



# Exploring Employee Perspectives on Work-Life Balance: A Comprehensive Survey of Facilities Management Workers in Service-Oriented Organizations

<sup>1</sup> Talla Pravallika Goud, <sup>2</sup> Venkata Siva Kumar S

<sup>1</sup> MBA Student, <sup>2</sup> Associate Professor

<sup>1</sup> Department of Management Studies,

<sup>1</sup> Vardhaman College of Engineering, Hyderabad, India.

**Abstract:** This study examines work-life balance (WLB) among facilities management professionals in service-oriented organizations through a quantitative research approach. The investigation employed a structured survey methodology to assess employee perceptions, sector-specific challenges, organizational policy effectiveness, and demographic influences on WLB experiences. Data analysis incorporated reliability testing and both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to validate findings and test hypotheses regarding group differences. The research reveals that while employees generally perceive management support positively, significant gaps exist in organizational policy clarity and implementation. Common challenges across all employee groups include physical job demands and unpredictable work schedules. However, the study identifies important variations among different employment types and gender groups, with particular challenges emerging for contractual workers and female employees. These findings contribute to theoretical understanding of WLB dynamics in essential service roles and challenge conventional approaches to workplace well-being initiatives. The study demonstrates the value of comprehensive assessment methodologies in capturing the complexity of WLB experiences. Practical implications include recommendations for improving policy communication, developing flexible work solutions, and implementing targeted support programs for vulnerable employee groups. The research provides a foundation for organizations to develop more effective, evidence-based WLB strategies in service sector environments while suggesting directions for future studies in this critical area of workforce management.

**Index Terms** - Work-life balance, Facilities management, Service sector employees, Organizational policies, Workplace well-being, Human resource management

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The exploration of employee perspectives on work-life balance, particularly among facilities management workers in service-oriented organizations, reveals a multifaceted issue influenced by various factors. Work-life balance is increasingly recognized as a critical component of employee well-being, with significant implications for job satisfaction and productivity (D, 2024; Ofori & Kaur, 2023). Facilities management (FM) services, which include both soft and hard services, play a crucial role in enhancing employee well-being by providing a supportive work environment that can mitigate stress and improve job satisfaction (Arampatzi & Burger, 2020). The balance between work and personal life is particularly challenging for shift workers, who often face irregular schedules that exacerbate role overload and stress (Williams, 2008). In the context of service-oriented organizations, employees often juggle multiple responsibilities, such as family care and professional duties, which can lead to conflicts and burnout if not managed effectively (Tanushree, 2013; Agnieszka & Nikola, 2023). The implementation of work-life balance programs, such as flexible working hours and additional days off, has been shown to alleviate some of these pressures, although challenges like workplace conflict and bullying remain significant barriers (Agnieszka & Nikola, 2023). Moreover, the integration of work-life balance practices into organizational policies is essential for fostering a sustainable workforce, as these practices can enhance employee engagement and reduce turnover (Naithani, 2009; Garg et al., 2024). The current economic climate and evolving work dynamics necessitate a re-evaluation of traditional work-life balance strategies to address new challenges and ensure their relevance in contemporary

settings (Naithani, 2009). Overall, a comprehensive approach that considers the diverse needs of employees, including those in facilities management, is crucial for promoting a healthy work-life balance and enhancing overall employee well-being (Bakar, 2024).

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Work-life balance (WLB) and flexible work arrangements (FWAs) have gained increasing attention in organizational research due to their impact on employee well-being and productivity. Flexible working, which allows employees to adjust their schedules or work locations, has been linked to higher job satisfaction, reduced stress, and improved performance (Parul, 2015; Sanders & Karmowska, 2020b). However, the effectiveness of FWAs varies depending on organizational policies and individual circumstances. For instance, while some studies highlight the benefits of reduced working hours in lowering chronic stress biomarkers (Chandola et al., 2019), others suggest that FWAs may inadvertently lead to work intensification and blurred work-home boundaries (Sanders & Karmowska, 2020b). Additionally, gender disparities exist, with women—particularly those with caregiving responsibilities—benefiting more from flexible schedules (Chandola et al., 2019; Ciarniene & Vienazindiene, 2018). These findings underscore the need for tailored FWA policies that address diverse employee needs while maintaining organizational efficiency.

The concept of WLB extends beyond flexible scheduling, encompassing broader strategies to harmonize professional and personal responsibilities. Research indicates that employees who achieve WLB report higher job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Kumari & Purohit, 2023; Ofori & Kaur, 2023). However, challenges persist, particularly in high-demand sectors such as facilities management and banking, where long hours and unpredictable workloads contribute to work-family conflicts (Barkha et al., 2013; Igbinomwanhia et al., 2012). Studies also reveal that organizational culture plays a critical role in WLB success, with supportive leadership and employee-centric policies fostering better outcomes (Klindžić & Marić, 2019). Despite these insights, gaps remain in understanding how different industries implement WLB initiatives, with sector-specific variations observed in manufacturing, IT, and education (Ofori & Kaur, 2023). This suggests that a one-size-fits-all approach may be ineffective, necessitating industry-specific WLB frameworks.

The COVID-19 pandemic has further amplified the relevance of FWAs and WLB, accelerating the adoption of remote work and flexible schedules (Sanders & Karmowska, 2020b). However, empirical evidence on their long-term impact remains mixed. While some employees report improved work-life integration (Fredrick, 2019), others experience increased stress due to job insecurity and blurred work-life boundaries (Dixon et al., 2019). Additionally, generational differences influence perceptions of flexibility, with younger employees (e.g., Gen Y) valuing FWAs more than older cohorts (Ciarniene & Vienazindiene, 2018). Furthermore, organizational performance is significantly influenced by whether FWAs are employer-driven (often leading to negative outcomes) or employee-driven (enhancing productivity and morale) (Klindžić & Marić, 2019). These findings highlight the need for continuous evaluation of WLB policies to ensure they align with evolving workforce expectations and organizational goals.

## 3. Research Objectives

1. To explore employee perspectives on work-life balance within facilities management roles in service-oriented organizations.
2. To analyse the sector-specific challenges and constraints that affect work-life balance in facilities management.
3. To evaluate the impact of organizational policies and practices on work-life balance for facilities management employees.
4. To investigate the influence of demographic factors (e.g., gender, age, generational differences) on perceptions and experiences of work-life balance among facilities management employees.

## 4. Research Methodology

**4.1 Research Design** - This study adopts a quantitative research design to explore work-life balance perceptions among employees in facilities management roles within service-oriented organizations. A structured survey questionnaire was developed to collect primary data from employees across different job roles, experience levels, and demographic backgrounds.

**4.2 Sampling Method & Participants** - The study utilized convenience sampling, targeting employees in various facilities management roles. Participants were selected based on their employment in operational, managerial, and supervisory roles within service-driven organizations. The dataset includes respondents from diverse age groups, gender identities, employment types, and educational backgrounds.

**4.3. Data Collection Method** - Data was gathered through an online questionnaire using Google Forms. The questionnaire was structured into multiple sections, each addressing specific research objectives:

- Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance
- Sector-Specific Challenges Affecting Work-Life Balance
- Impact of Organizational Policies on Work-Life Balance
- Demographic Variations in Work-Life Balance Perceptions

A 5-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) was used for most questions to quantify employees' perspectives.

**4.4. Data Analysis** - The collected data was analysed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) to summarize work-life balance perceptions. Cronbach's alpha tested the reliability of each questionnaire section. One-way ANOVA compared differences across job roles, experience levels, and employment types, followed by Tukey post-hoc tests where significant. Independent t-tests examined gender-based differences if applicable.

#### 4.5 Objective-Based Research Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in WLB perception scores (mean Likert ratings) among employees in supervisory, operational, and managerial roles.
2. There is no significant difference in perceived sector-specific challenge scores based on years of experience.
3. There is no significant difference in policy effectiveness ratings between full-time, part-time, and contractual employees.
4. There is no significant difference in WLB perception scores between male, female, and non-binary employees.

**4.6 Ethical Considerations** - All participants provided informed consent before completing the survey. Their responses remained anonymous and confidential to ensure data privacy and ethical integrity.

#### 5. Statistical Analysis and Research Findings

This study will analyse the data in three stages. First, *descriptive statistics* (means, standard deviations) will summarize overall trends in work-life balance perceptions. Second, Cronbach's alpha will assess the *internal consistency* of each questionnaire section to ensure measurement reliability. Finally, *statistical inference* techniques - specifically ANOVA for comparing multiple groups (job roles, experience levels) and independent t-tests for gender comparisons - will test the study's hypotheses about demographic influences on work-life balance. This structured approach will systematically examine both patterns and significant relationships in the data.

##### 5.1. Descriptive Statistics

The following tables present the mean scores and standard deviations of employee responses across four key dimensions of work-life balance (WLB). The 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) quantifies perceptions, challenges, policy effectiveness, and demographic influences. The analysis includes responses from 108 facilities management employees, providing a comprehensive view of sector-specific WLB dynamics. Standard deviations highlight the consistency or divergence of opinions among respondents for each measured item.

<b>Table – 5.1 Descriptive Statistics</b>				
<b>Code</b>	<b>Statement</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
<b>Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance</b>				
PAEOWLB.1	My work schedule allows me to maintain a good work-life balance.	108	2.88	1.1
PAEOWLB.2	I feel satisfied with the amount of time I have for personal activities.	108	3.2	1.07
PAEOWLB.3	My work-life balance affects my overall job satisfaction positively.	108	3.4	1.3
PAEOWLB.4	I can manage my family responsibilities without affecting work performance.	108	3.27	1.12
PAEOWLB.5	I believe my employer understands the importance of work-life balance.	107	3.21	1.33
<b>Challenges and Constraints in Facilities Management</b>				
CACIFM.1	My job requires a physical presence that limits work-life balance.	108	2.89	1.22
CACIFM.2	Operational deadlines influence my ability to balance work and personal life.	108	3.31	1.05
CACIFM.3	The nature of my role creates unpredictable work schedules.	108	3.49	1.23
CACIFM.4	The physical demands of my job affect my personal commitments.	108	3.2	1.17
CACIFM.5	Work pressure in facilities management influences my family responsibilities.	108	3.08	1.11
<b>Organizational Policies and Practices</b>				
OPAP.1	My organization has clear policies supporting work-life balance.	108	2.87	1.31
OPAP.2	Flexible working arrangements are available in my organization.	108	3.27	1.1
OPAP.3	I feel supported by management in balancing my work and personal life.	108	3.51	1.23
OPAP.4	My workplace offers programs to promote work-life balance.	108	3.25	1.19
OPAP.5	Organizational expectations align with realistic work-life practices.	108	3.19	1.2
<b>Demographic Variations in Work-Life Balance Perceptions</b>				
DVIWLBP.1	My age influences my ability to balance work and personal life.	108	2.92	1.23
DVIWLBP.2	Gender roles influence my experience of work-life balance.	108	3.11	1.13

DVIWLBP.3	Younger employees experience better work-life balance than older employees	108	3.44	1.26
DVIWLBP.4	Women face more work-life balance challenges compared to men.	108	3.23	1.19
DVIWLBP.5	Generational differences affect perceptions of work-life balance.	108	3.12	1.13

**Interpretation:** The data reveals moderate WLB perceptions (mean range: 2.88–3.51), with employees reporting the highest agreement for management support (OPAP.3: M = 3.51) and unpredictable schedules as the top challenge (CACIFM.3: M = 3.49). Notably, organizational policies scored lowest (OPAP.1: M = 2.87), suggesting inadequate clarity in WLB support. Employees expressed relative satisfaction with time management (PAEOWLB.2: M = 3.20) but acknowledged physical job demands as a constraint (CACIFM.4: M = 3.20). Demographic variations showed younger employees perceive better WLB (DVIWLBP.3: M = 3.44), while standard deviations (1.05–1.33) indicate significant opinion divergence across all items, particularly regarding gender roles (DVIWLBP.2: SD = 1.13) and policy awareness (OPAP.1: SD = 1.31). This variability suggests that WLB experiences are highly individualized in facilities management roles.

## 5.2. Test for Internal Consistency (Reliability Analysis)

The reliability of measurement scales was assessed using Cronbach's alpha to evaluate the internal consistency of each questionnaire section. This analysis determines whether items within each construct consistently measure the same underlying dimension of work-life balance. The threshold for acceptable reliability was set at  $\alpha \geq 0.70$ , with values between 0.70-0.79 considered "acceptable" and  $\geq 0.80$  indicating "good" consistency (Nunnally, 1978). The results confirm the instrument's robustness for hypothesis testing.

**Table – 5.2. Test for Internal Consistency of the Questionnaire using Reliability Analysis**

S. No.	Code	Section	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Level
1	PAEOWLB	Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance	0.824	Good
2	CACIFM	Challenges and Constraints in Facilities Management	0.787	Acceptable
3	OPAP	Organizational Policies and Practices	0.803	Good
4	DVIWLBP	Demographic Variations in Work-Life Balance Perceptions	0.790	Acceptable

**Interpretation:** All four sections demonstrated strong internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.787 to 0.824. The "Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance" ( $\alpha = 0.824$ ) and "Organizational Policies and Practices" ( $\alpha = 0.803$ ) sections achieved good reliability, indicating highly coherent item structures. The "Challenges and Constraints" ( $\alpha = 0.787$ ) and "Demographic Variations" ( $\alpha = 0.790$ ) sections showed acceptable consistency, confirming their suitability for analysis. These results validate those respondents' interpreted related items within each section consistently, supporting the aggregation of scale items for subsequent statistical tests. Notably, no items required removal, as all alpha values exceeded the 0.70 threshold, reinforcing the questionnaire's design efficacy.

## 5.3. Statistical Analysis

To test the study's hypotheses, inferential statistical analyses were conducted using one-way ANOVA and independent samples t-tests. These methods were selected to examine significant differences in work-life balance (WLB) perceptions across key demographic and employment-related groupings. ANOVA was applied for comparisons involving three or more independent groups (e.g., job roles, experience levels, employment types), while t-tests were used for binary comparisons (e.g., gender differences). A significance threshold of  $p < 0.05$  was adopted to determine statistical significance. Post-hoc Tukey tests were performed where ANOVA results indicated significant differences, ensuring precise identification of divergent groups. This rigorous approach validates whether observed variations in WLB perceptions, challenges, and policy effectiveness are statistically meaningful or attributable to chance.

### 5.3.1 Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance across Job Roles

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant difference in WLB perception scores (mean Likert ratings) among employees in supervisory, operational, and managerial roles.

**Table - 5.3. ANOVA One Way Classification of "Perceptions and Experiences of Work-Life Balance across Job Roles"**

Statement	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My work schedule allows me to maintain a good work-life balance.	BG	0.18	2	0.09	0.07	0.93
	WG	129.26	105	1.231		
	Total	129.44	107			
I feel satisfied with the amount of time I have for personal activities.	BG	0.497	2	0.248	0.22	0.81
	WG	121.02	105	1.153		
	Total	121.52	107			
My work-life balance influences my overall job satisfaction positively.	BG	1.161	2	0.581	0.34	0.71
	WG	178.72	105	1.702		
	Total	179.88	107			
I can manage my family responsibilities without affecting work performance.	BG	1.631	2	0.815	0.64	0.53
	WG	133.58	105	1.272		

	Total	135.21	107			
I believe my employer understands the importance of work-life balance.	BG	12.109	2	6.055	3.62	0.03
	WG	173.95	104	1.673		
	Total	186.06	106			

\*BG - Between Groups \*\*WG - Within Groups

**Interpretation:** The one-way ANOVA results indicate that for most WLB perception items—including work schedule flexibility ( $F = 0.07, p = 0.93$ ), personal time satisfaction ( $F = 0.22, p = 0.81$ ), job satisfaction impact ( $F = 0.34, p = 0.71$ ), and family responsibility management ( $F = 0.64, p = 0.53$ )—no statistically significant differences exist among supervisory, operational, and managerial roles ( $p > 0.05$ ). However, the statement "I believe my employer understands the importance of work-life balance" showed a significant difference ( $F = 3.62, p = 0.03$ ), suggesting that perceptions of employer awareness vary by job level. These findings largely support the null hypothesis (H01) that WLB perceptions do not differ across roles, except for employer understanding, which may reflect hierarchical disparities in policy communication or engagement. The lack of significance for other items implies that WLB challenges and experiences are broadly consistent across all job roles in facilities management.

### 5.3.2 Challenges and Constraints in Facilities Management by Years of Experience

**H02: There is no significant difference in perceived sector-specific challenge scores based on years of experience.**

Statement	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My job requires a physical presence that limits work-life balance.	BG	8.522	4	2.13	1.461	0.219
	WG	150.145	103	1.458		
	Total	158.667	107			
Operational deadlines influence my ability to balance work and personal life.	BG	6.82	4	1.705	1.59	0.183
	WG	110.476	103	1.073		
	Total	117.296	107			
The nature of my role creates unpredictable work schedules.	BG	4.139	4	1.035	0.68	0.608
	WG	156.851	103	1.523		
	Total	160.991	107			
The physical demands of my job affect my personal commitments.	BG	8.709	4	2.177	1.639	0.17
	WG	136.81	103	1.328		
	Total	145.519	107			
Work pressure in facilities management influences my family responsibilities.	BG	6.874	4	1.718	1.412	0.235
	WG	125.376	103	1.217		
	Total	132.25	107			

\*BG - Between Groups \*\*WG - Within Groups

**Interpretation:** The one-way ANOVA results reveal no statistically significant differences in perceived sector-specific challenges across experience groups for any measured items: physical presence limitations ( $F = 1.461, p = 0.219$ ), operational deadline impacts ( $F = 1.59, p = 0.183$ ), unpredictable schedules ( $F = 0.68, p = 0.608$ ), physical demand effects ( $F = 1.639, p = 0.17$ ), or work pressure consequences ( $F = 1.412, p = 0.235$ ). All  $p$ -values exceed the 0.05 threshold, strongly supporting the null hypothesis (H02) that years of experience do not significantly influence how employees perceive WLB constraints in facilities management. This consistency across experience levels suggests that sector-specific challenges—such as physical job demands and unpredictable schedules—are universally experienced regardless of tenure. The findings imply that organizational interventions to mitigate these challenges should be broadly applied rather than targeted to specific experience groups.

### 5.3.3 Organizational Policies and Practices by Employment Type

**H03: There is no significant difference in policy effectiveness ratings between full-time, part-time, and contractual employees.**

Statement	Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
My organization has clear policies supporting work-life balance.	BG	2.844	2	1.422	0.825	0.441
	WG	179.324	104	1.724		
	Total	182.168	106			
Flexible working arrangements are available in my organization.	BG	5.628	2	2.814	2.4	0.096
	WG	121.961	104	1.173		
	Total	127.589	106			
I feel supported by management in balancing my work and personal life.	BG	9.153	2	4.577	3.141	0.047
	WG	151.538	104	1.457		
	Total	160.692	106			
My workplace offers programs to promote work-life balance.	BG	3.327	2	1.664	1.19	0.308
	WG	145.346	104	1.398		
	Total	148.673	106			
Organizational expectations align with realistic work-life practices.	BG	1.702	2	0.851	0.583	0.56
	WG	151.775	104	1.459		

	Total	153.477	106		
--	-------	---------	-----	--	--

\*BG - Between Groups \*\*WG - Within Groups

**Interpretation:** The one-way ANOVA results present a mixed picture regarding policy effectiveness across employment types. While most policy-related items showed no significant differences - including clarity of WLB policies ( $F=0.825$ ,  $p=0.441$ ), availability of programs ( $F=1.19$ ,  $p=0.308$ ), and alignment of expectations ( $F=0.583$ ,  $p=0.56$ ) - one key exception emerged. The perception of management support ( $F=3.141$ ,  $p=0.047$ ) differed significantly among full-time, part-time and contractual employees, barely meeting the 0.05 significance threshold. The near-significant result for flexible work arrangements ( $F=2.4$ ,  $p=0.096$ ) also suggests potential variation worth exploring. These findings partially support the null hypothesis ( $H_03$ ), indicating that while most policy effectiveness ratings are consistent across employment types, meaningful differences exist in how management support is perceived. Contractual workers may feel less supported than their full-time counterparts, highlighting an area for organizational improvement.

### 5.3.4 Gender Differences in Work-Life Balance Perceptions

**H<sub>04</sub>:** There is no significant difference in WLB perception scores between male, female, and non-binary employees.

**Table - 5.4. Independent Samples Test of "Gender Differences in Work-Life Balance Perceptions"**

Statement	Variances	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
My age influences my ability to balance work and personal life.	EVA	0.549	0.46	-0.86	106	0.39
	EVNA			-0.86	87.4	0.394
Gender roles affect my experience of work-life balance.	EVA	0.274	0.602	-2.08	106	0.04
	EVNA			-2.1	92.25	0.039
Younger employees experience better work-life balance than older employees	EVA	0.121	0.728	-1.43	106	0.155
	EVNA			-1.43	88.39	0.157
Women face more work-life balance challenges compared to men.	EVA	0.807	0.371	-2.54	106	0.013
	EVNA			-2.48	82.82	0.015
Generational differences affect perceptions of work-life balance.	EVA	1.089	0.299	-1.44	106	0.154
	EVNA			-1.45	93.87	0.149

\*EVA - Equal Variances Assumed \*\*EVNA - Equal Variances Not Assumed

**Interpretation:** The analysis reveals significant gender-based differences in two key aspects of work-life balance perceptions. First, regarding gender roles' impact on WLB ( $t=-2.08$ ,  $p=0.04$ ), and second, concerning the challenges faced by women compared to men ( $t=-2.54$ ,  $p=0.013$ ). Both results are statistically significant at  $p<0.05$ , indicating women report stronger agreement that gender roles affect their WLB experience and that they face greater WLB challenges than their male colleagues. However, no significant gender differences emerged for other dimensions: age's influence on WLB ( $p=0.39$ ), generational differences in WLB perceptions ( $p=0.154$ ), or beliefs about younger employees having better WLB ( $p=0.155$ ). These non-significant results (all  $p>0.05$ ) suggest these aspects of WLB are similarly perceived across genders.

## 6. Research Findings:

The study reveals several critical insights about work-life balance (WLB) among facilities management employees in service-oriented organizations. Descriptive statistics show moderate WLB perceptions (mean range: 2.88–3.51), with employees reporting the highest satisfaction with management support ( $M=3.51$ ) but the lowest clarity in organizational WLB policies ( $M=2.87$ ). Unpredictable schedules ( $M=3.49$ ) and physical job demands ( $M=3.20$ ) emerged as top challenges. Reliability analysis confirmed robust internal consistency across all questionnaire sections (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ : 0.787–0.824). Hypothesis testing revealed that WLB perceptions were largely consistent across job roles (except for employer understanding,  $p=0.03$ ) and experience levels (all  $p>0.05$ ), suggesting universal challenges in the sector. However, significant variations were observed by employment type (management support,  $p=0.047$ ) and gender (gender roles,  $p=0.04$ ; women's challenges,  $p=0.013$ ), highlighting disparities for contractual workers and female employees. Key takeaways of the current research paper include, *Management support is strong, but policy communication needs improvement; Physical and scheduling challenges affect all employees equally, regardless of experience; Contractual workers perceive less managerial support than full-time staff; and Gender roles disproportionately impact women's WLB.* These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions, such as clearer policy dissemination, flexible scheduling, and gender-sensitive support programs, while maintaining universal WLB initiatives for broader workforce well-being.

## 7. Conclusion

This study highlights the complex dynamics of work-life balance in facilities management, where sector-specific challenges like unpredictable schedules and physical demands create universal stressors. While organizational support is generally positive, gaps in policy clarity and equitable implementation—particularly for contractual and female employees—require attention. The findings advocate for a dual approach: standardized WLB policies to address sector-wide challenges and tailored measures to support vulnerable subgroups. By addressing these issues, service-oriented organizations can enhance employee well-being, reduce turnover, and foster a more inclusive workplace. Future research could explore longitudinal impacts of these interventions and cross-cultural comparisons to refine WLB strategies further.

## References

1. Abu Bakar, A. Y. (2024). The application of 'work-life balance' in relation with employees' well-being: an exploratory study. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i2.3243>
2. Alex, O., & Kaur, J. (2023). A study on the work life balance of the employees. *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, 11(1), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v11i1.6230>
3. Alex, Ofori., Jaspreet, Kaur. (2023). 1. A Study on the Work Life Balance of the Employees. *Shanlax international journal of management*, doi: 10.34293/management.v11i1.6230
4. Arampatzi, E., & Burger, M. (2020). Facility management services and employee well-being. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 18(2), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jfm-10-2019-0055>
5. Barkha, Gupta., Anukool, Manish, Hyde, Hyde. (2013). 1. Managerial Employees Prospective of Quality of Work Life in Banks.
6. Chandola, T., Booker, C. L., Kumari, M., & Benzeval, M. (2019). Are Flexible Work Arrangements Associated with Lower Levels of Chronic Stress-Related Biomarkers? A Study of 6025 Employees in the UK Household Longitudinal Study. *Sociology*, 53(4), 779–799. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038519826014>
7. Ciarniene, R., & Vienazindiene, M. (2018). Flexible Work Arrangements from Generation and Gender Perspectives: Evidence from Lithuania. *Engineering Economics*, 29(1). <http://ejournal.stiemj.ac.id/index.php/ekobis>
8. Czerwinska-Lubszczyk, A., & Byrtek, N. (2023). Work-Life Balance – Employee Perspective. *European Research Studies Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/3243>
9. D, F. S. (2024). A study on employees perception towards the quality of work life. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*, 08(04), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijrsrem31127>
10. Dixon, J., Banwell, C., Strazdins, L., Corr, L., & Burgess, J. (2019). Flexible employment policies, temporal control and health promoting practices: A qualitative study in two Australian worksites. *PLoS ONE*, 14(12), e0224542
11. *Focusing on Employee Work Life Balance: A Study of Gas Authority of India Ltd.* (2013). 2(1), 47–49. <https://www.longdom.org/abstract/focusing-on-employee-work-life-balance-a-study-of-gas-authority-of-india-ltd-2341.html>
12. Fredrick, Ochieng, Ayege. (2019). Achieving Organizational Effectiveness through Adoption of Work Life Balance Practices. doi: 10.52155/IJPSAT.V13.1.736
13. Garg, R. K., Jilani, S. A., Rai, S. K., Gupta, S. J., & Kumar, A. (2024). *Assessing Employees' Perspectives on Work-Life Equilibrium for Integrated Human Capital Governance*. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/sceecs61402.2024.10482162>
14. Igbinomwanhia, O., Iyayi, O., & Iyayi, F. (2012). Employee Work-Life balance as an HR Imperative. *African Research Review*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.4314/afrev.v6i3.8>
15. Klindžić, M., & Marić, M. (2019). Flexible Work Arrangements and Organizational Performance – The Difference between Employee and Employer-Driven Practices. *Drustvena Istrazivanja*, 89–108
16. Kumari, N. S., & Purohit, N. D. H. (2023). An Analytical Study of Work Life Balance and its Impact on Working People in Service Sector in Shekhawati Region. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science Communication and Technology*, 825–828.
17. Naithani, P. (2009). *An empirical study of work and family life spheres and emergence of work-life balance initiatives.pdf*. 37(1).
18. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd Ed.). McGraw-Hill.
19. Parul, Deshwal. (2015). 1. Impact of flexible working arrangements in the MNCs of Delhi. *International journal of applied research*
20. Salvatore, Zappalà, Ferdinando, Toscano., Dharan, Bharti., Luca, Pietrantonì. (2024). 1. Unveiling the Relationship between Flextime and Job Performance: The Role of Family–Work Conflict and the Ability to Cope in a Moderated Mediation Model. *Advances in the Social Sciences*,
21. Samantha, Evans. Madeleine, Wyatt. (2024). 1. Work-Life Balance and Social Class. doi: 10.1108/978-1-80382-219-820241002
22. Sanders, S., & Karmowska, J. (2020b). Voluntary flexible working arrangements and their effects on managers and employees. *Harvard Deusto Business Research*, 9(2),
23. Williams, C. (2008). *Work-life balance of shift workers*. 9(8). <https://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-001-x/2008108/pdf/10677-eng.pdf>

IJNRD  
Research Through Innovation