

ROLE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD WORK-LIFE BALANCE IN JOB SATISFACTION AND PERFORMANCE: ANOVA APPROACH

Miss Sanskriti Yadava

Student, Department of Science

Poornima Tiwari, PhD

Assistant Professor

Department of Science

The Bhopal School of Social Sciences, Bhopal, M.P.

E-mail: yadavasanskriti@gmail.com

Abstract

Work-life balance (WLB) and job satisfaction & performance are considered the most influencing factors towards employee well-being and the success of the organization. This study focuses whether there is a significant variation in terms of WLB and JSP among various groups using Welch's One-Way ANOVA. Quantitative method was applied, relying on the pre-validated questionnaire constructed by the researcher. Data were gathered from a random sample of employees from different industries, and pilot study testing confirmed the reliability of the tool, Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.756$. EFA results showed high factor loadings (0.710) and moderate uniqueness (0.496). ANOVA test did not present statistically significant variations in WLB, $F = 0.901$ and JSP, $F = 0.089$ across the groups. The results suggest that organizational policies and workplace culture could affect WLB and JSP more than group differences. Future research may focus on longitudinal effects and external moderating factors like leadership and job autonomy.

Keywords: Work-Life Balance, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Welch's ANOVA, Employee Well-Being, Workplace Policies

Introduction

The concept of work-life balance has been widely found in organizational research, and attitudes toward WLB are highly significant in forming job satisfaction. Indeed, the perception that employees hold about WLB and its value impacts the overall contentment of work life, as the balancing of personal with professional responsibilities contributes to psychological well-being.

Positive attitude toward WLB is accompanied by reduced stress, lower burnout, and greater motivation and these together act as an impetus for higher job satisfaction. When employees have the perception that their organization cares for their WLB, it leads to stronger commitment, greater engagement, and a sense of fulfillment in one's job. On the contrary, a poor attitude toward WLB, resulting from excessive demands at work or unrealistic expectations coupled with a lack of organizational support, can create dissatisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and higher turnover intentions. Therefore, employees' attitudes toward work-life balance act as an important determinant of job satisfaction, impacting their view regarding workplace fairness, autonomy, and the level of work-related stress.

Actually, attitudes toward work-life balance also have an impact on employee performance. In fact, employees who have a positive attitude about work-life balance are more likely to gain increased productivity, creativity, and efficiency in dealing with tasks. An organization that nurtures a conducive work-life balance environment will enhance employees' time management, enable them to concentrate on their job, and give quality results. Conversely, poor attitudes or the presence of organizational barriers toward work-life balance can lead to reduced motivation levels, increased rates of absenteeism, and performance. Moreover, excessive stress at work associated with an out-of-balance lifestyle can cause impairment in cognition, decision making, and personal relationships at the workplace, reducing overall organizational efficiency. As a result of recognizing the strategic need for employee wellness, positive attitudes toward WLB become a necessary ingredient for optimizing individual and organizational performance.

Job satisfaction and performance are intricately linked, where attitudes toward WLB play an important mediating role. For individuals, a balanced relationship between work and personal life leads to higher job satisfaction, which subsequently boosts performance. Satisfied employees tend to be more engaged, committed, and proactive about their duties-variables that contribute to efficiency and innovativeness. When WLB is seen to be neglected, however, dissatisfaction grows, leading to disengagement and lower productivity. It is in these organizations that one would be able to have a healthy work culture with employee well-being and success. Understanding, then, the role of attitudes toward WLB in job satisfaction and performance has

crucial implications both for academic research and practical uses in human resource management, leadership strategies, and workplace policies.

Literature Review

The study titled "**The Role of Work-Life Balance Practices in Order to Improve Organizational Performance**" by Lazăr, Osoian, and Rațiu (2010) investigates the role of work-life balance initiatives in enhancing individual and organizational performance. The study aims to identify whether WLB practices can be regarded as strategic human resource management decisions that lead to improved employee well-being, engagement, and business outcomes. The study used a literature review methodology to examine the various research findings on WLB initiatives, such as flexible work arrangements, job sharing, telecommuting, and family-friendly policies. Findings indicate that organizations that have comprehensive WLB strategies experience reduced absenteeism, increased productivity, improved job satisfaction, and enhanced corporate reputation. However, the study also reveals challenges such as organizational culture, managerial support, and employee perceptions, which may affect the effectiveness of WLB policies. The authors suggest that businesses integrate WLB initiatives into their core human resource management strategies to foster a more engaged and productive workforce (Lazăr et al., 2010) [4].

The study is titled "**Employees' Perception on Work-Life Balance and Its Relation with Job Satisfaction in Indian Public Sector Banks**" by Lalita Kumari, 2012. It has explored how factors of work-life balance influence the job satisfaction among employees in Indian public sector banks. The goal of the paper is to find out the employees' perception towards WLB policies, gender difference in job satisfaction, and explore the relationship between WLB and job satisfaction. The study uses a quantitative survey research design, and data were collected from a sample of 350 employees using a quota sampling method. Statistical analyses, including factor analysis, descriptive statistics, t-tests, and Karl Pearson's correlation, were performed using SPSS. Findings indicate a significant positive correlation between WLB and job satisfaction ($r = .772$, $p < .01$), which means that employees with better WLB policies tend to have higher job

satisfaction. Gender differences do exist; female employees reported lower WLB scores compared to their counterparts, but reported higher job satisfaction. In a nutshell, an enhanced WLB policy would improve employee commitment, productivity, and job satisfaction in public sector banks by designing flexible work arrangements and management practices (Kumari, 2012) [3].

The study titled "**Empirical Analysis of Work-Life Balance Policies and Its Impact on Employee's Job Satisfaction and Performance: Descriptive Statistical Approach**" by Maurya et al. (2015) explores the relationship between work-life balance (WLB) policies and employee job satisfaction in the Indian banking sector. The purpose of the study is to analyze how flexible work practices, leave provisions, family welfare policies, and job design affect employee satisfaction and performance. A sample of 240 employees from commercial banks in Uttar Pradesh, India, was selected, and a structured questionnaire was used for data collection. The study used a descriptive statistical approach, applying multivariate correlation and regression analysis to evaluate the relationships among the variables. Findings reveal that policies for work-life balance significantly impact job satisfaction, and welfare policies had the strongest impact at $\beta = 0.422$ followed by flexibility policies at $\beta = 0.207$, then leave provisions at $\beta = 0.178$, and lastly, job design at $\beta = 0.161$. The goodness of fit was excellent ($R^2 = 0.618$), which means the independent variables strongly correlate with job satisfaction. The study recommends that bank managers enhance work-life balance policies to improve employee satisfaction, commitment, and productivity (Maurya et al., 2015) [5].

This research article, titled "**Impact of Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction among School Teachers of 21st Century**" by Hafeez and Akbar (2015), investigated the impact of WLB on job satisfaction in elementary school teachers of Karachi, Pakistan. It was designed to find out to what extent these WLB factors such as working long hours, work pressure, change of jobs, and flexible working conditions would influence job satisfaction. The study adopted a quantitative approach and used a self-administered questionnaire distributed to a sample of 350 school teachers using the quota sampling technique, with an 83% response rate of 290 valid responses. The study utilized descriptive, correlation, and regression analyses using SPSS 19. The results

showed that although flexible working conditions are positively related to job satisfaction ($r = .795$, $p < .05$), long working hours ($r = -.589$), work pressure ($r = -.585$), and job change intentions ($r = -.486$) have significant negative correlations with job satisfaction. However, WLB was established to have limited impacts on teachers' job satisfaction as a result of economic instability, inflation, and lack of national policies. It is suggested that educational institutions adopt flexible work schedules, workload reduction, and the implementation of WLB policies for the purpose of improving job satisfaction and retaining teachers (Hafeez & Akbar, 2015) [2].

A study by Okolie, Ighorhiohwunu, and Omole (2017) on "**Impact of Work-Life Balance on Employee Job Attitudes: A Review**" studies the effect of WLB on employee job attitudes, that is, job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement. The paper explores the relevance of WLB to employee attitudes and presents some suggestions for enhancing WLB to attain a balance between work and personal life. The research uses a qualitative review method, analyzing existing literature to identify the effects of WLB policies on organizational performance and employee well-being. Findings suggest that difficulty in balancing work and personal responsibilities negatively impacts job satisfaction, commitment, and engagement, whereas effective WLB policies enhance employee attitudes and overall productivity. The study concludes that organizations need to implement more holistic WLB initiatives, which include flexible work arrangements, teleworking, childcare support, and employee wellness programs, to improve job satisfaction, reduce stress, and increase organizational commitment (Okolie et al., 2017) [7].

A comparative study of work-life balance and job satisfaction of the employees working in business process outsourcing sector, Subooh Yusuf (2018) investigated the relationship between WLB and job satisfaction of the employees in the Indian BPO sector. The aim of the study was to compare the WLB and job satisfaction of male and female employees working in BPOs. A sample of 200 employees (120 males and 80 females) was selected from BPO companies in Aligarh and Delhi using a random sampling method. WLB was measured using a 15-item scale adapted from Hayman (2005), and job satisfaction was assessed using Khan and Sheeba's (2002)

scale. The study employed t-tests for statistical analysis using SPSS 16.0. Findings indicate no significant difference in job satisfaction ($t = -0.661$, $p = 0.954$) and WLB ($t = -0.016$, $p = 0.116$) between male and female employees, which suggests that both genders are similarly affected by these variables. It thus concludes that demographics like gender hardly influence WLB and job satisfaction in the BPO sector. This is supported by previous studies, which stated that organizational policies and work environment are more relevant to employee satisfaction (Yusuf, 2018) [13].

This paper is titled "**The Influences of Job Performance, Work-Life Balance, and Organizational Justice on Employees' Career Satisfaction**" by Saraih et al. (2019). This study analyzes the relationships between job performance, work-life balance, and organizational justice in a manufacturing company in northern Malaysia. It aims to identify how job performance, work-life balance, and organizational justice affect employees' career satisfaction. A quantitative research design was adopted by collecting data with a survey sample of 240 employees from a random sampling set, where a total of 148 valid answers were analyzed using a cross-sectional correlation approach facilitated by SPSS statistical analysis. The findings indicate that all three factors—job performance ($\beta = .71$, $p = .00$), work-life balance ($\beta = .71$, $p = .00$), and organizational justice ($\beta = .83$, $p = .00$)—have significant and positive relationships with career satisfaction. Among these, organizational justice emerged as the most influential factor. This study should motivate organizations to enhance fairness in appraisals and decision-making processes, promote a balanced work-life culture, and ensure that workers maintain high performance to improve career satisfaction and organizational success (Saraih et al., 2019) [11].

Attar, Çağlıyan, and Abdul-Kareem (2020) in their study "**Evaluating the Moderating Role of Work-Life Balance on the Effect of Job Stress on Job Satisfaction**" examine whether WLB moderates the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction among employees in manufacturing SMEs in Konya, Turkey. The purpose of the study is to evaluate how job stress affects job satisfaction and whether WLB can reduce its adverse effects. Using a quantitative research approach, data were collected through surveys from a sample of 308 respondents working in 90 manufacturing SMEs. The study used statistical analysis using SPSS 23 and

Hayes PROCESS macro v.3.4.1. Findings reveal that job stress has a statistically significant negative impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.17$, $p < 0.001$), while WLB has a positive effect on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.001$). Contrary to expectations, WLB does not moderate the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Therefore, according to the study, stress management strategies should be set up independently of WLB policies in order to provide overall improvement in job satisfaction of workers (Attar et al., 2020) [1].

Ogunola (2022) explores how quality of work-life (QWL) and work-life balance (WLB) predict job satisfaction among bank employees in Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria, in the study titled **"Quality of Work-Life and Work-Life Balance as Predictors of Employee Job Satisfaction."** The aim of the study is to determine whether QWL and WLB predict job satisfaction independently and together. Using a descriptive survey research design, the study collected data from a sample of 100 employees working in four selected banks through structured questionnaires. Multiple regression analysis was used to identify relationships among variables. Findings show that both QWL ($\beta = .648$, $t = 8.597$, $p > .05$) and WLB ($\beta = .212$, $t = 2.849$, $p > .05$) significantly affect job satisfaction, with QWL having a stronger effect. The study concludes that organizations should improve working conditions, create family-friendly policies, and enhance employees' physical and psychological work environments to increase job satisfaction and overall productivity (Ogunola, 2022) [6].

This article, titled **"Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Job Performance among Bankers: A Cross-Sectional Study"** by Rathi and Islam (2024), considers the linkages between WLB, job satisfaction, and job performance in banking. The main purpose of this study is to find out if WLB and job satisfaction independently and jointly predict job performance in bankers. A cross-sectional survey design was used to collect data from a purposive sample of 100 bankers, out of which 50 were from public banks and 50 from private banks in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Validated scales were used to measure WLB, job satisfaction, and job performance, and the data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics in SPSS. The results indicate that there is a strong positive relationship between WLB

and job performance ($r = .538$, $p < .01$) and between job satisfaction and job performance ($r = .713$, $p < .01$). Through stepwise multiple regression analysis, it has been found that the strongest predictor of job performance is job satisfaction, with $\beta = .593$ and $p < .01$. However, it was also established that WLB $\beta = .164$, $p < .01$ has a role to play in the performance outcomes. The study concludes that enhancing WLB and job satisfaction can improve employee performance, and private bank employees show significantly higher job performance compared to their public sector counterparts. The results give insights to HR managers and policymakers in developing strategies that promote employee well-being and organizational success (Rathi & Islam, 2024) [9].

Significance And Research Gaps

The reviewed studies generally point out that work-life balance (WLB) plays an important role in determining job satisfaction and employee performance in different industries, including banking, education, manufacturing, and business process outsourcing (BPO). A few studies, for example, by Maurya et al. (2015) and Ogunola (2022), have found that effective WLB policies improve job satisfaction and thereby increase employee retention and commitment. Others, such as Rathi and Islam (2024) and Attar et al. (2020), focus on the direct effects of WLB on job performance, indicating that satisfied employees are more productive and engaged. Extensions of this discussion are found in the research conducted by Lazăr et al. (2010) and Hafeez and Akbar (2015), which demonstrates that organizations that undertake strategic WLB initiatives experience organizational performance and employee well-being improvement. Gender-based analyses also, such as Kumari (2012) and Yusuf (2018) reveal that, though perceptions of WLB vary between men and women, the correlation of WLB and job satisfaction for everyone is big. Together, these studies contribute to human resource management by showing that encouraging WLB has positive workplace outcomes, such as greater employee morale, lesser stress, and improved productivity.

Because these studies are significantly valuable and are proving to fill a few research gaps, the relationship between WLB and job satisfaction or performance is examined in most of these studies. However, the potential mediators include organizational culture, leadership style, and

psychological well-being (e.g., Attar et al., 2020; Hafeez & Akbar, 2015). Many studies by, for instance, Saraih et al. (2019) and Ogunola (2022), are cross-sectional in design. This leaves room for noncausal interpretations since longitudinal approaches should be considered for the effects of changes in WLB policies over time. Furthermore, much research, although having some investigations regarding gender (for example, Kumari, 2012; Yusuf, 2018), lack extensive intersectional approaches that could integrate age, marital status, or socioeconomic status. Further, studies such as Rathi and Islam (2024) and Maurya et al. (2015) are industry-specific, which limits the generalization of findings across various work environments. Lastly, most research focuses on formal WLB policies without examining the informal workplace culture that impacts work-life integration. Filling these gaps with comprehensive, multi-sectoral, and longitudinal research can further enhance our understanding of how WLB initiatives contribute to sustainable workforce management.

Research Methodology

1. Research Design

The study adopts the quantitative research methodology to investigate WLB and JSP differences in various groups. A cross-sectional survey design is used, with data collected at one point in time to gauge the variations between WLB and JSP for employees.

2. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

A total of 70 employees working within various organizations participated in the study. A random sampling procedure was used for the study to help represent employees drawn from various job levels, departments, and sectors. Individual participants were drawn from diversified backgrounds to enhance generalization.

3. Instrument of Research

A pre-validated questionnaire was the research instrument to measure Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction & Performance. The questionnaire was constructed by the researcher and designed to capture employees' perceptions of their work-life balance and job satisfaction levels.

The tool comprised Likert-scale items, ensuring ease of response and consistency in measurement. The scale's reliability was confirmed through Cronbach's alpha (0.756), indicating acceptable internal consistency.

4. Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with a small proportion of the target population, say 30 employees, to assess the reliability and clarity of the questionnaire. Ambiguities and difficulties in understanding the questions from the participants' feedback were assessed and incorporated accordingly in the questionnaire with minor modifications as indicated by the pilot study findings. The pilot study revealed that the reliability analysis confirmed the suitability of the research tool for further use in the main study.

5. Data Collection and Analysis

Self-administered surveys were conducted on the basis of online and physical distribution methods. The collected data were then analyzed by means of Welch's One-Way ANOVA in order to assess whether differences are significant regarding Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction & Performance between various groups. The analysis of the findings was performed by the help of descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS software.

This methodology ensures that the study follows a systematic, reliable, and replicable approach, allowing for meaningful conclusions regarding the impact of group differences on Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction & Performance.

Reliability Analysis [12]

Table 1 – Scale Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's α
Scale	0.756

Interpretation of Reliability Analysis

The Cronbach's alpha (α) value obtained is 0.756, which means that the scale has acceptable internal consistency and reliability. Cronbach's alpha is a measure that is used to assess how well a set of items in a scale are correlated and measure the same underlying construct.

Interpretation based on Reliability Thresholds:

- $\alpha \geq 0.9 \rightarrow$ Excellent reliability
- $0.8 \leq \alpha < 0.9 \rightarrow$ Good reliability
- $0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.8 \rightarrow$ Acceptable reliability
- $0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7 \rightarrow$ Questionable reliability
- $\alpha < 0.6 \rightarrow$ Poor reliability

As the Cronbach's alpha is 0.756 and is in the acceptable range, i.e. between 0.7 and 0.8, then the scale in the present study is reliable enough for research. Therefore, items of the scale moderately correlate and are consistent with measurement of one construct. However, while the reliability is acceptable, there is room for improvement. To further enhance reliability, researchers may consider:

1. Reviewing individual items to identify and refine poorly correlated items.
2. Increasing the number of items in the scale, as longer scales tend to improve reliability.
3. Conducting factor analysis to check whether all items belong to the same construct.

Overall, the scale is reliable enough for meaningful data collection and analysis, ensuring that responses are consistent and dependable across participants.

Exploratory Factor Analysis [8]

Table 2 – Factor Loadings

	Factor 1	Uniqueness
Work-Life Balance	0.710	0.496

Job Satisfaction and Performance	0.710	0.496
---	-------	-------

Note. 'Minimum residual' extraction method was used in combination with a 'oblimin' rotation

Exploratory Factor Analysis Interpretation

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was carried out by the minimum residual extraction method using oblimin rotation. It is appropriate for factors that are anticipated to be correlated. The factor loadings and uniqueness for the two measured constructs, Work-Life Balance (WLB) and Job Satisfaction and Performance (JSP), are presented below.

1. Factor Loadings

- Work-Life Balance (WLB) → 0.710
- Job Satisfaction and Performance (JSP) → 0.710

The factor loadings refer to the correlation between each item and the factor extracted. The loading of 0.710 indicates that WLB and JSP have strong factor loadings, meaning that these variables are contributing significantly to the identified factor structure. In general, values above 0.60 are considered meaningful, and values above 0.70 indicate a strong association with the factor.

2. Uniqueness Values

- Work-Life Balance (WLB) → 0.496
- Job Satisfaction and Performance (JSP) → 0.496

Uniqueness values are the percentage of variance in each variable that is not explained by the factor. The uniqueness value of 0.496 means that about 50.4% of the variance in both WLB and JSP is accounted for by the extracted factor, while the remaining 49.6% is unexplained, or unique variance. Typically, uniqueness values below 0.50 are indicative of well representation of the item by the factor, whereas values above 0.60 suggest weaker representation. In the present case, both WLB and JSP are moderately well represented by the extracted factor.

3. Important Findings

- Factor Structure: The single-factor structure of the analysis can be inferred as both constructs loaded significantly onto the same factor.
- Strong Factor Loadings: Loadings of 0.710 indicate that WLB and JSP are highly associated with this factor.
- Moderate Uniqueness: The uniqueness values (0.496) indicate that nearly half of the variance is unique to each construct, suggesting some room for further refinement.
- Implication for Future Research: While the factor structure is acceptable, researchers may consider adding more variables or conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to validate this factor structure.

Data Analysis [10]

Table 3:

- **Objective:**

The paper aims to analyze whether there are significant differences in Work-Life Balance (WLB) and Job Satisfaction & Performance (JSP) based on different groups using Welch's One-Way ANOVA. For instance, the study would investigate the relationship between group membership and employees' views regarding work-life balance as well as their job satisfaction and performance levels.

- **Null Hypotheses (H_0):**

1. H_0 (Work-Life Balance): There is no significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the different groups.
2. H_0 (Job Satisfaction & Performance): There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance among the groups.

Since the p-values both for variables are above 0.05, i.e., 0.096 for WLB and 0.651 for JSP, then we fail to reject the null hypotheses, which means that there is no statistically significant difference between groups.

Table 3 - One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Work-Life Balance	2.520	4	12.0	0.096
Job Satisfaction and Performance	0.630	4	11.8	0.651

- **Interpretation of Hypothesis 1 (Work-Life Balance)**

The first null hypothesis was tested using Welch's One-Way ANOVA, H_0 : There is no significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the different groups. The results are an F-value of 2.520 with $df1 = 4$ and $df2 = 12.0$, and a p-value of 0.096. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, which means there is no statistically significant difference in Work-Life Balance among the groups. But, again, the p-value is close enough that it seems like a trend might be present here and could reach significance based on either an increase in sample size or finer detail in the analysis. This means that though group differences in Work-Life Balance could not be statistically ascertained in the present study, future studies with a larger sample size may still be necessary to examine possible underlying trends.

- **Interpretation of Hypothesis 2 (Job Satisfaction & Performance)**

The second null hypothesis (H_0 : There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance across the different groups) was tested at this juncture with the help of Welch's One-Way ANOVA Result. The F-value was 0.630 with $df1 = 4$ and $df2 = 11.8$, and p-value was 0.651. Since the value of the p-value is much greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis indicating that there is not significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance between the groups. This basically means that within these groups, the employees believe they have similar levels of job satisfaction and performance despite any possible difference of conditions and demographics of their workplaces. The results indicate that the relationship

between group membership and job satisfaction is weak, indicating that perhaps variables such as individual motivation, workplace policies, or organizational culture might have a greater influence on job satisfaction and performance than differences based on group.

Table 4:

- **Objective:**

The objective of this study is to determine, using Welch's One-Way ANOVA, whether the two groups of employees differ in Work-Life Balance (WLB) and Job Satisfaction & Performance (JSP). In general, the researcher wants to see if group membership affects the perceived work-life balance of employees as well as the levels of their job satisfaction and performance.

- **Null Hypotheses (H_0):**

1. H_0 (Work-Life Balance): No significant difference in Work-Life Balance between the two groups.
2. H_0 (Job Satisfaction & Performance): There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance between the two groups.

Since the p-values for both variables, WLB with a value of 0.719 and JSP with a value of 0.542, are greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypotheses, indicating no statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Table 4 - One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Work-Life Balance	0.131	1	68.0	0.719
Job Satisfaction and Performance	0.375	1	63.5	0.542

First null hypothesis: H_0 : There is no significant difference in Work-Life Balance between the two groups. Welch's One-Way ANOVA was used to test the above hypothesis. $F(1, 68) = 0.131$

and the p-value was 0.719. As the p-value is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, meaning there is no statistical difference between the two groups on Work-Life Balance. This would indicate that both groups have the same level of work-life balance, and thus the differences in workload, organizational policies, or job flexibility between the two groups may not be considerable. The fact that there is no significant difference suggests that more variables, like individual coping strategies, personal priorities, or work culture, could play a stronger role in Work-Life Balance than group differences.

- **Interpretation of Hypothesis 2 (Job Satisfaction & Performance)**

Welch's One-Way ANOVA was also used to test the second null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance between the two groups. This is as such that an analysis appears with $F(1, 63.5) = 0.375$ and a p-value of 0.542. With this p-value being greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, which suggests that Job Satisfaction & Performance are not significantly different among the two groups. This suggests that the two groups demonstrate similar levels of job satisfaction and performance, meaning external factors like job role, compensation, and workplace environment are likely to have more consistent impacts across groups than based on group. The results therefore suggest that perhaps other factors like motivation, leadership, or personal work ethics can be more significant in having effects on job satisfaction and performance instead of group-based differences.

Table 5:

- **Objective:**

The purpose of this research study is to test whether there exists a significant variation in Work-Life Balance (WLB) and Job Satisfaction & Performance (JSP) between three groups. In this research, it tries to determine if group membership is a factor influencing the level of work-life balance and job satisfaction & performance in employees.

- **Null Hypotheses (H_0):**

1. H_0 (Work-Life Balance): The Work-Life Balance is not significantly different in the three groups.

2. H_0 : Job Satisfaction & Performance: No significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance among the three groups.

Since the p-values for each of the two variables are greater than 0.05-that is, 0.901 for WLB and 0.089 for JSP- failure to reject the null hypotheses prevails, which means that there is no statistical difference between Work-Life Balance or Job Satisfaction & Performance across these three groups.

Table 5 - One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Work-Life Balance	0.112	2	1.44	0.901
Job Satisfaction and Performance	12.542	2	1.78	0.089

- **Interpretation of Hypothesis 1 (Work-Life Balance)**

The first null hypothesis was tested using Welch's One-Way ANOVA: H_0 : Work-Life Balance across the three groups is not significantly different. Results: $F(2, 1.44) = 0.112$; p-value = 0.901 Since this p-value is much greater than 0.05, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, which indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in Work-Life Balance among the three groups. This would indicate that the groups do not have differences in their levels of Work-Life Balance and that the ability of the employee to achieve this balance does not depend on membership in the groups. A high p-value would also imply that any variation found in Job Satisfaction & Performance might be because of random rather than real effects.

- **Explanation of Hypothesis 2: Job Satisfaction & Performance**

The second null hypothesis is, "There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance across the three groups." Welch's One-Way ANOVA estimated for this gives $F(2, 1.78) = 12.542$ with a p-value of 0.089. The F-value is quite high, but the p-value is above 0.05. This means that we fail to reject the null hypothesis at the standard significance level. However, the p-value is 0.089, approaching the 0.05 cut point, thereby indicating a potential trend that becomes significant with further data or higher-resolution analysis. It means, while there's no statistically significant difference in the Job Satisfaction & Performance among these groups in the study, a more extensive data set may find meaningful differences among them.

Table 6:

- **Objective:**

This research study aims to find out whether there is a significant difference between groups regarding WLB and JSP through Welch's One-Way ANOVA. This study aims to find out whether group membership impacts the employees' perceived levels of work-life balance and job satisfaction & performance.

- **Null Hypotheses (H_0):**

1. H_0 (Work-Life Balance): There is no significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the different groups.
2. H_0 (Job Satisfaction & Performance): There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance across the different groups.

- **Interpretation Based on p-values:**

1. For Work-Life Balance: The p-value (0.029) is less than 0.05, hence we reject the null hypothesis. This implies that there is a statistically significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the groups.
2. For Job Satisfaction & Performance: As the p-value (0.997) is way greater than 0.05, this results in our failure to reject the null hypothesis. This says that there might not be significant variation in terms of Job Satisfaction & Performance within the groups themselves.

Table 6 - One-Way ANOVA (Welch's)

	F	df1	df2	p
Work-Life Balance	4.9746	4	7.53	0.029
Job Satisfaction and Performance	0.0319	4	5.25	0.997

- **From Hypothesis 1 Work-life balance**

The first null hypothesis (H_0 : There is no significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the different groups) was tested using Welch's One-Way ANOVA. The results showed $F(4, 7.53) = 4.9746$ with a p-value of 0.029. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, indicating that there is a statistically significant difference in Work-Life Balance across the groups. This means that employees in different groups perceive their ability to balance work and personal life differently, which may be influenced by factors such as job role, industry type, organizational policies, or personal circumstances. The findings suggest that some groups may have better work-life balance than others, which is a reason for further investigation into workplace policies and cultural influences that contribute to these differences.

- **Interpretation of Hypothesis 2: Job Satisfaction & Performance**

The second null hypothesis, H_0 : There is no significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance across the different groups, was tested by using Welch's One-Way ANOVA. $F(4, 5.25) = 0.0319$ and the p-value = 0.997. The p-value is much larger than 0.05; thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, which states that there is no statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction & Performance across the groups. This means that even though there might be differences in work-to-life balances, the same levels of job satisfaction and performance were reported among the different groups. These results indicate that organizational culture, leadership, and motivation may have more uniform effects on job satisfaction and performance, which are then relatively stable between groups.

Discussion

The goal of this study was to determine the differences that exist in WLB and JSP across different groups using Welch's One-Way ANOVA. The results found that there was no statistical difference in terms of WLB or JSP across the groups since the p-values in all the comparisons were more than 0.05. This suggests that group membership does not significantly impact employees' ability to balance their work and personal lives or their levels of job satisfaction and performance.

Factor analysis results indicated that WLB and JSP have strong factor loadings (0.710) and moderate uniqueness values (0.496). These variables are, therefore, well-represented in the factor structure. Scale reliability showed acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.756$), thereby confirming that the research tool was appropriate for measuring these constructs.

Furthermore, the pilot study ensured that the tool was valid in terms of clarity and reliability before full data collection. The quantitative survey method used enables an objective examination of differences among groups. However, in cases where the F-values were very high, such as JSP: $F = 12.542$, $p = 0.089$, the results were not statistically significant but indicate a kind of trend that could lead to a further study using a sample size of more respondents.

These findings are consistent with previous studies indicating that the influence of organizational culture, leadership style, and personal coping mechanisms on WLB and JSP is stronger than demographic groupings alone. Additionally, although WLB is strongly associated with employee well-being, its impact does not necessarily vary between groups as many modern workplaces have implemented flexible policies that generate relatively uniform experiences for employees.

Conclusion

The results of this study suggest that Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction & Performance do not differ significantly across groups. The results indicate that job satisfaction and work-life balance among employees across the different groups are similar, and this reinforces the notion that perhaps individual or organizational factors, rather than group-based differences, might be more crucial in determining these outcomes. The reliability analysis established that the research

tool was indeed valid for the measurement of the constructs, while the factor analysis confirmed the strength of the study's measurement framework.

Although Welch's One-Way ANOVA did not show significant differences, the near-threshold p-value for Job Satisfaction & Performance ($p = 0.089$) suggests a potential trend that could become more evident with a larger and more diverse sample size. Future research could further explore longitudinal changes in work-life balance and how external workplace factors, such as leadership support, job autonomy, or mental health policies, influence these constructs over time.

Recommendations

Several recommendations can be drawn from the results:

- **For Organizations:**

1. Work-Life Balance Policies must be improved: Even though WLB did not vary significantly across groups, it is still crucial for organizations to continue promoting flexible work arrangements, remote work options, and employee wellness programs that will enhance the overall well-being of employees.
2. Job Satisfaction & Performance Initiatives: Companies need to focus on factors such as employee recognition, career development, and supportive leadership to maintain and enhance job satisfaction.
3. Regular Employee Feedback & Assessments – Organizations should conduct continuous evaluations of WLB and job satisfaction to ensure that policies are meeting employee needs effectively.

- **For Researchers:**

1. Expand the Sample Size – Future studies should increase the number of participants to improve statistical power and capture potential significant differences.
2. Conduct Longitudinal Studies – Rather than cross-sectional studies, a longitudinal study will trace the trajectory of WLB and JSP with organizational and policy changes.

3. Investigate Further Moderating Variables – The impact of leadership styles, workplace culture, and industry-specific factors should be explored as potential moderators in shaping WLB and JSP.

- **For Policymakers:**

1. Develop Workplace Rules and Regulations on WLB – This is by designing policies to work towards a better work-life balance, which incorporates rules about work hours, leave, and even the right to work remotely.
2. Promote Programs for Employee Wellness – The lawmakers should motivate entrepreneurs to provide quality mental health support, flexible hours, and overall employee welfare policies to boost their job satisfaction.

Although this study did not find significant differences across groups, it provides valuable insights into the stability of Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction & Performance in modern workplaces. The findings suggest that organizations should focus on workplace policies and cultural factors rather than group-based interventions to improve employee satisfaction and performance. Future research should explore additional variables and longitudinal effects to build a more comprehensive understanding of WLB and JSP dynamics in different work environments.

References

- [1] Attar, M., Çağlıyan, V., & Abdul-Kareem, A. (2020). Evaluating the moderating role of work-life balance on the effect of job stress on job satisfaction. *Istanbul Business Research*, 49(2), 201-223. <https://doi.org/10.26650/ibr.2020.49.0081>
- [2] Hafeez, U., & Akbar, W. (2015). Impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction among school teachers of 21st century. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 4(11), 25-35. <https://doi.org/10.52283/NSWRCA.AJBMR.20150411A03>
- [3] Kumari, L. (2012). Employees' perception on work-life balance and its relation with job satisfaction in Indian public sector banks. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research*, 2(2), 1-13. Retrieved from <http://www.exclusivemba.com/ijemr>
- [4] Lazăr, I., Osoian, C., & Rațiu, P. (2010). The role of work-life balance practices in order to improve organizational performance. *European Research Studies Journal*, 13(1), 201-214.

- [5] Maurya, V. N., Jaggi, C. K., Singh, B., Arneja, C. S., Maurya, A. K., & Arora, D. K. (2015). Empirical analysis of work-life balance policies and its impact on employee's job satisfaction and performance: Descriptive statistical approach. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 4(2-1), 33-43. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.s.2015040201.15>
- [6] Ogunola, A. A. (2022). Quality of work-life and work-life balance as predictors of employee job satisfaction. *TAZKIYA Journal of Psychology*, 10(1), 75-84. <https://doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v10i1.22499>
- [7] Okolie, U. C., Ighorhiohwunu, A. V., & Omole, O. G. (2017). Impact of work-life balance on employee job attitudes: A review. *Journal of Management and Corporate Governance*, 9(1), 71-93. Retrieved from <http://www.cenresinpub.org>
- [8] R Core Team (2021). *R: A Language and environment for statistical computing*. (Version 4.1) [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org>. (R packages retrieved from MRAN snapshot 2022-01-01).
- [9] Rathi, S. R., & Islam, A. (2024). Work-life balance and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance among bankers: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(1), 120-129. <https://doi.org/10.25215/1201.011>
- [10] Revelle, W. (2023). *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*. [R package]. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=psych>.
- [11] Saraih, U. N., Mohd Zaki, M. I. I., Mohd Karim, K., Sakdan, M. F., & Amlus, M. H. (2019). The influences of job performance, work-life balance, and organizational justice on employees'