

Work Life Balance in the time of Work from Home (WFH) – Evidence from Women Employees working in IT Companies in Coimbatore City, Tamil Nadu, India

Dr. S. Ilayasankar

Assistant Professor, GRD Institute of Management (GRDIM), Dr. GRD College of Science, Coimbatore-641014

Abstract

COVID-19 pandemic induced restrictions and the necessity of adhering to COVID appropriate behaviors accelerate the Work From Home (WFH) trend in many sectors. The Indian IT sector is one such a sector wherein WFH is widely adopted. This research analyses whether WFH has any impact on Work Life Balance (WLB) of women employees working in Indian IT companies. This research is also interested to know the impact of factors like Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL), Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW), Job controls and Job demands on WLB. 191 women employees working in IT companies in Coimbatore city, Tamil Nadu, India were participated in this research. This research will help the IT companies to understand the factors that affect WLB of women employees. Hence, the researcher hopes that key insights that are found out of this research will help these companies to take many corrective steps to improve WLB of their women employees.

Keywords: Work from Home (WFH), Work Life Balance (WLB), Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)

Article Publication

 Published Online: 13-Oct-2021

*Author's Correspondence

 Dr. S. Ilayasankar

 Assistant Professor, GRD Institute of Management (GRDIM), Dr. GRD College of Science, Coimbatore-641014

 ilayasankar[at]gmail.com

 [10.31305/rrjim.2021.v06.i10.002](https://doi.org/10.31305/rrjim.2021.v06.i10.002)

© 2021 The Authors. Published by RESEARCH REVIEW International Journal of Multidisciplinary. This is an open access article under the CC BY-

NC-ND license 

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Introduction

There are about 4.36 million employees are working in Indian IT sector as of 2020. In this sector, women employees constituted 21 per cent of the total IT workforce in 2001 (NASSCOM 2001) and increased to about 30 per cent in 2012 (NASSCOM 2013). In 2018 (NASSCOM 2018), in this sector, 34% of the total employees were women as per a report of Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology, Government of India. The women employees in the Indian IT companies facing a lot of problems at their work places like Mental harassment, Sexual harassment, Discrimination at Workplace, No Safety of Working Women While Traveling, Lack of Family Support, Insufficient Maternity Leaves, Job insecurity and Workplace Adjustment. Apart from the above-mentioned problems, they have to shoulder the responsibility of fulfilling their family obligations like child care and other family commitments. They are yearning for Work life balance (WLB). Going by the many researches in this area, WLB improves job satisfaction and increases productivity. Work-life balance is the positive state of mind. WLB is about allocating the hours for professional life and personal life judiciously so that one can lead a healthy and peaceful life. According to Takami Tomohiro (2021), the COVID-19 pandemic increased WFH and it also increased the burden of housework and childcare of women employees. This research analyses WLB in multiple angles. It also tries to identify psychological factors that affect WLB.

Review of Literature

Shanthi and Sundar (2012). They did a research on WLB of women employees in Indian IT industry. They identified major factors that influence WLB. They are: Support system in the family, child care, benefits given by the company, alternative work options, relocation options, provision of adequate time for recreation activities and conducive working environment. Their research also revealed that programmes implemented by IT Companies ensured WLB of the women employees.

Meenakshi et al., (2013) have come to know that to improve employee loyalty and productivity, an organization has to ensure that its employees have a supportive work environment, work-life balance and personal responsibility. By the same token, these authors through their research have found that the following factors are responsible for causing depression and poor performance among employees working in an organization: Poorly managed work schedules and domestic life conflicts due to work pressure.

Abioro, Oladejo and Ashogbon (2018). These authors had found that Work Life Balance was important for employees working in any organization – Private or Government. Moreover, they added that if an organization failed to ensure Work life Balance of its employees, it would lead to decrease in employee productivity and performance.

Darko-Asumadu et al., (2018) have emphasized the importance of ensuring work life balance for employees. Work environment should not impose more stress on employees as that will reduce their work commitment and at the same time, if employees are allowed to spend more time with their family and less time at work, this will also bring about increase in absenteeism and lower performance.

Michael Gibbs, Friederike Mengel, and Christoph Siemroth (2021) in their working paper on ‘work from Home and Productivity: Evidence from Personnel and Analytics data on IT Professionals’ have enough evidence to come to the conclusion that WFH, in fact, brought about a significant change in working patterns. They are: Extended working hours, frequent interruptions in the form of meetings which ultimately reduces focus on the job, less networking among employees and less time for training to learn new skills. These factors affect employees’ productivity adversely.

Objectives of the Study

- To investigate the impact of Work from Home (WFH) on the Work Life Balance (WLB) of women employees working in IT Companies.
- To find out the impact of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) on the Work Life Balance (WLB) of women employees working in IT Companies.
- To identify psychological factors of the women employees that affect their WLB.
- To know the impact of Job controls and Job demands on WLB of women employees.

Hypotheses of the Study

- There is a significant difference between WFH and WLB(H₁)
- Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) affect Work Life Balance (WLB) (H₂)
- Job controls and Job demands affect WLB (H₃)
- There is a significant difference between income (INR/Month) of the respondents and WLB felt by them(H₄)
- There is a significant difference between age of the respondents and WLB felt by them(H₅)

Research Methodology

It is a descriptive research. Women employees working in IT companies in Coimbatore city constitute population for this study. Snowball sampling method was used to build significant sample size of 191. A structured questionnaire was distributed by using Google Forms to collect data. The scale used for measuring work-life balance in this study is adopted from an instrument developed by Fisher-McAuley et al. (2003). The items use in this scale is designed to assess certain dimensions of work-life balance: Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL), Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW), and Work Life Balance (WLB). Statistical techniques like Simple percentage analysis, one way ANOVA, Multiple Regression, t-test and Factor analysis were used to analyze the data. The study was carried out for 4 months (January 2021-April 2021)

Discussion and Analysis

Table.1.

Demographic Profile of the Women employees working in IT companies

Demographic Variables	Frequency (N = 191)	Percent
Age (in Years)		
18-30	40	20.9
31 –40	103	53.9
41 –50	43	22.5
Above 50	05	2.6
Monthly Household Income of the respondents (INR/Month)		
10,001-20,000	3	1.6
20,001-30,000	32	16.8
30,001-40,000	110	57.6
40001-50000	32	16.8
50000 and Above	14	7.3

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the above table, one can understand that 53.9% of the respondents belonged to the age group of 31-40 years. The monthly household income (in INR) is in the range of 30,001-40,000 for 57.6 % of the respondents.

Table.2.

Difference between WFH and WLB

Factor	The respondents who are Working From Home(WFH)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value	Level of Significance
WLB	Yes	140	13.67	1.991	3.39	0.001
	No	51	12.59	1.846		

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the above table, as $t = 3.390$ and $p < 0.001$, it is interpreted that there is a significant difference between the fact that whether the respondents are Working from Home (WFH) and the Work Life Balance (WLB) of them. Going by the higher mean value (13.67), one can come to the conclusion that WFH affects WLB positively. Therefore, H_1 is accepted.

Table.3.
Descriptive Statistics

The Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL)	22.13	3.125	191
Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)	11.41	2.744	191
Work Life Balance (WLB)	13.38	2.007	191

Source: Primary Data

Table.4.
Model Summary

Model Summary ^b			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.827 ^a	0.782	0.761	1.825
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)			
b. Dependent Variable: Work Life Balance (WLB)			

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

In the above table the R is the value of the multiple correlation coefficient between the predictors and the outcome. Here, the correlation between WIPL, PLIW and WLB is 0.874. The R Square, which is a measure of how much of the variability in the outcome is accounted for by the predictors. In this model WIPL and PLIW account for 78.2 % of variation in WLB. The adjusted R Square helps one to predict how well a regression model generalizes. It is expected that adjusted R Square value is to be very close to R Square value. Here in the model also, the adjusted R square value is closer to R square value.

Table.5.
ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	139.246	2	69.623	20.914	0.000 ^b
	Residual	625.853	188	3.329		
	Total	765.099	190			
a. Dependent Variable: WLB						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)						

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The above given ANOVA table can be used to test whether the regression model is significantly better at predicting the outcome. At F-Ratio 20.914, the model is significant ($p < 0.000$). It indicates that it is very unlikely, the model has happened purely by chance. Therefore, one could come to the conclusion that this model has significantly improved its ability to predict the outcome variable (WLB), given the changes in the predictor variables (WIPL and PLIW).

Table.6
Coefficients

Coefficients ^a					
Model (1)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	10.027	1.086		9.230	0.000
WIPL	-0.236	0.042	-0.367	-5.570	0.000
PLIW	-0.164	0.048	-0.224	-3.390	0.001
a. Dependent Variable: WLB					

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The B values given in the above table indicate the individual contribution of each predictor variable to the model. Based on these values, WLB model can be described in the following ways: B values (Unstandardized Coefficients) tell the relationship between the outcome variable (WLB) and each predictor variable (WIPL and PLIW). If a 'B' value is positive, it indicates that there is a positive relationship between the predictor and the outcome, whereas a negative coefficient represents a negative relationship. Here in the above model, the two have negative relationship with WLB. In the above table, t-tests measure whether the predictors are making a significant contribution to the model. Therefore, if the t-test associated with a B-value is significant (if the value in the column labelled sig. is less than 0.05) then the predictor is making a significant contribution to the model. The smaller the value of sig. (and the larger the value of t), the greater the contribution of that predictor. From the magnitude of the t-statistics being presented in the above table, WIPL ($t = -5.570$, $p < 0.000$) and PLIW ($t = -3.390$, $p < 0.001$) are negatively affecting WLB. By taking into account mean values given in the Table.3, one can come to the conclusion that WIPL negatively affects WLB greater than PLIW. Therefore, H_2 is accepted.

Table.7
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.620
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	471.008
	df	45
	Sig.	0.000

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the above table, it is concluded that as the significance value is $p < 0.000$, it implies that the factor analysis to identify psychological factors of the women employees that affect their WLB is valid. As the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy value is 0.620, which is more than 0.5, this implies that this factor analysis for data reduction is effective.

Table.8.
Communalities

Statements about acceptance of work life balance	Initial	Extraction
At the moment, because the job demands it, I usually work long hours	1.000	0.594
There isn't much time to socialise/relax with my partner/see family in the week	1.000	0.535
I have to take work home most evenings	1.000	0.813
I often work late or at weekends to deal with paperwork without interruptions	1.000	0.687
Relaxing and forgetting about work issues is hard to do	1.000	0.699

I worry about the effect of work stress on my health	1.000	0.490
My relationship with my partner is suffering because of the pressure or long hours of my work	1.000	0.711
My family is missing out on my input, either because I don't see enough of them/am too tired	1.000	0.475
Finding time for hobbies, leisure activities, or to maintain friendships and extended family relationships is difficult	1.000	0.606
I would like to reduce my working hours and stress levels, but feel I have no control over the current situation	1.000	0.353
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The above table, as indicated by extraction values, shows that the level of variation brings about by an underlying factor on a particular item which are given in the form of a statement. For instance, the item, 'I often work late or at weekends to deal with paperwork without interruptions', has the extraction value of 0.687, which means that 68.7% variation happened in this item is being caused by an underlying factor.

Table.9
Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.905	29.045	29.045	2.905	29.045	29.045
2	1.793	17.935	46.980	1.793	17.935	46.980
3	1.266	12.660	59.640	1.266	12.660	59.640
4	0.903	9.032	68.672			
5	0.772	7.720	76.391			
6	0.673	6.731	83.123			
7	0.587	5.865	88.988			
8	0.513	5.127	94.114			
9	0.332	3.316	97.431			
10	0.257	2.569	100.000			
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.						

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The above table shows a list of the eigenvalues associated with each linear component (Factor) before extraction (Initial Eigenvalues) and after extraction (Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings). Before extraction, 10 linear components are identified within the data set. The eigenvalues associated with each factor or component represent the variance explained by that factor. In the Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings three factors are identified based on their eigenvalues which are given in the form of Percentage of Variance. From this one can come to the conclusion that the component 1 or factor 1 explains 29.045%, factor 2 explains 17.935% and factor 3 explains 12.660% of variations in the data.

Table.10
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Sl. No	Statements	Rotated Component Matrix ^a		
		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	My relationship with my partner is suffering because of the pressure or long hours of my work	0.787		
2	There isn't much time to socialize/relax with my partner/see family in the week	0.718		
3	My family is missing out on my input, either because I don't see enough of them/am too tired	0.680		
4	At the moment, because the job demands it, I usually work long hours	0.636		
5	I worry about the effect of work stress on my health	0.555		
6	I would like to reduce my working hours and stress levels, but feel I have no control over the current situation	0.521		
7	I have to take work home most evenings		0.900	
8	I often work late or at weekends to deal with paperwork without interruptions		0.788	
9	Relaxing and forgetting about work issues is hard to do			0.806
10	Finding time for hobbies, leisure activities, or to maintain friendships and extended family relationships is difficult			0.759
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.				
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. ^a				
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.				

Source: Primary Data

Table.11
Factor Solution

Sl. No	Statements	Suggested name for a psychological factor identified	Rotated Component Matrix ^a		
			Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	My relationship with my partner is suffering because of the pressure or long hours of my work	Jitteriness about not able to pay enough attention to family	0.787		
2	There isn't much time to socialize/relax with my partner/see family in the week		0.718		
3	My family is missing out on my input, either because I don't see enough of them/am too tired		0.680		
4	At the moment, because the job demands it, I usually work long hours		0.636		
5	I worry about the effect of work stress on my health		0.555		
6	I would like to reduce my working hours and stress levels, but feel I have no control over the current situation		0.521		
7	I have to take work home most evenings	Mental agitation as the time that is meant for family is to be spent for work related paper works		0.900	
8	I often work late or at weekends to deal with paperwork without interruptions			0.788	
9	Relaxing and forgetting about work issues is hard to do	Absence of joie de vivre			0.806
10	Finding time for hobbies, leisure activities, or to maintain friendships and extended family relationships is difficult				0.759
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.					
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. ^a					
a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.					

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

Factor 1: This is the most important factor as it explains 29.045% variations in the data. In total, 6 statements are loaded on to this factor. Highest loading is for the statement, “My relationship with my partner is suffering because of the pressure or long hours of my work” (0.787), followed by “There isn’t much time to socialize/relax with my partner/see family in the week” (0.718), “My family is missing out on my input, either because I don’t see enough of them/am too tired” (0.680), “At the moment, because the job demands it, I usually work long hours” (0.636), “I worry about the effect of work stress on my health” (0.555) and “I would like to reduce my working hours and stress levels, but feel I have no control over the current situation”(0.521) The combination of this statements has represented a factor that can be collectively called as “Jitteriness about not able to pay enough attention to family”.

Factor 2: This factor explains 17.935% variations in the data. In total, 2 statements are loaded on to this factor. Highest loading is for the statement, “I have to take work home most evenings” (0.900) which is followed by “I often work late or at weekends to deal with paperwork without interruptions” (0.788) The combination of this statements has represented a factor that can be termed as “Mental agitation as the time that is meant for family is to be spent for work related paper works”. Factor 3: This factor explains 12.660% variations in the data. In total, 2 statements are loaded on to this factor. Highest loading is for the statement, “Relaxing and forgetting about work issues is hard to do” (0.806) which is followed by “Finding time for hobbies, leisure activities, or to maintain friendships and extended family relationships is difficult” (0.759). The combination of this statements has represented a factor that can be named as “Absence of joie de vivre”.

Table.12
Descriptive Statistics

The Factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Controls	18.9424	2.80635	191
Job Demand	22.4398	3.07028	191
Work Life Balance (WLB)	13.38	2.007	191

Source: Primary Data

Table.13
Model Summary

Model Summary ^b			
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.751 ^a	0.684	0.667	1.889
a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Controls and Job Demand			
b. Dependent Variable: Work Life Balance (WLB)			

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

In the above table the R is the value of the multiple correlation coefficient between the predictors and the outcome. Here, the correlation between Job Controls, Job Demand and WLB is 0.751. The R Square, which is a measure of how much of the variability in the outcome is accounted for by the predictors. In this model Job Controls and Job Demand account for 75.1 % of variation in WLB. The adjusted R Square helps one to predict how well a regression model generalizes. It is expected that adjusted R Square value is to be very close to R Square value. Here in the model also, the adjusted R square value is closer to R square value.

Table.14
ANOVA

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	94.009	2	47.004	13.168	0.000 ^b
	Residual	671.090	188	3.570		
	Total	765.099	190			
a. Dependent Variable: WLB						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Demand, Job Controls						

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The above given ANOVA table can be used to test whether the regression model is significantly better at predicting the outcome. At F-Ratio 13.168, the model is significant ($p < 0.000$). It indicates that it is very unlikely, the model has happened purely by chance. Therefore, one could come to the conclusion that this model has significantly improved its ability to predict the outcome variable (WLB), given the changes in the predictor variables (Job Demand and Job Controls).

Table.15.
Coefficients

Coefficients ^a					
Model (1)	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	12.424	1.221		10.175	0.000
Job Controls	-0.189	0.051	-0.265	-3.741	0.000
Job Demand	-0.203	0.046	-0.310	-4.377	0.000
a. Dependent Variable: WLB					

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

The B values given in the above table indicate the individual contribution of each predictor variable to the model. Based on these values, WLB model can be described in the following ways: B values (Unstandardized Coefficients) tell the relationship between the outcome variable (WLB) and each predictor variable (Job Controls and Job Demand). If a 'B' value is positive, it indicates that there is a positive relationship between the predictor and the outcome, whereas a negative coefficient represents a negative relationship. Here in the above model, the two have negative relationship with WLB. In the above table, t-tests measure whether the predictors are making a significant contribution to the model. Therefore, if the t-test associated with a B-value is significant (if the value in the column labelled sig. is less than 0.05) then the predictor is making a significant contribution to the model. The smaller the value of sig. (and the larger the value of t), the greater the contribution of that predictor. From the magnitude of the t-statistics being presented in the above table, Job Controls ($t = -3.741$, $p < 0.000$) and Job Demand ($t = -4.377$, $p < 0.001$) are negatively affecting WLB. By taking into account mean values given in the Table.12, one can come to the conclusion that Job Demand negatively affects WLB greater than Job Controls. Therefore, H_3 is accepted

Table.16
Descriptives

Dependent Variable	Monthly Income of the respondents (INR/Month)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Work Life Balance (WLB)	10,001-20,000	03	12.67	0.577	0.333
	20,001-30,000	32	12.19	1.768	0.313
	30,001-40,000	110	13.82	2.015	0.192

	40001-50000	32	13.25	2.000	0.354
	50000 and Above	14	13.14	1.562	0.417
	Total	191	13.38	2.007	0.145

Source: Primary Data

Table.17**One Way ANOVA for the Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month) and the Work Life Balance (WLB)**

Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month)		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Life Balance(WLB)	Between Groups	69.480	4	17.370	4.645	0.001
	Within Groups	695.620	186	3.740		
	Total	765.099	190			

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the Table -17, one can come to the conclusion that there is a statistically significant variation among the respondents from different monthly income ranges in feeling Work Life Balance (WLB) ($F=4.645$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, there is a significant difference between income (INR/Month) of the respondents and WLB felt by them. Hence, hypotheses H_4 is accepted.

Table.18**The Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month) and the Work Life Balance (WLB)****Post Hoc Tests – Scheffe Multiple Comparisons**

Depend-ent Variable	(I) The Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month)	(J) The Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Work Life Balance (WLB)	10,001-20,000	20,001-30,000	0.479	1.168	0.997
		30,001-40,000	1.152	1.132	0.904
		40001-50000	0.583	1.168	0.993
		50000 and Above	0.476	1.230	0.997
	20,001-30,000	10,001-20,000	0.479	1.168	0.997
		30,001-40,000	1.631*	0.388	0.002
		40001-50000	1.063	0.483	0.309
		50000 and Above	0.955	0.620	0.667
	30,001-40,000	10,001-20,000	1.152	1.132	0.904
		20,001-30,000	1.631*	0.388	0.002
		40001-50000	0.568	0.388	0.710
		50000 and Above	0.675	0.549	0.824
	40001-50000	10,001-20,000	0.583	1.168	0.993
		20,001-30,000	1.063	0.483	0.309
		30,001-40,000	0.568	0.388	0.710
		50000 and Above	0.107	0.620	1.000
	50000 and Above	10,001-20,000	0.476	1.230	0.997
		20,001-30,000	0.955	0.620	0.667
		30,001-40,000	0.675	0.549	0.824
		40001-50000	0.107	0.620	1.000

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the above Post Hoc – Scheffe Multiple Comparisons tests and its output, a few insights can be drawn about the Monthly Income of the Respondents (INR/Month) and Work Life Balance (WLB) they felt in their life. There is a significant difference between the group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of 20,001-30,000 and the group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of 30,000-40,000 ($p < 0.002$) in their feelings about WLB. However, the group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of 30,000-40,000

have (Mean= 13.82) better WLB feelings than the group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of 20,001-30,000. Therefore, going by the mean values(table-16) of all the income groups, the respondents, whose monthly income is in the range of 20,001-30,000 have felt that they have not had adequate WLB.

Table.19
Descriptives

Dependent Variable	Age of the respondents (in years)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Work Life Balance(WLB)	18-30	40	13.00	2.013	0.318
	31 –40	103	13.78	1.878	0.185
	41 –50	43	12.86	2.221	0.339
	Above 50	05	12.80	1.095	0.490
	Total	191	13.38	2.007	0.145

Source: Primary Data

Table.20
One Way ANOVA for Age of the Respondents (in years) and the Work Life Balance (WLB)

Age of the respondents (in years)		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Life Balance(WLB)	Between Groups	35.273	3	11.758	3.013	0.031
	Within Groups	729.827	187	3.903		
	Total	765.099	190			

Source: Primary Data

Interpretation:

From the Table -20, one can infer that there is no statistically significant variation among the respondents from different age groups and their feeling of Work Life Balance (WLB) ($F=3.013$, $p < 0.031$). Therefore, there is no significant difference between age of the respondents and WLB felt by them. Hence, hypotheses H_5 is not accepted. Moreover, if one refers mean values given in Table-19, there is no much variation among the respondents from different age group as far as the kind of WLB they felt.

Findings

- WFH affects WLB positively.
- WIPL and PLIW negatively affect WLB.
- The following are identified as psychological factors that affect WLB adversely: ‘Jitteriness about not able to pay enough attention to family’, “Mental agitation as the time that is meant for family is to be spent for work related paper works” and “Absence of joie de vivre”.
- Job Controls and Job Demand affect WLB adversely.
- There is a significant difference between income (INR/Month) of the respondents and WLB felt by them.
- The group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of INR 30,000-40,000 have better WLB feelings than the group of respondents whose monthly income is in the range of INR 20,001-30,000. Moreover, the respondents, whose monthly income is in the range of INR 20,001-30,000 have felt that they have not had adequate WLB vis-à-vis other income groups.
- The age of the respondents is not nothing to do with the level of WLB felt by them.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has changed the very face of work life balance of women employees working in IT companies. Though, for time being, majority of them have shifted to WFH way of working, as this research shows that, still their WLB can be affected by work related factors. This research shows that majority of them

have felt that WFH increased their feelings of WLB. By taking into account the outcomes of this research, IT companies can change certain work-related aspects to ensure WLB for their women employees. These ameliorative steps will increase the women employees' productivity and job satisfaction.

References

- Abioro, Matthew & Dauda, Oladejo & Faderera, Ashogbon. (2018). "Work Life Balance Practices and Employees Productivity in the Nigerian University System", *Crawford Journal of Business & Social Sciences (CJBASS)*, 8(2), Pp 49-59.
- Darko-asumadu, Daniel & sika-bright, Solomon & Osei, Bismark. (2018). "The influence of work-life balance on employees' commitment among bankers in Accra, Ghana". *African Journal of Social Work*. 8. 47-55.
- Fisher-McAuley, Gwenith, J. Stanton, J. Jolton, and James Gavin (2003). "Modelling the Relationship between Work-Life Balance and Organizational Outcomes." In *Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology*. Orlando, pp. 1-26.
- Industry Performance: 2018-19 and what lies ahead, https://nasscom.in/sites/default/files/Industry-Performance2018-19-and-what-lies-ahead_0.pdf
- Meenakshi, S. P., V, V. S. C., & Ravichandran, K. (2013). "The Importance of Work -Life- Balance." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 14(3), 31–35.
- Michael Gibbs, Friederike Mengel, and Christoph Siemroth (2021). "Work from Home & Productivity: Evidence from Personnel & Analytics Data on IT Professionals", Working Paper No. 2021-56, Becker Friedman Institute for Research in Economics, The University of Chicago, 1-40.
- Santhi T.S. and Dr.Sundar.K (2012). "A study on the work life balance of women employees In information technology industry", *ZENITH International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research*, 2(1), 82-96.
- Takami Tomohiro (2021). "Working from Home and Work-life Balance during COVID-19: The Latest Changes and Challenges in Japan", *Japan Labor Issues*, 5(33), 21-33.