in the overflows stream across and inside different related frameworks (factors) in manners that are not effortlessly noticed, appreciated and evaluated.. ." (Frischman, 2009, p. 823). In view of need hypothesis and overflow hypothesis, it tends to be proposed that QWL influences work satisfaction and different factors which might influence other life areas like family, partners, money and relaxation (Sirgy et al., 2001). Applying these two speculations, we have fostered a model (Figure 1) to make sense of the relationship of QWL and WLB as interceded by work pressure, work satisfaction and occupation responsibility. We will currently talk about every association in the model.

Development of hypotheses

Effect of QWL on job stress

Stress of workers hands on has been a thoroughly explored region in the field of authoritative way of behaving (Cooper and Marshall, 1976; Ivancevich and Matteson, 1980). Work pressure, otherwise called word related pressure (Frone, 1990) or work pressure, happens when there is a bungle between a representative's capacities, assets and necessities, and the work prerequisites. Work pressure is worried about mental and physiological responses to the circumstances in the work environment which might have malicious outcomes on the strength of people (Williams and Hazer, 1986). A portion of the unfriendly working circumstances incorporate congestion, over the top clamor and outrageous temperatures (McGrath, 1976).



Past analysts have recognized a few reasons for work pressure, to be specific, job struggle, regular scaling back by associations, decrease of representative advantages, associations requesting the workers to stay at work past 40 hours to fulfill the objectives inside time constraints, and consolidation exercises of top supervisory crews that might disengage the workers (CoX and Griffiths, 1995). Extra purposes behind work pressure range from non-participation between the employees to the evil treatment of bosses. Work pressure additionally may result from an awkward workplace, work struggle, job struggle and working circumstances (Schuler, 1982). Workers The connection among QWL and WLB-interceding job likewise feel anxious when they are approached to stay at work past 40 hours with no earlier notification and anticipate the employees to genuinely acknowledge it. Behr and Glazer (2001) revealed that work stressors like working circumstances, assumptions from the board, responsibility and non-collegiality among employees antagonistically influence the soundness of people. Seibt et al. (2009) revealed that occupation stress can be diminished by working on working circumstances in associations. Improving the QWL ought to prompt lower work pressure. In view of the abovementioned, we speculate:

H1. Nature of work life is adversely connected with work pressure.

Impact of QWL on work satisfaction

In the fields of hierarchical way of behaving and applied brain research, work satisfaction is perhaps of the most generally concentrated on factor (Lawler and Doorman, 1967; Locke and Latham, 1990; Spector, 1997). Chiefs in associations give need to work satisfaction of employees (Yu€cel, 2012). From a utilitarian and philanthropic viewpoint, it is vital that workers who are fulfilled on their positions are supposed to add to the association (Abdallah et al., 2017; Parvin and Kabir, 2011). Past examination has shown that QWL decidedly affects work satisfaction in that people who have elevated degree of QWL are probably going to encounter a more significant level of occupation satisfaction (Danna and Griffin, 1999). Later exploration has affirmed this relationship. Jabeen et al. (2018) found that QWL affected work satisfaction in an example of Emiranti ladies utilized in different public area associations in the UAE. Consequences of a review investigating the relationship of occupation satisfaction with the QWL elements of bank employees in India showed that the unconducive workplace had a negative relationship with work satisfaction. Sirgy et al. (2001) fight that people consider work-life as a mental space wherein the encounters connected with work are put away, and these encounters will upgrade work satisfaction. In light of past exploration, we guess:

H2. The nature of work life is decidedly connected with work satisfaction.

Impact of QWL on work responsibility

One more widely explored variable in authoritative conduct writing is work, or hierarchical, responsibility. Responsibility is a mental express that ties a person to an association (Meyer and Allen, 1991). In their examination, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) observed that QWL is one of the main forerunners of hierarchical responsibility. Research during that time has recorded that QWL affects hierarchical responsibility (Anuradha and Pandey, 1995; Efraty and Sirgy, 1990; Fields and Thacker, 1992; Huang et al., 2007; Lee et al., 2007). Later examination on assorted examples in various nations has affirmed these discoveries. Ojedokon et al. (2015) observed that QWL was decidedly connected with authoritative responsibility for public area workers in Ghana. Utilizing Primary Condition Demonstrating, QWL was viewed as a genuinely huge precursor of hierarchical responsibility for college educators in India (Khan and Khan, 2017). Extra sure connections among QWL and hierarchical responsibility were found in examples of Iranian crisis attendants (Hashempour et al., 2018), Sri Lankan railroad station aces (Ramawickrama et al., 2019), Filipino general wellbeing experts (Ong et al., 2019) and Indian college employees (Bala et al., 2019). In view of need satisfaction hypothesis, Sirgy et al. (2001) fight that employees who are high on QWL experience satisfaction of seven requirements, in particular, wellbeing and security needs, financial and family needs, social necessities, regard needs, completion needs, information necessities and tasteful requirements. Higher QWL prompts good sentiments about the association and workers will generally show responsibility. In light of the past exploration, we estimate:

H3. Nature of work life is emphatically connected with work responsibility.

Impact of occupation weight on WLB

The balance among family and work has gotten consideration since the mid-1960s when Kahn et al. (1964) underlined work-family clashes as a critical cause of occupation stress. Associations along these lines endeavor to diminish work-family clashes by giving adaptable plans for getting work done, childcare, parental depart and different drives (Emslie and Chase, 2009; Hon and Chan, 2013; Pasamar and Cabrera, 2013). In their exploration Helmle et al. (2014) found that hierarchical drives of balance between fun and serious activities have a negative relationship with work pressure. Past scientists have observed that family issues, monetary emergencies and clashes between requests from organization and home are likely stressors of employees at work (Weinberg et al., 2010). It was reported that work-family

clashes lead to work pressure, notwithstanding the functioning circumstances in associations (White et al., 2013). Although most past exploration has analyzed the impact of WLB on work pressure, a few investigations have inspected the impact of occupation weight on WLB. The consequences of concentrating on female resources in focal colleges of Delhi, India, demonstrate that there are areas of strength for a connection between word-related pressure and balance between fun and serious activities (Zaheer et al., 2015). Likewise, saw work pressure was related with more unfortunate balance between serious and fun activities, and expanded struggle between scholastics' work and individual lives (Chime et al., 2012). As hypothesized in overflow hypothesis, impacts of one life space overflow into others, accordingly employees who feel more pressure at work are bound to encounter awkwardness in the home and work. In light of the abovementioned, we estimate:

H4. Work pressure is adversely connected with balance between fun and serious activities.

Impact of occupation satisfaction on balance between fun and serious activities

While past specialists concentrated on the impacts of occupation satisfaction on worker execution, the connection between work satisfaction and WLB has been seldom analyzed (Daud, 2010). The majority of the past exploration has zeroed in on the impact of WLB on work satisfaction, as opposed to the opposite way around. An exemption is an investigation of the effect of balance between fun and serious activities on ladies specialists in India that found balance between serious and fun activities emphatically affects work satisfaction (Anuradha and Pandey, 2016). However it is extremely challenging to determine the specific arrangement of connections between work satisfaction and WLB, it tends to be consistently contended that employees who are blissful working are very liable to bring balance among work and home than the people who are not. Work disappointment might have overflow consequences for WLB as employees will generally convey forward the sentiments they experience in associations to the home and life. Seventy years of exploration on the relationship between joy of laborers and efficiency in the working environment has not been affirmed. Notwithstanding, there is an agreement that a cheerful worker will turn out to be more useful (Joo and Lee, 2017). By being useful, employees create more income and get monetary advantages, notwithstanding inherent satisfaction from occupations (Koubova and Buchko, 2013). Since WLB is worried about a suitable time-dividing proportion among family and work, all things considered, employees who are blissful at work are probably going to keep a cheerful harmony among work and life. In light of the abovementioned.

H5. Work satisfaction is decidedly connected with balance between fun and serious activities.

Impact of occupation responsibility on balance between serious and fun activities

The collected examination on work responsibility, or hierarchical responsibility, throughout recent many years has zeroed in on the predecessors and results (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). Notwithstanding, very little exploration has been finished to secure the connection between position responsibility and WLB. Most examinations that have inspected the work responsibility WLB relationship have viewed at work responsibility as a result of WLB not as a predecessor. For instance, a concentrate on ladies in the US development industry tracked down that harmony among work and individual time decidedly affected authoritative responsibility (Malone and Issa, 2013). Another review found a positive connection between's balance between serious and fun activities factors and hierarchical responsibility for bank employees in India (Vijaya and Hemamalini, 2012). Different investigations have tried for and found an intervening impact of hierarchical responsibility on the connection among WLB and hierarchical citizenship conduct (Pradhan, et al., 2016) or authoritative execution (Oyewobi et al., 2019). Concentrates on that have inspected hierarchical responsibility as a precursor of WLB have been restricted. In their concentrate on the intercession impacts of hierarchical responsibility on the relationship of WLB and authoritative execution, Oyewobi et al. (2019), did likewise observe that there was a positive connection among WLB and hierarchical responsibility. We hypothesize that expanded work responsibility has a potential for employees to keep up with balance among work and life. In view of the abovementioned, we speculate:

H6. Work responsibility is decidedly connected with balance between fun and serious activities.

Intercession impacts of impact of occupation stress, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility

QWL assumes an essential part in WLB of workers in associations. Many investigations look at the immediate impacts of QWL on WLB and different results. Notwithstanding, the impacts of QWL are predicated on the hidden cycles that stir up in mental cycles of people. In view of need-based and stress speculations, we recommend that the impacts of QWL on WLB will be interceded by a few factors. The main factors, in our review, are work pressure, work satisfaction and occupation responsibility. Ongoing examinations have shown the significance of responsibility and occupation satisfaction as middle people (Bhola and Nigade, 2016; Miryala and Chiluka, 2012). Generally around twenty years Sirgy (2001) showed that there is a causal succession of nature of work-life to life satisfaction through work satisfaction. In one

review led in India, the connection between the view of QWL and WLB was positive and huge in employees of electronic industry (Kumar and Udayasuriyan, 2008). Bilal et al. (2010) reported that authoritative strategies reflected as far as QWL are decidedly connected with work satisfaction and adversely connected with turnover goals and upgraded the WLB of employees. In light of the abovementioned, we conjecture:

H7a. Work pressure completely intercedes the connection among QWL and WLB.

H7b. Work satisfaction completely intervenes the connection among QWL and WLB.

H7c. Work responsibility completely intervenes the connection among QWL and WLB.

Strategy

Sample : Information was gathered from workers of a vehicle organization in southern piece of India. With the end goal of this exploration an overview instrument was created. The instrument was disseminated to transport drivers and guides. Altogether, 610 overview surveys were shipped off the respondents. Out of these, 100 were deficient and 65 were re-submitted without finishing up any data. This gave the specialists 445 completely finished studies, which were utilized in information examination. Segment profile of respondents India, being agrarian economy, over two thirds of individuals live in towns. Since India was under English rule for north of 200 and fifty years, the transportation framework in India was principally on the English framework where individuals relied upon public transportation. The transportation area assumes a significant part in giving movement to 1.37 billion individuals. India's transport area is huge and different and adds to around 6% of country's Gross domestic product, of which street transportation contributes the significant offer. A portion of the difficulties in street transport are clogged streets, unfortunate support, weakening of streets, and significant expense of upkeep. The interest for transport framework and administrations is truly expanding with the developing populace and urbanization. The employees in the vehicle area experience numerous issues of changing their functioning hours to fulfill the developing needs and giving crisis administrations during the bubbly season when Legislatures send off exceptional transports to ship travelers starting with one spot then onto the next. The outline of segment attributes of respondents is introduced in **Table 1**

A survey of segment profiles uncovers that 61.1% of the respondents are drivers and 38.9% are guides. All things considered, 38% of the respondents taken for the review are Senior Auxiliary school qualified, 28.8% are optional qualified, 12.8 recognition holders, 7% are post-

graduation, 6.5% are students. With regards to mature, 44.3% of the respondents are in the age bunch 31-40 years, 25.4% are somewhere in the range of 41 and 50 years, 16% are somewhere in the range of 21 and 30 years, 14.4% are over 50 years. Around 59.1% of the respondents hold a long-lasting post, 35.3% are on agreement premise, and 5.6% are parttime. With respect to encounter, 32.1% of the respondents have 5-10 years of involvement, 24.9% have 15-20 years of involvement, 19.6% have over 20 years of involvement, 17.5% have somewhere in the range of 10 and 15 years of involvement, and just 5.8% have five years of involvement. The examination of pay of respondents uncovers that 6.1% of the respondents acquire a yearly pay up to Rs. 250,000 (\$3,500), 22.5% procure between Rs. 250,000 to Rs. 500,000 (\$3,500 - \$7,000), 11.5% procure between Rs.500,000 to Rs. a million (\$7,500 to \$15,000). Concerning status, 90.6% of respondents are hitched, 6.7% are unmarried, 2.5% are single, and 0.2% are bereft. The profile of the quantity of offspring of respondents in this study uncovers that around 34.4% of the respondents have five kids, 23.8% have four youngsters, 11% have three youngsters, 13.9% have two youngsters, 11% have one kid, and 5.8% have over five youngsters.

Measures

The review included five principal factors and four control factors. The actions were recently utilized by analysts were adjusted to suit the unique circumstance and reason. Nature of work-life: QWL was estimated utilizing 15 things adjusted from Walton (1973) and Sirgy et al. (2001) addressing seven aspects, to be specific, development and improvement, support, actual climate, oversight, pay and advantages, social pertinence, and work environment incorporation. Some example things read as: "I get participation from different offices"; "I get sufficient and legitimate correspondence from my bosses"; "Relationship with prompt managers is great." The unwavering quality coefficient Cronbach's alpha for this action is 0.724.

Work Pressure: Occupation stress was estimated utilizing 12 things adjusted from Judge et al. (1994), Shukla and Srivastava (2016) and some example things read as: "I don't land position related sicknesses in PRTC"; "Sound contamination doesn't influence the functioning mobility"; "Seat state of the PRTC transports is great." The dependability coefficient Cronbach alpha for this action was 0.750. **Work Satisfaction:** Occupation satisfaction was estimated utilizing 16 things. Some example things read as: "I'm happy with my obligation in PRTC"; "I'm blissful about the actual work in PRTC"; "I gain appreciation in my work at PRTC." The dependability coefficient Cronbach alpha for this measure was 0.832.

Table 1 demographic profile

Variable	Number	%
<i>Designation</i>		
Drivers	272	61.1
Conductors	173	38.9
Total	445	100
<i>Region-wise distribution</i>		
Pondicherry	318	71.5
Karaikal	102	22.9
Mahe	13	2.9
Yanam	12	2.7
Total	445	100
<i>Educational qualification</i>		
Post-graduation	31	7.0
Under-graduation	29	6.5
Diploma	57	12.8
ITI	31	7.0
Higher secondary	128	28.8
SSLC	169	38.0
Total	445	100
<i>Age</i>		
21 to 30	71	16.0
31 to 40	197	44.3
41 to 50	113	25.4
Above 50 years	64	14.4
Total	445	100
<i>Nature of employment</i>		
Permanent	263	59.1
Contract	157	35.3
Part-time	25	5.6
Total	445	100
<i>Experience</i>		
5 years	26	5.8
5-10 years	143	32.1
10-15 years	78	17.5
15-20 years	111	24.9
Above 20 years	87	19.6
Total	445	100
<i>Marital status</i>		
Married	403	90.6
Unmarried	30	6.7
Single	11	2.5
Widower	1	0.2
Total	445	100
<i>Annual income</i>		
Up to Rs. 250,000	294	66.1
Rs. 250,000 to Rs. 500,000	100	22.5
Rs. 500,000 to Rs. 1,000,000	51	11.5
Total	445	100
<i>Family structure</i>		
Nuclear	270	60.57
Joint	175	38.43
Total	445	

Variable	Number	%
<i>Number of children</i>		
1	48	11.0
2	62	13.9
3	49	11.0
4	106	23.8
5	153	34.4
Above 5	27	5.8
Total	445	100
<i>Age group of children</i>		
Less than 5 years	44	9.9
5–10 years	222	49.9
10–15 years	175	39.3
15–20 years	3	0.7
Above 20 years	1	0.2
Total	445	100
<i>Elderly dependents</i>		
No one	241	54.2
One	160	36.0
Two	41	9.2
More than two	3	0.6
Total	445	100
<i>Spouse occupation</i>		
Housewife	77	17.3
Private sector employees	54	12.1
Public sector employees	31	7.0
Government employees	27	6.1
Own business	7	1.6
Others	249	56.0
Total	445	100
<i>Working hours per week</i>		
Up to 57 h	257	57.8
58–67 h	140	31.5
68–77 h	47	10.6
Above 77 h	1	0.2
Total	445	100

Work Responsibility: Occupation responsibility was estimated utilizing 13 things adjusted from Meyer et al. (1993). Some example things read as: "I'm answerable for my duties"; "I am not withdrawing every now and again"; "I'm submitting to the orders by bosses." The alpha for this action is 0.879. The balance between fun and serious activities: Balance between serious and fun activities was estimated utilizing six things. Some example things read as: "I make some satisfactory memories to enjoy with the family regardless of whether I work in PRTC"; "I have adequate opportunity to deal with my youngsters regardless of whether I work in PRTC"; "I have sufficient opportunity to deal with older wards regardless of whether I work in PRTC." The unwavering quality coefficient alpha for this action is 0.911. The psychometric properties of the instrument (corroborative element examination), normalized loadings, dependability, fluctuation, and the change extricated gauge are introduced in Table 2.

Measure	Reliability coefficient Cronbach alpha	Standardized Loadings (λ_{yj})	Reliability (λ_{yj}^2)	Variance ($\text{Var}(\epsilon_i)$)	Average Variance-Extracted $\Sigma(\lambda_{yj}^2) / [(\lambda_{yj}^2) + (\text{Var}(\epsilon_i))]$
<i>Quality of Work-Life</i>	0.72				0.60
I get cooperation from other departments		0.77	0.60	0.40	
I receive adequate and proper communication from my supervisors		0.79	0.63	0.37	
Relationship with immediate supervisors is good		0.71	0.51	0.49	
Grievance redressal system is excellent		0.77	0.60	0.40	
Training programs are frequently conducted in the PRTC		0.76	0.59	0.41	
Training programs are organized to improve the quality of work-life in PRTC		0.77	0.60	0.40	
I get fringe benefits in PRTC		0.77	0.61	0.39	
Over time wages are provided in PRTC		0.74	0.55	0.45	
Rewards based on performance are given in PRTC		0.81	0.67	0.33	
Compensation for night shifts is available in PRTC		0.74	0.55	0.45	
Safety measures are strictly followed in the working environment of PRTC		0.81	0.66	0.34	
Health maintenance programs are executed systematically in PRTC		0.80	0.64	0.36	
Life Insurance facilities are available in PRTC		0.84	0.72	0.28	
Total working hours per week are reasonable in PRTC		0.80	0.64	0.36	
Over time Work is optional during festival seasons in PRTC		0.69	0.48	0.52	
<i>Job Stress</i>	0.75				0.65
I do not get job-related diseases in PRTC		0.85	0.74	0.26	
Sound pollution does not affect the working manoeuvrability		0.71	0.52	0.48	

Measure	Reliability coefficient Cronbach alpha	Standardized Loadings (λ_{yj})	Reliability (λ^2_{yj})	Variance ($\text{Var}(\epsilon_j)$)	Average Variance-Extracted $\Sigma(\lambda^2_{yj}) / [(\lambda^2_{yj}) + (\text{Var}(\epsilon_j))]$
Seat condition of the PRTC buses is good		0.76	0.58	0.42	
Bus running condition of PRTC buses is good		0.79	0.63	0.37	
There is no overcrowding in PRTC buses		0.83	0.70	0.30	
There is no chance of Bus break down in PRTC buses		0.80	0.65	0.35	
A number of bus stops do not create stress in me		0.82	0.68	0.32	
The PRTC will not take action against me even if I meet with bus accident without my mistake		0.84	0.71	0.29	
Facing legal battle does not create stress in me		0.82	0.68	0.32	
Less amount of compensation I receive in PRTC does not create stress		0.83	0.70	0.30	
Disbursal of exact tender during peak hours does not create pressure		0.84	0.71	0.29	
Suspension instead of termination does not create tension		0.72	0.53	0.47	
<i>Job Commitment</i>	0.87				0.71
I am working with Zero accident motive in PRTC		0.75	0.56	0.44	
I am taking fuel-saving measures in PRTC		0.84	0.71	0.29	
I do regularly check up on tyre pressure of my bus in PRTC		0.84	0.71	0.29	
I am paying immediate attention to the repair of the bus where I work		0.88	0.78	0.22	
I am responsible for my duties		0.83	0.70	0.30	
I am not taking leave frequently		0.80	0.65	0.35	
I am obeying the orders by superiors		0.82	0.69	0.31	

The decency of fit list of CFA are: χ^2 5 219.599 ($p < 0.001$); RMR 5 0.042; GFI 5 0.927; NFI 5 0.939; CFI 5 0.941. Every one of these records show meaning of model fit. Table 2 The relationship between QWL and WLB- mediating role Since the AVE is more prominent than the squares of between connections, discriminant legitimacy is laid out. For instance, the between connection among's QWL and work pressure is 0.69 and huge. The AVE for QWL and work pressure (0.60 and 0.65) is more noteworthy than 0.476 (the square of 0.69), lays out discriminant legitimacy. Likewise, for other between connections we checked for discriminant legitimacy. The starter examination of connections uncovers that the most extreme relationship between's the factors was 0.691 (among QWL and work pressure) and the base relationship was 0.121 (between work satisfaction and balance between fun and serious activities). Since relationships were under 0.75, multicollinearity isn't an issue (Kennedy, 2008). To really look at multicollinearity between the The connection among QWL and WLB-interceding job factors, we likewise checked difference expansion factor (VIF). For every one of the factors the VIF is less than "2" which suggests that multicollinearity isn't an issue. To test the speculations, we performed various leveled relapse. To test the speculations, we performed progressive relapse. Various leveled relapse is a suitable instrument for examining the impact of indicator variable in the wake of controlling for different factors (Pedhazur and Schemelkin, 1991). Scientists utilize progressive relapse when change on a rule variable is being made sense of by indicator factors that are corresponded with one another and in sociology research it is exceptionally considered normal (Aiken and West, 1991). In the relapse (Table 4), first control factors were placed. The control factors are age, pay, insight and occupation. It was important to remember these control factors for the relapse condition on the grounds that these may influence QWL straightforwardly. Of the control factors, age and experience were huge. The beta coefficient old enough was positive and critical (β 5 0.103; $p < 0.05$). The relapse coefficient of involvement was positive and critical (β 5 0.233; $p < 0.001$). The beta coefficients of pay (β 5 0.089; p 5 0.058) and occupation (β 5 0.014; p 5 0.757) were not critical. The control factors model made sense of 7.6% of change in QWL and the model was critical (R^2 5 0.076; Adj R^2 5 0.068; F 5 9.10, $p < 0.001$).The vitally autonomous variable, work pressure, was placed into the relapse condition in sync 2 (segment 2). Of the control factors, the beta coefficient old enough was not critical (β 5 0.061; p 5 0.074); pay (β 5 0.089; $p < 0.05$), experience (β 5 0.08; $p < 0.05$), and occupation (β 5 0.065; $p < 0.05$), were huge. The beta coefficient of QWL on work pressure was negative and huge (β 5 0.675; $p < 0.001$). The model made sense of 50.1% of difference in the gig stress because of QWL, notwithstanding control factors, and the model was critical (R^2 5 0.501; Adj R^2 5 0.495; F 5 88.035, $p < 0.001$; ΔR^2

5 0.424; ΔF 5 372.47; $p < 0.001$). These outcomes support H1 that QWL is adversely connected with work pressure. In the relapse (Table 5), first control factors were placed. The control factors are age, pay, insight, and occupation. Of the control factors, age and pay were huge. The beta coefficient old enough was negative and huge (β 5 0.137; $p < 0.05$). The relapse coefficient of pay was positive and huge (β 5 0.166; $p < 0.001$). The beta coefficients of involvement (β 5 0.052; p 5 0.027), and occupation (β 5 0.015; p 5 0.745) were not critical. The control factors model made sense of 4.9 % of change in QWL and the model was huge (R^2 5 0.049; Adj R^2 5 0.041; F 5 5.72, $p < 0.001$). The super autonomous variable, work satisfaction, was placed into the relapse condition in sync 2 (segment 2). Of the control factors, the beta coefficient old enough (β 5 0.104; $p < 0.01$), pay (β 5 0.165; $p < 0.01$) and experience (β 5 0.17; $p < 0.01$) were critical. The relapse coefficient of occupation was not critical (β 5 0.046; p 5 0.025). The beta coefficient of QWL on work satisfaction was positive and critical (β 5 0.522; $p < 0.001$). The model made sense of 30.2% of change in the gig satisfaction because of QWL, notwithstanding control factors, and the model was critical (R^2 5 0.302; Adj R^2 5 0.295; F 5 38.11, $p < 0.001$; ΔR^2 5 . 0.253; ΔF 5 159.41; $p < 0.001$). These outcomes support H2 that QWL is emphatically connected with work satisfaction. In the relapse, first control factors were placed, and all control factors were huge: age (β 5 0.19; $p < 0.01$), pay (β 5 0.11; $p < 0.01$), experience (β 5 0.44; $p < 0.01$), and occupation (β 5 0.105; $p < 0.01$). The control factors model made sense of 25 % of change in QWL and the model was critical (R^2 5 0.25; Adj R^2 5 0.243; F 5 36.57, $p < 0.001$). The super free factor, work responsibility, was placed into the relapse condition in sync 2 (segment 2). But occupation, all the control factors were critical: the beta coefficient old enough (β 5 0.172; $p < 0.01$), pay (β 5 0.11; $p < 0.01$) and experience (β 5 0.504; $p < 0.01$) were huge. The relapse coefficient of occupation was not huge (β 5 0.072; p 5 0.07). The beta coefficient of QWL on work responsibility was positive and huge (β 5 0.283; $p < 0.001$). The model made sense of 32.4% of change in the gig responsibility because of QWL, notwithstanding control factors, and the model was huge (R^2 5 0.324; Adj R^2 5 0.316; F 5 42.06, $p < 0.001$; ΔR^2 5 . 0.074; ΔF 5 48.27; $p < 0.001$). These results support H3 that QWL is emphatically connected with work responsibility.

Various leveled relapse aftereffects of impact of occupation stress, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility on balance between serious and fun activities are introduced in First control factors were placed into the relapse condition., Stage 1 (segment 1) uncovers that the relapse coefficient of involvement on balance between serious and fun activities was critical (β 5 0.459; $p < 0.01$) and other control factors were not huge. The control factors model was

critical and made sense of 22.5% change in the balance between fun and serious activities ($R^2 = 0.225$; Adj $R^2 = 0.218$; $F = 31.98$, $p < 0.001$).

Stage 2 (section 2) in Table 7 shows the relapse consequences of the impact of primary factors on balance between serious and fun activities. The relapse coefficient of occupation stress was negative and huge ($\beta = 0.387$; $p < 0.001$), subsequently supporting H4. The relapse coefficient of occupation satisfaction was positive and huge ($\beta = 0.104$; $p < 0.01$), subsequently supporting H5. The relapse coefficient of occupation responsibility was positive and critical ($\beta = 0.434$; $p < 0.01$), consequently supporting H6. The model was huge and made sense of 42.8% of difference in balance between fun and serious activities in view of these three principal factors, specifically, work pressure, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility ($R^2 = 0.428$; Adj $R^2 = 0.419$; $F = 46.77$, $p < 0.001$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.203$; $\Delta F = 51.73$; $p < 0.001$). To test the intervention speculations, we followed the systems illustrated by Aiken and West (1991). Three circumstances are important to show full intervention.

Path diagram empirical model



Satisfaction and job commitment are mediators in the relationship between QWL and WLB. The path coefficients corroborated the regression results. The empirical model is presented in Figure

DISCUSSION

Our review is maybe the first of its sort, as far as anyone is concerned, to concentrate on the connection among QWL and WLB. This study is important because of multiple factors. In the first place, it offers help for the significance of QWL in associations. Past scientists basically

centered around the elements of QWL as opposed to recognizing outcomes. Predecessors of QWL were perceived by earlier scientists. Our review conveys the examination further into outcomes of QWL. Second, as opposed to analyzing the immediate impacts of QWL on WLB, our review zeroed in on three significant middle people, to be specific, work pressure, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility. Likewise, in spite of prior scientists who reported that work satisfaction, work pressure, and occupation responsibility were ramifications of WLB we analyzed the converse causality. However there is no deduced hypothetical starting point for such opposite causality, we involved natural rationale for such a relationship showing reverse causality. Our outcomes show that QWL impacts WLB through work pressure, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility. It is vital to talk about the outcomes from the calculated model we created and tried in Indian setting. Since past examinations zeroed in on western nations, we needed to look at whether the connections hold great in the Indian setting, taking into account that it is a creating economy and work conditions are unique. QWL is adversely connected with work pressure among the employees in transportation area. The transport drivers and guides feel so focused on as a result of gridlocks, managing travelers during the busy times, work plans and so forth. In any case, workers are committed and happy with their positions. In India, working in open transportation organizations is preferred by individuals in view of the idea of work (for example government work) which guarantees professional stability. Obviously, the work satisfaction and responsibility are decidedly connected with QWL. These outcomes are not astoundingly not quite the same as the examinations led in western nations. Also, work pressure is adversely and altogether connected with WLB, true to form. Employees in transportation organizations can keep up with balance in the work-life due to resolute plans for getting work done, and family requests. Narrative confirmations recommend that higher feelings of anxiety at work lead to bring down adjusts of work-life. Once more, due to their work satisfaction and responsibility levels are high, employees can keep up with WLB. One more significant finding from this study is that occupation stress, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibilities are to some extent intervening the connection among QWL and WLB. It isn't is business as usual that QWL is additionally significantly affecting WLB, which isn't in opposition to what has been archived in examinations from western nations. Our outcomes in this manner verify the current examination and in spite of social contrasts between the nations the connections hold great. However we tried the model in transportation area, we expect that the outcomes will be generalizable across any remaining areas in India.

CONCLUSION

Our review adds to both writing on human asset the board and rehearsing supervisors. The model we proposed and tried observationally adds to the writing. The discoveries prove the aftereffects of existing examinations in western nations and it is uncovered that there are no distinctions in the outcomes of QWL in India. However the functioning circumstances are different in India, the impacts of QWL on work pressure, work satisfaction and occupation responsibility are same as in western nations. The generalizability of results is added commitment of the current exploration. In any case, it ought to be recollected that there might be different factors (like turnover, truancy, citizenship conduct) that can be viewed as in ongoing investigations of QWL and WLB. Further, segment factors, for example, age and pay might have some effect on the outcomes of QWL as in certain examinations age was a likely mediator in the connection between work responsibility and occupation satisfaction. The outcomes from present review have suggestions for society. At the point when employees feel better working and feel less pressure are bound to encounter satisfaction at work and add to the association, which helps society overall. WLB is vital according to the perspective of society. As proven by the discoveries from the current review, QWL decreases pressure, increments work satisfaction and occupation responsibility, which at last prompts WLB. The employees encountering greater of WLB have inspirational perspective towards association and furthermore inspirational perspective about society. When individuals are cheerful working and furthermore at home, the mental prosperity of families decidedly affects society. Low QWL results more significant levels of pressure which brings about expansion in medical services costs both for the association and for society. As associations and people are essential for society, WLB benefits the association as far as responsibility and efficiency and QWL decidedly influences society as far as mental prosperity of families. In end, this study has shown that QWL and WLB free develops and that associations should be worried about both. Also, this exploration shows that emotional and attitudinal ideas, for example, work pressure, work satisfaction, and occupation responsibility are significant factors in the connection among QWL and WLB. It is trusted that this study will animate further examination on WLB to better our comprehension on how associations might empower employees to all the more likely equilibrium their work and family lives.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, A.B., Obeidat, B.Y., Aqqad, N.O., Al Janini, M.N.K. and Dahiyat, S.E. (2017), “An integrated model of job involvement, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a structural analysis in Jordan’s banking sector”, *Communications and Network*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 28-53.
- Aiken, L. and West, S. (1991), *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Anuradha and Pandey, M. (2016), “Impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction of women doctors”, *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 319-324.
- Au, W.C. and Ahmed, P.K. (2014), “Sustainable people management through work-life balance: a study of the Malaysian Chinese context”, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 262-280.
- Bala, I., Saini, R. and Goyal, B.B. (2019), “Impact of quality of work life on behavioral commitment”, *Sumedha Journal of Management*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 58-72.
- Bataineh, K.A. (2019), “Impact of work-life balance, happiness at work, on employee performance”, *International Business Research*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 99-112.
- Beauregard, A. and Henry, L.C. (2009), “Making the link between work life balance practices and organizational performance”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 9-22.
- Behr, T.A. and Glazer, S. (2001), “A cultural perspective of social support in relation to occupational stress”, in Perrewe, P.L. and Ganster, D.C. (Eds), *Research in Occupational Stress and Wellbeing. Volume 1: Exploring Theoretical Mechanisms and Perspectives*, JAI Press, New York, NY, pp. 97-142.

- Bell, A.S., Rajendran, D. and Theiler, S. (2012), “Job stress, wellbeing, work-life balance and work-lifeconflict among Australian academics”, *Electronic Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 25-37.
- Bhatt, H.C. (2018), “Leadership styles and quality of work life in small and medium scale enterprises of Kumoun Region of Uttarakhand”, *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 23-32.
- Bhola, S.S. and Nigade, J.J. (2016), “Relationship between work life balance, quality of work life and quality of life of women working in service industry”, *Pravara Management Review*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 30-46.
- Bilal, M., Rehman, Z., M. and Raza, I. (2010), “Impact of family friendly policies on employees job satisfaction and turnover intention: a study on work-life balance at workplace”, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol. 2, pp. 378-395.
- Burke, R. (2000), “Do managerial men benefit from organizational values supporting work-personal life balance?”, *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 81-87.
- Chan, K.W. and Wyatt, T.A. (2007), “Quality of work life: a study of employees in Shanghai, China”,
Asia Pacific Business Review, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 501-517.
- Efraty, D. and Sirgy, M.J. (1990), “The effects of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioral responses”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 31-47.
- El Badawy, T.A., Chinta, R. and Magdy, M.M. (2018), “Does ‘gender’ mediate the relationship between ‘quality of work life’ and ‘organizational commitment’?”, *Gender in Management*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 332-348.
- Ellis, N. and Pompli, A. (2002), *Quality of Working Life for Nurses*, Commonwealth Dept of Health and Ageing, Canberra.
- Emslie, C. and Hunt, K. (2009), “‘Live to work’ or ‘work to live’? A qualitative study of gender and work-life balance among men and women in mid-life”, *Gender, Work and Organization*, Vol. 16No. 1, pp. 151-172.

- Feldman, P.H. (1993), “Work life improvements for home care workers: impact and feasibility”, *The Gerontologist*, Vol. 33 No. 1, pp. 47-54.
- Fields, M.W. and Thacker, J.W. (1992), “Influence of quality of work life on company and union commitment”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 439-450.
- Frischmann, B. (2009), “Spillovers theory and its conceptual boundaries”, *William and Mary Law Review*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 801-824.
- Frone, M.R. (1990), “Intolerance of ambiguity as a moderator of the occupational role stress— strain relationship: a meta-analysis”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 11, pp. 309-320.
- Grady, G., McCarthy, A., Darcy, C. and Kirrane, M. (2008), *Work Life Balance Policies and Initiatives in Irish Organizations: A Best Practice Management*, Oak Tree Press, Cork.
- Grawitch, M.J., Tares, S. and Kohler, J.M. (2007), “Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes”, *International Journal of Stress Management*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 275-293.
- Guthrie, V.M.J. (2012), “Management control of work-life balance. A narrative study of an Australian financial institution”, *Journal of Human Resource Costing and Accounting*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 258-280.
- Hardjanti, I.W., Noermijati and Dewanto, A. (2017), “Influence of quality of work life towards psychological well-being and turnover intention of nurses and midwives in hospital”, *Kesmas: National Public Health Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 7-14.
- Harish, K. and Subashini, K. (2014), “Quality of work life in Indian industries – a case study”, *International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology*, Vol. 3 No. 10, pp. 16799-16804.
- Janes, P. and Wisnom, M. (2011), “Changes in tourism industry quality of work life practices”, *Journal of Tourism Insights*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 107-13.

- Joo, B.K. and Lee, I. (2017), “Workplace happiness: work engagement, career satisfaction, and subjective well-being, Evidence-based HRM”, *A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 206-221.
- Judge, T.A., Boudreau, J.W. and Bretz, R.D. (1994), “Job and life attitudes of male executives”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 79, pp. 767-782.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J.D. and Rosenthal, R.A. (1964), *Organizational Stress*, Wiley, New York.
- Kanten, S. and Sadullah, O. (2012), “An empirical research on relationship quality of work life and work engagement”, *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 62 No. 24, pp. 360-6.
- Kennedy, P. (2008), *A Guide to Econometric*, 6th ed., Blackwell Publishing, Malden.
- Khan, M.A. and Khan, S.M. (2017), “Search for antecedents of organizational commitment: a structural equation model”, *Journal of Organisation and Human Behaviour*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 8-15.
- Konrad, A.M. and Mengel, R. (2000), “The impact of work life program on firm productivity”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 12, pp. 1225-1237.
- Koubova, V. and Buchko, A.A. (2013), “Life-work balance: emotional intelligence as a crucial component of achieving both personal life and work performance”, *Management Research Review*, Vol. 36 No. 7, pp. 700-719.
- Kumar, S.M. and Udayasuriyan, G. (2008), “The relationship between work-life-balance and the perception of quality of work life of employees in the electronic industry in Chennai and Bangalore (India)”, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 2 Nos 1-2, pp. 23-31.
- Kwahar, N. and Iyortsuun, A.S. (2018), “Determining the underlying dimensions of quality of work life (QWL) in the Nigerian hotel industry”, *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 53-70.
- Lau, T.Y.H., Wong, K.F., Chan and Law, M. (2001), “Information technology and the work environment does it change the way people interact at work”, *Human Systems Management*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 267-280.

context: the role of workplace flexibility”, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 234-249.

Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2002), “Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature”,

Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 87 No. 4, pp. 698-714.

Saraji, G.S. and Dangahi, H. (2006), “Study of quality of work life (QWL)”, *Iranian Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 8-14.

Schuler, R.S. (1982), “An integrated transactional process model of stress in organizations”, *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, Vol. 3, pp. 5-19.

Seibt, R., Spitzer, S., Blank, M. and Scheuch, K. (2009), “Predictors of work ability in occupations with psychological stress”, *Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 9-18.

Semlali, S. and Hassi, A. (2016), “Work–life balance: how can we help women IT professionals in Morocco?”, *Journal of Global Responsibility*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 210-225.

Shaffer, M.A., Reiche, B.S., Dimitrova, M., Lazarova, M., Chen, S., Westman, M. and Wurtz, O. (2016), “Work and family role adjustment of different types of global professionals: scale development and validation”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 113-139.

Shukla, A. and Srivastava, R. (2016), “Development of short questionnaire to measure an extended set of role expectation conflict, coworker support and work-life balance: the new job stress scale”, *Cogent Business and Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 1-19.

Singh, S. and Chaudhary, N. (2019), “Quality of work life and dynamics of work-related wellbeing: an exploratory study of textile employees”, *International Management Review*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 77-84.

Sirgy, M.J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. and Lee, D.J. (2001), “A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories”, *Social Indicators Research* Vol. 55, pp. 241-302.

- Soomro, A.A., Breitenecker, R.J. and Shah, S.A.M. (2018), “Relation of work-life balance, work-family conflict, and family-work conflict with the employee performance-moderating role of job satisfaction”, *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 129-146.
- Spector, P.E. (1997), *Job Satisfaction. Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Surienty, L., Ramayah, T. and May-ChiunTarmizi, L.A.N. (2014), “Quality of work life and turnover intention: a partial least square (PLS) approach”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 119 No. 1, pp. 405-420.
- Thakur, R. and Sharma, D. (2019), “Quality of work life and its relationship with work performance – a study of employees of Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Limited”, *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 45-52.