**WORK-LIFE INTERFERENCE -A MASSIVE CONCERN FOR WORK LIFE BALANCE**
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A balance between work and life has become more important in the present scenario because imbalances had a negative impact on both work and life roles. One should devote time and effort to both their personal life and job because they are the two sides of the same coin. Both men and women strive to balance their obligations to their families and their jobs because these multiple responsibilities need effort, energy and time. The main objective of this research paper is to study the interference between work and life roles of paramedical staff of the hospitals in H.P. The sample taken for the study consisted of 360 respondents. The quota sampling method is used and data was collected through questionnaires from the government and private hospitals. The responses of the respondents were measured by applying Likert five-point scales and t-test, ANOVA is used to analyse the data. The results of the study concluded that there is so much interference between the work and life roles of employees working in hospitals. The results of the study reveal that female, as well as male employees, are facing greater work to life interference problems. On the other hand, nursing staff faces more difficulties to balance their work and life responsibilities as compared to other staff.
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**INTRODUCTION:**

Work life interference comes under the domain of Human Resource Management which is intercorrelated to humans. In any context, the use of the workforce effectively and efficiently to accomplish an organization's goals and objectives are known as human resource management (HRM). The process of choosing and keeping the best employees within the company is the general goal of human resources management (HRM). "WLB refers to the simultaneous pursuit of the responsibilities in work and life without any conflict or imbalance," states Fisher (2002).**1**Role overload is when a person has too many responsibilities for the time available. Therefore, it causes a sense of stress, exhaustion, and anxiety.
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The researchers presented a wider definition of WLB that included the conflict and enhancement dimensions as well as two additional dimensions of WLB, namely work interference with personal life (WIPL) and personal life interference with work (PLIW). Work to family interference, and family to work interference are the two aspects of WLB. The work-life conflict has a significant adverse influence on employee performance, organisational performance, and the physical, mental and emotional health of employees. As a result, a lot of organizations today assist employees in achieving a balance between their professional and personal lives.**2**Organizations that have a reputation for supporting work-life balance have gained popularity, particularly in light of how challenging it can be to attract and retain young talent in modern organisations. Work-life interface is the point where personal and professional lives overlap. Family, leisure, and health seem to be just a few examples of the various facets of one's personal life that may overlap with their profession. Work and personal life can interconnect in both directions; for example, work might interfere with personal life, and vice versa. This interface may have a negative nature (such as work-life conflict) or a positive nature (such as work-life enrichment).**3**

The Oxford Economic states that " “Replacing an employee cost on average around £30,000 and it takes up to 28 weeks to get them up to speed.” " Retaining your current staff satisfied may be a great strategy in view of this. By maintaining a great focus on work-life balance, you can attract a valuable talent pool for recruits and improve retention rates. It will ensure a high quality of in-house talent and save both money and time. Various factors have been associated with work to life interference. These include age, gender, parental status, marital status, educational level, work experience, job position, and household income. (Beauregard, 2004)**4**Employees who are workaholics report greater degrees of work-life conflict (Bonebright, Clay&Ankenmann, 2000)**5**. Likewise, employees with strong negative affectivity report more work-related interference with their personal lives (Carlson, 1999)**6**.

**LITERATURE REVIEW:**

**Hyman et al. (2003)7** conducted research on work life imbalance in the service sector economy. They focused their study on employees in two growing sectors i.e., call centres and software development. The study examined the interference of work with household and family life in these two sectors. The data was collected through questionnaires and interviews conducted in nine research sites in Scotland. It was found that call centers employees experienced difficulties in juggling complex patterns of working hours with household responsibilities. Furthermore, it was observed that the stress and lack of sleep caused by the job were intruding on the private space of the employees. The study also found that a supportive workplace that values family life lowers the work-related demands for family life. **Kovacheva and Baivanov (2008)8**in their study measured the work life balance of employees by using four scales: work and family stress, work family interference, work family enrichment and satisfaction with work life balance. It was observed from the study that banks had the highest working hours, working extra hours on short notice than other service sectors while working part-time, working in a team and shift work was highest in the hospital sector. The university hospital also offered opportunities for flexible working through shifts and provides childcare leaves and also has the most family-friendly organizational culture. It was analysed that those sectors which provide career opportunities that sector employees have balanced work and life. The study concluded that organizational culture and work life balance were associated with each other means if organizational culture is favourable for work and family responsibility then the chances of conflicts are lesser and employee contentment is greater. **Sinha (2013)9**made an attempt to study the issues which were related to work life balance of employees in continental carbon India limited (NOIDA). The majority of the respondents agreed that they will happily spend their remaining working life for the same organisation. It was further revealed that the working environment, working conditions and work-related policies were provided to employees in CCIL which were an indicator of good H.R management. The study suggested that if organisation efforts to support the work life balance of employees, then it results to lower intention to leave the organisation and also enhances overall job satisfaction. **Agrwal (2014)10**in his research paper entitled "A Study on Work Life Balance with Special Reference to Indian Call Centre Employees" examined the problems of employees working in call centres and studied its effect on their work life balance. The study also compared the challenges faced by male and female employees during the day and night shifts. The findings of the study revealed that employees have to deal with myriad problems of the customers so they had to feel of getting sandwiched between their work and life demands and there was a difference in the challenges which were faced by male and female employees. It was concluded from the study that with the help of work life programs morale of employees improved and it also helps to reduce employees’ absenteeism and retain employees’ sin organisation during economic times. **Pillay and Abhayawansa (2014)11**in their paper titled " Work Family Balance: Perspectives from Higher Education" selected 469 teaching and non-teaching staff as a respondent from the nine universities in the state of Victoria and studies the conflicts which were related to work, family and role. The study also focused on the family strain and factor which affects the Work Life Balance of university employees. The results of the study indicated work life balance of the university staff was imbalanced and the main causes of work life conflicts were like insufficient time, tension ambiguity, the lack of leader support, extensive travel, health concern and unchallenging task and lack of family support and cost of child care was seen as factors which contributed significantly in work life strain. **Bharaths et al. (2015)12**in their study tried to identify and investigate professional and personal challenges and enhancers for work life balance amongst employees working in information technology. It was observed that the main challenges in professional life were like, odd working hours, long hours/time for traveling from home, an additional job in the workplace and assignment participation. On the other hand, the main reasons for stress in professional life were such as not enough time spent on taking care of dependent elders and inadequate attention to self-care. The study revealed that most women employees used social media as stress busters. It was also indicated from the study that flexible working hours, a supportive spouse, a supportive environment and understanding & supportive family members and friends were the main enhancers of work life balance. **Sahar and Hanaa (2015)13**made an attempt to study the relationship between job satisfaction and the quality of work life balance of nurses in Assuit University Hospital in Egypt. It was revealed from the study that the majority of the nurses had low quality work life balance. The results of the study indicate that unmarried nurses and nurses who were in the age group of 25-30 years were dissatisfied with their quality of work life balance. Job experience also played an important role in work life balance because those nurses whose job experience was less than 5 years had low quality work life balance. The study further also revealed that there was a high positive significant correlation between job satisfaction and quality of work life balance. **Dev and Raj (2017)14** in their research paper entitled “Work Life Balance and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study Focusing on Higher Education Teachers in Oman” examined the work life balance, teaching satisfaction and job satisfaction of teachers in higher education institutions. The study was based on some independent variables (work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work life and work personal life enhancement) and some dependent variables (job satisfaction and overall life satisfaction). It was found that work interference with personal life and personal life interference with work had a negative relation with teaching satisfaction and job satisfaction. On the other hand, work personal life enhancement had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. It was observed that if teaching satisfaction increased then job satisfaction also increased. It was concluded that work and personal life need to be integrated smoothly and should not be left to impact each other negatively. It was observed that if organizations provide work life balance policies like flexible family-friendly benefits, work programs, etc. to their employees’ then employees’ satisfaction was enhanced and it leading to heightened levels of commitment and loyalty to the organizational objectives.

**NEED AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY:**

Work-life balance (WLB) has consistently been viewed as a severe issue in the realm of human resource management. This issue gains value from the new business contexts, and the pace of change brings it thrust. There is a great need for a study on the work life interference for making a healthy balance between work and life roles of employees and providing them with a better working environment, a family-friendly culture, and personal space. In reality, most studies on work-life balance have focused on the extent that work interferes with personal life instead of how significantly personal life interferes with work. The present study aims to study the extent of work to life interference and life to work interference of the paramedical staff working in hospitals of H.P.

**OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY:**

-to examine the extent of work interference in personal & family life of employees

-to investigate the extent of personal & family life interference in work roles of employees

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:**

Primary data has been used for the fulfilment of the objective of the present study. Data has been collected from a sample survey of 360 respondents of paramedical staff of the hospitals through quota sampling. Data was collected personally through the questionnaire. To achieve the objective of the study, a five-point Likert scale has been developed for certain identified variables. These statements are measured on the five-point scale as strongly disagree-1, disagree-2, neutral -3, agree -4, strongly agree-5. Based on responses from the respondents, t-test and ANOVA have been used to study the interference between work and life roles of employees of the government and private hospitals.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS:**

Work to life interference means the extent to which professional and work related duties and responsibilities (professional life) intrude with fulfilment of personal, family and social life demands. For studying the work to life interference of paramedical staff, ten parameters are clubbed. It includes often miss out family get together, holidays and social functions because of work, being an employee of medical profession, it produce negative feeling that disturbs their personal life, due to busy work schedule they do not meet their friends, don’t find much time for hobbies, fail to fulfil their family responsibilities because they spend more time in their work domain, cannot even focus on personal goal due to pressure at work, often preoccupied with work related thought even after they reach at home, due to work cannot enjoy things which they like most, spouse has to compromise with his/her career because of the busy schedule and because of work they feel so much exhausted and left no energy to interact with family members. The responses of respondents to all the variables range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The minimum score for this factor is ten and the maximum score can be fifty.

**1.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WORK TO LIFE INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF GENDER:**

 It is clear from the table that work to life interference has been reported more than moderate by all the respondents irrespective of their gender. However, mean score has been found higher for female employees with lower standard deviation in comparison to male employees.

**Table-1.1 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analyses for Work to Life Interference on the basis of Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **N** |  **Mean** | **Standard Deviation**  | **Standard Error Mean** |
| **Male**  | 67 | 29.2985 | 7.97727 | .97458 |
| **Female**  | 293 | 33.9249 | 7.03522 | .41100 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

It seems that work have more interference in females’ personal life than males.

**Table-1.1 (b): Independent Sample Test for Equality of Mean on the basis Gender**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance** | **T test for Equality of Mean** |
| **F Statistics** | **p- Value** | **t-Value** | **Degree of Freedom** | **p-Value** | **Mean Difference** | **Standard Error Difference** |
| 1.536 | .216 | -4.733 | 358 | .000 | -4.62641 | .97747 |

 t-test has been used to study the significance of difference in the responses on basis of gender in table-1.1 (b). Levene’s statistics for equality of variance is equal to 1.536 which confirms that the data shows the results for assumption of equal variance. The p-value for the t test is .000 which is less than 0.01. Hence, the null hypothesis has been rejected. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference in the mean score of males and females regarding work to life interference. So, it can be concluded that female employees have been experiencing more work to life conflicts such as because of work they often miss out family get together and social functions, due to busy work schedule they do not meet their friends, don’t find much time for their hobbies etc. as compared to male employees. These findings also supported by results of earlier study by Walia (2015)15.

**1.2 SHIFT OF WORK-WISE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WORK TO LIFE INTERFERENCE:**

The result of descriptive statistical analysis for work to life interference on the basis of shift of work has been presented in table-1.2 (a). Table analysis depicts that the value of mean is 34.8755 in the case of shift workers and 29.3950 in case of non-shift work employees.

**Table-1.2 (a): Shift of Work-wise Descriptive Statistical Analyses for Work to Life Interference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Shift of Work** | **N** |  **Mean** | **Standard Deviation**  | **Standard Error Mean** |
| **Yes**  | 241 | 34.8755 | 6.62579 | .42680 |
| **No**  | 119 | 29.3950 | 7.64157 | .70050 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

The calculated values of standard deviation for shift work employees and non-shift work employees are 6.62579 and 7.64157 respectively.

**Table-1.2 (b):** **Shift of Work-wise** **Independent Sample Test for Equality of Mean**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance** | **T test for Equality of Mean** |
| **F Statistics** | **p- Value** | **t-Value** | **Degree of Freedom** | **p-Value** | **Mean Difference** | **Standard Error Difference** |
| 3.213 | .074 | 7.011 | 358 | .000 | 5.48056 | .78169 |

Further, table-1.2 (b) presents the results of levene’s test for equality of variance in which p-value is equal to .074. It indicates that null hypothesis for equality of variance is accepted. So, the table shows the result for assumption of equal variance. Further, table shows that the value for t-statistics is 7.011 with degree of freedom 358. The p-value for the statistics is .000, thus the null hypothesis has been rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the responses of respondents of two different groups significantly differ on the basis of shift of work and employees who are working in shits facing greater work to life interference as compare to non-shift workers. The result is aligned with Wohrmann et al. (2020)**16**.

**1.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WORK TO LIFE INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF AGE:**

The result of descriptive statistics for work to life interference on the basis of age has been presented in table-1.3 (a). Analysis reports that employees, who belong to age group of below 30 years, have highest work to life interference. 31–40-year age group and 41-50 years age group have moderate work to life interference. This depicts that employees belonging to different age groups have different work to life interference

**Table-1.3 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis for**

**Work to Life Interference: Age-wise Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age**  | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Below 30 Years** | 154 | 34.7597 | 6.75438 | .54428 | -.224 | 33.6845 | 35.8350 |
| **31-40 Years** | 113 | 32.1770 | 8.12759 | .76458 | .116 | 30.6621 | 33.6919 |
| **41-50 Years** | 64 | 31.3438 | 5.97938 | .74742 | -.286 | 29.8501 | 32.8374 |
| **Above 50 Years** | 29 | 31.3103 | 9.21607 | 1.71138 | -.276 | 27.8047 | 34.8160 |
| **Total**  | **360** | **33.0639** | **7.43018** | **.39160** |  | **32.2938** | **33.8340** |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

As far as standard deviation is concerned, it is 6.77790, 8.13539, 5.97938 and 9.21607 for the respective four age groups, which presented significant variation in responses of the respondents for work to life interference on the basis of age. The computed value of skewness is -.224 for below 30 years age group, -.286 for 41-50 years, -.276 for above 50 years age group which show that the distributions are negatively skewed and most of the frequencies lie towards the higher side of their respective means and .116 for 31-40 years which shows inclination of majority responses towards lower side of mean score.

**Table-1.3 (b): ANOVA Results for**

**Work to Life Interference: Age-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.** |
| **Between Groups** | 810.316 | 3 | 270.105 | 5.058 | .002 |
| **Within Groups** | 19009.215 | 356 | 53.397 |  |  |
| **Total**  | **19819.531** | **359** |  |  |  |

Table-1.3 (b) shows the ANOVA results for work to life interference on the basis of age. The significance value of F test is less than 0.01 which depicts rejection of null hypothesis. So, it can be said that there is significant difference between mean scores of work to life interference of paramedical staff on the basis of age.

**Table-1.3 (c): Post Hoc Results for**

**Work to Life Interference: Age-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error** | **Significance** |
| **Below 30 Years** | **31 - 40 Years** | 2.58275\* | .90513 | .024 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | 3.41599\* | 1.08676 | .010 |
| **Above 50 Years** | 3.44940 | 1.47919 | .093 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -2.58275\* | .90513 | .024 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | .83324 | 1.14318 | .885  |
| **Above 50 Years** | .86665 | 1.52112 | .941 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -3.41599\* | 1.08676 | .010 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | -.83324 | 1.14318 | .885 |
| **Above 50 Years** | .03341 | 1.63572 | 1.000 |
| **Above 50 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -3.44940 | 1.47919 | .093 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | -.86665 | 1.52112 | .941 |
| **41-50 Years** | -.03341 | 1.63572 | 1.000 |

The post hoc results for opinion of the respondents regarding work to life interference on the basis of age have been presented in the table-1.3 (c). The table shows mean difference and significant values of four age groups in comparison with each other resulting in twelve different cases. The difference is highly significant in the case of age group of below 30 years with 31-40 years and 41-50 years. On the basis of above analysis, it can be concluded that employees who belong to below 30 years age group have greater work due to life interference as compared to other age groups and they have to face many interferences such as missing out family get together, holidays and social functions, don’t find much time for hobbies, fail to fulfil their family responsibilities because of work. Kazmierska and Stankiewicz (2016)**17** also presented the same results in their research paper.

**1.4 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WORK TO LIFE INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF NATURE OF JOB:**

Table-1.4 (a) exhibits the descriptive statistics for work to life interference on the basis of nature of job. It is apparent from the table that the mean score is 35.3170 in the case of nursing staff and 30.2992 and 26.3750 in the case of technician and supervisory staff respectively. However, mean score for work to life interference has been worked out maximum (35.3170) for nursing staff and minimum (26.3750) for technical staff.

**Table-1.4 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis of**

**Work to Life Interference: Nature of Job-wise Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Nursing Staff** | 224 | 35.3170 | 6.51335 | .43519 | -.217 | 34.4594 | 36.1746 |
| **Technical Staff** | 104 | 30.2992 | 7.40799 | .72641 | .173 | 28.8286 | 31.7099 |
| **Supervisory Staff** | 32 | 26.3750 | 6.53897 | 1.15594 | .538 | 24.0175 | 28.7325 |
| **Total**  | 360 | 33.0639 | 7.43018 | .39160 |  | 32.2938 | 33.8340 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

The calculated value of standard deviation depicts variation in the responses of all respondents irrespective of their nature of job and skewness is -.217 in the case of nursing staff which depicts that the distribution is negatively skewed, .173 in the case of technical staff and .538 in the case of supervisory staff which presented positive skewness and most of the frequencies lie towards lower side of respective mean scores. The above analysis confirms the fact that management of the organisations are also responsible to create conflict between work and life of the employees.

**Table-1.4 (b): ANOVA Results for**

**Work to Life Interference: Nature of Job-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.** |
| **Between Groups** | 3381.073 | 2 | 1690.537 | 36.714 | 0.000 |
| **Within Groups** | 16438.457 | 357 | 46.046 |  |  |
| **Total**  | 19819.531 | 359 |  |  |  |

Further table-1.4 (b) explains ANOVA results for work to life interference on the basis of designation. Further, the table reveals that the null hypothesis has been rejected as the significant value of the F test is less than 0.05. Therefore, it can be said that there is significant difference in work to life interference of different staff group on the basis of nature of job. Further, the table submits proof that nursing staff has more work to life interference as compared to technician and supervisory staff.

**Table -1.4 (c): Post Hoc Results for Work to Life Interference: Nature of Job-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error** | **Significance** |
| **Nursing Staff** | Technical staff | 5.04773\* | .80518 | .000 |
| Supervisory staff | 8.94196\* | 1.28238 | .000 |
| **Technical Staff** | Nursing staff | -5.04773\* | .80518 | .000 |
| Supervisory staff | 3.89423\* | 1.37175 | .013 |
| **Supervisory Staff** | Nursing staff | -8.94196\* | 1.28238 | .000 |
| Technical staff | -3.89423\* | 1.37175 | .013 |

 Table-1.4 (c) presents the post hoc results of paramedical staff for work to life interference on the basis of nature of job. On the basis of above analysis, it can be said that the nursing staff have been facing more problems to manage their work and life responsibilities as compare to other staff. The results are similar to the findings of Stapathy and Patnaik (2014)**18**.

**1.5 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WORK TO LIFE INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF WORKING HOURS PER WEEK:**

Table-1.5 (a) reports the descriptive statistics for paramedical staff work to life interference on the basis of working hours per week. The mean score is maximum that is 34.9310 for employees who are working for more than 54 hours per week. Hence, it seems that employees who are working for more hours have been experiencing more conflicts between work and life roles. The calculated values of standard deviation are 7.41916 for up to 42 working hours, 7.52139 for 43-48 hours, 7.34034 for 49-54 hours, and 6.85191 for more than 54 hours which indicate significant variation in the responses of employees.

**Table-1.5 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis of Work to Life Interference: Working Hours per Week**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Hours per Week** | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Up to 42 Hours** | 69 | 31.6812 | 7.41916 | .89316 | -.344 | 29.8989 | 33.4634 |
| **43-48 Hours** | 148 | 34.9865 | 7.52139 | .61825 | -.069 | 30.7647 | 33.2083 |
| **49-54 Hours** | 56 | 34.7143 | 7.34034 | .98089 | -.412 | 32.7485 | 36.6800 |
| **More than 54 Hours** | 87 | 34.9310 | 6.85191 | .73460 | .213 | 33.4707 | 36.3914 |
| **Total**  | 360 | 33.0639 | 7.43018 | .39160 |  | 32.2938 | 33.8340 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

The computed values of skewness are -.344, -.069, -.412, and .213 for up to 42 hours, 43-48 hours, 49-54 hours, and more than 54 working hours per week respectively which confirm that most of the distributions are negatively skewed except for the group more than 54 hours which is positively skewed.

**Table-1.5 (b): ANOVA Results for**

**Work to Life Interference: Working Hours per Week Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Hours per Week** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.** |
| **Between Groups** | 759.557 | 3 | 251.186 | 4.729 | .003 |
| **Within Groups** | 19059.973 | 356 | 53.539 |  |  |
| **Total**  | 19819.531 | 359 |  |  |  |

ANOVA results for work to life interference on the basis of working hours per week have been presented in table-1.5 (b). The significance value of the F test is less than .001 which depicts that the null hypothesis is rejected. So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the opinion of employees of different groups formed on the basis of member of working hour per week.

**Table-1.5 (c): Post Hoc Results for Work to Life Interference: Working Hour per Week Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Hours per Week** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error** | **Significance** |
| **Up to 42 Hours** | 43-48 Hours | -.30533 | 1.06662 | .992 |
| 49-54 Hours | -3.03313 | 1.31605 | .099 |
| More than 54 Hours | -3.24988\* | 1.17954 | .031 |
| **43-48 Hours** | Up to 42 Hours | .30533 | 1.06662 | .992 |
| 49-54 Hours | -2.72780 | 1.14796 | .084 |
| More than 54 Hours | -2.94455\* | .98851 | .016 |
| **49-54 Hours** | Up to 42 Hours | 3.03313 | 1.31605 | .099 |
| 43-48 Hours | 2.72780 | 1.14796 | .084 |
| More than 54 Hours | -.21675 | 1.25358 | .998 |
| **More than 54 Hours** | Up to 42 Hours | 3.24988\* | 1.17954 | .031 |
| 43-48 Hours | 2.94455 | .98851 | .016 |
| 49-54 Hours | .21675 | 1.25358 | .998 |

Table-1.5 (c) exhibits the post hoc results for work to life interference on the basis of working hours per week. It reveals that mean difference is significant at 0.05 levels between up to 42 working hours and more than 54 working hours per week. Further the table shows that there is significant difference in the responses of respondents of 43-48 working hours per week with the respondents who work for more than fifty-four hours per week regarding work to life interference. Therefore, it can be said that employees who are working continually for longer period have to face more work to life interference problems. Holly and Mohnen (2012)**19** study differ from the results of the present study. They reveal that the companies can satisfy their employees if companies provide compensation for overtime and it also leads to less work life balance problem.

**LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE**

Life to work interference refers to the extent to which personal, family, and social life duties and responsibilities (personal life) intrude with fulfilment of professional responsibilities. For studying the life to work interference of paramedical staff, nine parameters are clubbed. It includes statements like, my energy level at workplace reduced because of my personal and dependent health related problems, I cannot succeed in my role at work properly due to my family related issues, I also feel disturbed and hardly concentrate on my work due to disturbing environment at home, my personal problems impede my professional development, my career suffers due to my family responsibilities, due to family issue I have lost my interest and motivation to work, I had to refuse job promotion, due to owing to family commitments, sometimes I lost my patience and temperament at work and get in an argument due to personal disturbance and due to difficulties in my family life, I have lost enthusiasm to work. The responses of respondents to all the variables range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The minimum score for this factor is nine and the maximum score can be forty five.

**1.6 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF GENDER:**

Descriptive statistical analysis for life to work interference on the basis of gender has been presented in table-1.6 (a). The table shows that the mean score in this regard for male is 18.0000 whereas it is 19.2321 for females.

**Table-1.6 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analyses for Life to Work Interference on the basis of Gender**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **N** |  **Mean** | **Standard Deviation**  | **Standard Error Mean** |
| **Male**  | 67 | 18.0000 | 4.70976 | .57539 |
| **Female**  | 293 | 19.2321 | 6.27351 | .36650 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

Further, the variation in the responses of female employees has been found more as compared to the male employees which seems that female employees opine that family demand and responsibilities make it more difficult to fulfil their work role responsibilities.

**Table-1.6 (b): Independent Sample Test for Equality of Mean on the basis of Gender**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance** | **T test for Equality of Mean** |
| **F Statistics** | **p- Value** | **t-Value** | **Degree of Freedom** | **p-Value** | **Mean Difference** | **Standard Error Difference** |
| 6.528 | .011 | -1.512 | 358 | .131 | -1.23208 | .81466 |

Table-1.6 (b) reports the results of the levene’s test for equality of variance. It reveals that null hypothesis for equality of variance is accepted. So, the variances of population from which samples are extracted are not equal. Calculated value of p is .131 which is more than 0.01 hence the null hypothesis has been accepted and it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the responses of male and female employees regarding life to work interference. This result is similar to the finding of Kaushal and Parmar (2019)**20**.

**1.7 SHIFT OF WORK-WISE DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE:**

Table-1.7 (a) highlights the results for descriptive statistics for life to work interference on the basis of shift work. The mean score for this variable has been recorded 19.4481 for employees who are working in shifts and 18.1008 for those who are not working in shifts. The calculated value of standard deviation has been found 6.51076 and 4.80183 for shit work employees and non-shift work employees respectively. It shows employees of both categories have reported life to work interference to some extent.

**Table-1.7 (a): Shift of Work-wise Descriptive Statistical Analyses for Life to Work Interference**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Shift of Work** | **N** |  **Mean** | **Standard deviation**  | **Standard Error Mean** |
| **Yes**  | 241 | 19.4481 | 6.51076 | .41939 |
| **No**  | 119 | 18.1008 | 4.80183 | .44018 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

**Table-1.7 (b): Shift of Work-wise Independent Sample Test for Equality of Mean**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance** | **T test for Equality of Mean** |
| **F statistics** | **p- Value** | **t-Value** | **Degree of Freedom** | **p-Value** | **Mean Difference** | **Standard Error Difference** |
| 11.051 | .001 | 2.216 | 305.641 | .027 | 1.34729 | .60799 |

Table-1.7 (b) reveals that the significance level of levene’s statistics for equality of variance is equal to .001. This indicates that, the null hypothesis for equality of variance is rejected. Hence, it is assumed that variances of population from which samples are extracted are unequal and shows the results for assumption of unequal variance. Table-1.7 (b) further depicts that t-statistics is 2.218 with degree of freedom 305. 641.The p value is .027 which is less than 0.05 hence; the null hypothesis has been rejected. Therefore, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the responses of respondents over this issue. This result is aligned with the result of Halawi and Khashfeh (2018)**21**.

**1.8 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF AGE:**

 Table-1.8 (a) clearly shows that employees of lower age groups consider more life to work interference in comparison to employees of higher age groups. However, the mean score in this regard has been found less than the standard score at five point likert scale for all age groups.

**Table-1.8 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis of**

**Life to Work Interference: Age-wise Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age**  | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Below 30 Years** | 154 | 20.4675 | 6.45970 | .52054 | .665 | 19.4392 | 21.4959 |
| **31-40 Years** | 113 | 17.9381 | 6.00786 | .56517 | 1.271 | 16.8182 | 19.0579 |
| **41-50 Years** | 64 | 17.9219 | 4.98666 | .62333 | 1.155 | 16.6762 | 19.1675 |
| **Above 50 Years** | 29 | 17.7586 | 4.08530 | .75862 | .433 | 16.2047 | 19.3126 |
| **Total**  | 360 | 19.0028 | 6.02663 | .31763 |  | 18.3781 | 19.6274 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

 Further, moderate variation shown by the calculated values of standard deviation and the computed value of skewness is .665 for below 30years, 1.271for 41-50 years, 1.155 for41-50 years and .433 for above 50 years age group which shows that the distribution is positively skewed and most of the frequencies lies towards lower side of their respective means.

**Table-1.8 (b): ANOVA Results for**

**Life to Work Interference: Age-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.** |
| **Between Groups** | 578.173 | 3 | 192.724 | 5.506 | .001 |
| **Within Groups** | 12460.824 | 356 | 35.002 |  |  |
| **Total**  | 13038.997 | 359 |  |  |  |

Table-1.8 (b) highlights ANOVA results for life to work interference on the basis of age. The significance value of the F test is less than 0.01. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it can be said that there is significance difference in the mean scores for life to work interference on the basis of age.

**Table-1.8 (c): Post Hoc Results for Life to Work Interference: Age-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Age** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error** | **Significance** |
| **Below 30 Years** | **31 - 40 Years** | 2.52948\* | .73283 | .003 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | 2.54566\* | .87989 | .021 |
| **Above 50 Years** | 2.70891 | 1.19761 | .109 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -2.52948\* | .73283 | .003 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | .01618 | .92556 | 1.000 |
| **Above 50 Years** | .17943 | 1.23156 | .999 |
| **41 – 50 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -2.54566\* | .87989 | .021 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | -.01618 | .92556 | 1.000 |
| **Above 50 Years** | .16325 | 1.32432 | .999 |
| **Above 50 Years** | **Below 30 Years** | -2.70891 | 1.19761 | .109 |
| **31 - 40 Years** | -.17943 | 1.23156 | .999 |
| **41-50 Years** | -.16325 | 1.32434 | .999 |

Post hoc results for work to life interference of paramedical staff on the basis of age have been presented in the table-1.8 (c). The table reveals that the difference is highly significant in the case of employees belonging to below 30 years age group when compared with the age group of 31-40 years and 41-50 years. Thus, it can be said that employees belonging to age group of below 30 years opine that they have more life to work role conflicts because of dependents health related problems due to which they cannot succeed in their role at workplace. The finding of present study is supported by Kaushal & Parmar (2019)22 and Rabi & Kuhlmann (2009)23. They revealed that age discrimination was positively related with life to work interference. This finding contradicts with Padmasiri and Mahalekamge (2016)24.

**1.9 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF NATURE OF JOB:**

Table-1.9 (a) highlights the descriptive statistics for opinion of respondents regarding life to work interference on the basis of nature of job. The table shows that the mean score is 19.7589 in case of nursing staff, 18.4231 in case of technical staff and 15.5938 in case of supervisory staff. It reveals that nursing staff faces more life interference in work as compare to other staff.

**Table-1.9 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis for**

**Life to Work Interference: Nature of Job-wise Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Nursing Staff** | 224 | 19.7589 | 6.63966 | .44363 | .865 | 18.8847 | 20.6332 |
| **Technical Staff** | 104 | 18.4231 | 4.81642 | .47229 | .534 | 17.4864 | 19.3598 |
| **Supervisory Staff** | 32 | 15.5938 | 3.02526 | .53480 | -.024 | 14.5030 | 16.6845 |
| **Total**  | 360 | 19.0028 | 6.02663 | .31763 |  | 18.3781 | 19.6274 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

The calculated value of standard deviation is 6.63966 for nursing staff, 4.81642 for technical staff and 3.02526 for supervisory staff, which reports significant variation in the responses of the respondents as far as life to work interference is concerned. The calculated value of skewness is .865 in the case of nursing staff, .534 in the case of technical staff which depicts that the distributions are positively skewed, and -.024 in the case of supervisory staff which presented negative skewness.

**Table-1.9 (b): ANOVA Results for**

**Life to Work Interference: Nature of Job-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.** |
| **Between Groups** | 534.912 | 2 | 267.456 | 7.636 | .001 |
| **Within Groups** | 12504.997 | 357 | 35.025 |  |  |
| **Total**  | 13038.997 | 359 |  |  |  |

Table-1.9 (b) confirms ANOVA results for life to work interference for different staff on the basis of nature of job. The results reveal that the null hypothesis is rejected because the significant value of F test is less than 0.01. So, it can be said that there is significance difference in the mean score for life to work interference on the basis of nature of job.

**Table-1.9 (c): Post Hoc Results for Life to Work Interference: Nature of Job-wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature of Job** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error** | **Significance** |
| **Nursing Staff** | Technical Staff | 1.33585 | .70224 | .140 |
| Supervisory Staff | 4.16518\* | 1.11844 | .001 |
| **Technical Staff** | Nursing Staff | -1.33585 | .70224 | .140 |
| Supervisory Staff | 2.82933\* | 1.19638 | .049 |
| **Supervisory Staff** | Nursing Staff | -4.16518\* | 1.11844 | .001 |
| Technical Staff | -2.82933\* | 1.19638 | .049 |

Post hoc results for employees’ life to work interference on the basis of nature of job have been reported in the table-1.9 (c). The result reveals that the difference is highly significant in the case of nursing staff when compared with the supervisory staff. On the other hand, difference is also significant when technical staff is compared with supervisory staff. Thus, it can be concluded that life to work interference is high in case of nursing staff. This finding is contrary to the findings of Vimla and Kumar (2019)25 in which they confirmed that nature of job has no significant influence over work life balance of employee in electrical industry.

**1.10 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR LIFE TO WORK INTERFERENCE ON THE BASIS OF WORKING HOURS PER WEEK:**

The result of descriptive statistics for life to work interference on the basis of working hours per week has been presented in table-1.10 (a). Table analysis reports that employees who are working for less hours have less life to work interference as compared to those who are working for more hours per week. However, the mean score in this regard has been found less than moderate at five point likert scale for different groups.

**Table-1.10 (a): Descriptive Statistical Analysis for Life to Work Interference: Working Hours per Week -wise Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Hours per Week** | **N** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Std. Error** | **Skewness** | **95% Confidence Interval for Mean** |
| **Lower Bound** | **Upper Bound** |
| **Up to 42 Hours** | 69 | 18.5362 | 4.80680 | .57867 | .425 | 17.3815 | 19.6910 |
| **43-48 Hours** | 148 | 18.3311 | 5.50743 | .45271 | .825 | 17.4364 | 19.2257 |
| **49-54 Hours** | 56 | 20.0357 | 7.64428 | 1.02151 | 1.234 | 17.9886 | 22.0829 |
| **More than 54 Hours** | 87 | 19.8506 | 6.46193 | .69279 | .667 | 18.4734 | 21.2278 |
| **Total**  | 360 | 19.0028 | 6.02663 | .31763 |  | 18.3781 | 19.6274 |

Source: Data Collected through Questionnaire.

The calculated value of standard deviation shows significant variation in the responses of the respondents. The computed values of skewness are .425, .825, 1.234 and .667 for up to 42 hours, 43-48 hours, 49-54 hours and more than 54 working hours per week respectively which confirms that all the distributions are positively skewed and most of the frequencies lies towards lower side of respective means.

**Table-1.10 (b): ANOVA Results for Life to Work Interference: Working Hours per Week -wise Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Hours per Week** | **Source**  | **Sum of Squares** | **Df** | **Mean Square** | **F**  | **Sig.**  |
| **Between Groups** | 204.075 | 3 | 68.025 | 1.887 | .131 |
| **Within Groups** | 12834.922 | 356 | 36.053 |  |  |
| **Total**  | 13038.997 | 359 |  |  |  |

Table- 1.10 (b) shows ANOVA results for life to work interference on the basis of working hours per week. The p value of the F test is more than 0.01 which accept the null hypothesis. So, it can be said that there is no significant difference in the responses of the respondents regarding life to work interference of the basis of working hours per week.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

The results of the study reveal that government, as well as private hospitals, employees are facing greater work to life interference problems and there is also a significant difference in the responses of respondents regarding work to life interference on the basis of gender. On the basis of the above analysis, it can be concluded that employees who belong to below 30 years age group have greater work to life and life to work interference as compared to other age groups. On the other hand, nursing staff faces more difficulties to balance their work and life responsibilities as compared to other staff. The study depicts that employees who have more working experience have less work to life and life to work interference. Further, it has been found that employees who have to work for longer working hours per week have to deal with more work to life and life to work conflicts.
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