

Do the Demographics have the potential to influence Work-Life Conflict?

Joshin Joseph¹, Dr. Deepu Jose Sebastian²

¹Junior Research Fellow, ST. Thomas College, Palai.

²Associate Professor & Research Guide, Dept. Commerce, Deva Matha College, Kuravilangad.

Email - ¹joshinpariyath@gmail.com ²deepudmc@yahoo.com

Abstract: Work-life conflict has been a great interest to researchers, practitioners and society in general (Michel, Clark and Beiler). Literature exploration found that limited research had exclusively explored the effect of demographics on work-life conflict (Michel, Clark, & Beiler, 2013; see also Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). This study exclusively evaluated the relationship between demographics (personal, family and work) and work life conflict with the help of data collected from 78 randomly selected professionals from Viakom Taluk, who were engaged with banking and teaching job. The result of the study illustrated that the demographics factors (work, family, and personal) does not have the potential to influence the state of work-life conflict and that the respondents had work-life balance rather than work-life conflict.

Key words: Work-life conflict, demographics, work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work, work/personal life enrichment.

1. INTRODUCTION:

Work life conflict is one amongst most discussed topic in the 21st century. Hochschild 1997 in a study states that changes that happened in the work place as well as in the demographics in the past decade lead to an increased concern for the boundary between employee work and non-work (as cited in Hayman, 2005). Work life conflict become popular on the basis of the role conflict model proposed by Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick Snoek and Robert A. Rosenthal in the year 1964. Conflict occurs as a result of simultaneous occurrence of two (or more) sets of pressure such that compliance with one would make more difficult or render impossible compliance with other (Kahn, Wolfe and Quinn). Traditionally work is considered as masculine and the family is considered as feminine. Where the men pre-dominantly occupied with work role and the women with family work. This sex discrimination in the social environment often keeps the work life conflict under control as there were only limited cross border occupancy (male involvement in discharging the family responsibility and female participation in paid work) (Joseph). The industrialisation, together with feminisation of the work environment dismantled the existing allies between work and personal life. Industrialisation formalised and standardised the work environment, which in turn result in the segregation of work from the family. However, the gender role divide was present in the society till the second quarter of the 20th century. The gender role divide that prevails in the society often absorbed the effect of industrialisation. But the feminisation of the work environment happened during the period of 1970s resulted in gender role breakdown. The industrialisation together with gender role breakdown fertile the conflict between work and personal life.

Work-Life conflict is a concept changed over time. Early studies in 1980s (e.g., Bedeian, Bruke, & Moffett, 1988; Cooke & Rousseau, 1984; Kopelman, Greenhaus, and Connolly, 1983) conceptualised the work-life (work-family) conflict as a unidimensional construct (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; see also McMillan, 2011). Later on, that is by 1990s researchers (e.g., Hammer & Thompson, 2003; Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999; Williams & Alliger, 1994) identified that bidirectional approach (work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict) will provide more conclusive view about conflict (McMillan, 2011; see also Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005; Frone, 2003; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict: Testing a Model of the Work-Family Interface, 1992; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, Prevalence of workfamily conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable?, 1992). During the early decade of 21st century the researchers (e.g., Fisher-McAuley, Stanton, Jolton, & Gavin, 2003; Hobson, Delunas, & Kesic, 2001) broadened the existing work-family conflict in to work-to-nonwork conflict/work-to-personal life conflict. Work-family conflict has been widely reported in the contemporary literature; although, the digemarcatic shift from the traditional role of men and women in the society requires more wider concept than work-family conflict-which inturn resulted in the development of work-to-nonwork conflict/ work-life conflict research (Hayman). However, relationship between demographics and work-life conflict remained under explored. Literature exploration found that limited research had exclusively explored the effect of demographics on work-life conflict (Michel, Clark, & Beiler, 2013; see also Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005).

2. DEMOGRAPHICS AND WORK-LIFE CONFLICT:

Demographics viz. age, gender, educational qualification, political affiliation, religion, socio-economic status etc. have the ability to influence the attitude, behaviour and perception (several studies Pjesivac, 2016; Klein, 2015; Loshin, 2013; Amina, 2007). That is the demographics have the potential to influence an individual both at psychological and physical level. The objective of this study is to explore the relationship if any that exist between work-life conflict and demographic dimension of the employees. Understanding about the underlying demographic divide (if any) among employees with regard to work-life conflict enables the policy makers (organisations as well as authorities-governments, trade unions, labour welfare organisations..) to understand frame customised policies to minimise the work-life conflict among employees. Here in this study the demographics specifically personal, family and work and its relation with work-life conflict was examined. Age, gender and educational qualification constitute the personal demographics; marital status, family type, child status and spouse employment status constitute the family demographics; job, designation and salary constitute the work demographics of the study. Based on the general assumption persisting about demographics (i.e., demographics have the potential to influence an individual at psychological and physical), following hypothesis were framed.

H1: Personal demographics and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW) are related.

H1a: There is relationship between age and work-life conflict.

H1b: There is relationship between gender and work-life conflict.

H1c: There is relationship between educational qualification and work-life conflict.

H2: Family demographics and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW) are related.

H2a: There is relationship between marital status and work-life conflict.

H2b: There is relationship between family type and work-life conflict.

H2c: There is relationship between child status and work-life conflict.

H2d: There is relationship between spouse employment status and work-life conflict.

H3: Work demographics and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW) are related.

H3a: There is relationship between job and work-life conflict.

H3b: There is relationship between employee designation and work-life conflict.

H3c: There is relationship between salary and work-life conflict.

H3d: there is relationship between employee experience and work-life conflict.

3. MATERIAL AND METHODS:

3.1 Measures Used

Work-Life conflict was measured with the help work/personal life conflict scale developed by Jeremy Hayman in the year 2005, which is in turn a modified version of Fisher-McAuley scale of work-life conflict. The conflict scale integrates two sub-scales, each describing two different dimensions of work-life conflict viz. Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) and Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW). The WIPL-sub-scale consist of seven items each measured on a 7-point frequency rating scale (1=Not at all, 2=All most never, 3=Rarely, 4=Sometimes, 5=A moderate amount, 6=Almost every time, 7=All the time). The WIPL scale yielded Cronbach alpha value of .879 and a sample item of the scale was 'My personal life suffers because of work'. The PLIW-sub-scale consist of four items each measured on a 7-point frequency rating scale (1=Not at all, 2=All most never, 3=Rarely, 4=Sometimes, 5=A moderate amount, 6=Almost every time, 7=All the time). The WIPL scale yielded Cronbach alpha value of .858 and a sample item of the scale was 'Personal life drains me of energy for work'. As the items of both sub scales were negatively worded, all the items were reverse coded. Hence, value more than or equal to four (on both WIPL as well as PLIW scale) indicates low level of conflict, whereas value below four indicates high level of conflict.

All the three dimensions of demographics viz. personal, family and work were considered in the study. Age, gender and educational qualification were the elements of personal demographics considered. Whereas marital status, family type, child status and employment status of spouse were the elements of family demographics considered. And job type, designation and salary were the elements of work demographics considered in this study.

Procedure

The preview of the study was confined to the academic (college lectures) and banking professionals who belongs to Vikom Thaluk of the Kottayam District. As the part of the study 100 questionnaires (50 to banking personals as well as 50 to academic professionals) were distributed to randomly identified respondents. The required data was obtained with the help of questionnaire. Out of 100 questionnaires distributed, 78 were returned. Hence the response rate of the study was 78 percent. All the returned questionnaires were competitive in all respect (checked for errors) and therefore included in the study. Thus, the final sample size of the study become 78.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION:

4.1 Profile of Respondents

The Table 1 illustrates the breakdown of the respondents based on their profile. Gender silhouette illustrates that sample represent both the gender almost equally (52.6 percent male and 47.4 percent female). While the job profile demonstrates that 61.5 percent of the respondents were academic professionals and the remaining 38.5 percent were banking professionals. More than three fourth (78.2 percent) of the respondents were married and only less than one fourth (21.8 percent) were unmarried. When it comes to the education profile of the respondents' 94.9 percent of the respondents have qualification equalling or above graduation, whereas only 5.1 percent had qualification below graduation. Salary wise break down of the profile illustrates that 48.7 percent of the respondents were getting salary in between 25000 to 60000, whereas 33.3 percent had salary below 25000 and only 17.9 percent had salary above 60000. Respondents designation wise distribution shows that 70.5 percent were employed with non-managerial post, whereas the remaining 29.5 were at managerial position. When the respondents were organised based on their age, 39.7 percent of the respondents were below the age of 31, it was followed by 34.6 percent between 31 to 45 and the rest 25.6 percent above the age of 45.

Table 1 Profile of Respondents

| Profile Dimension | | N | % |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----|------|
| Gender | Male | 41 | 52.6 |
| | Female | 37 | 47.4 |
| Job Type | Academic | 48 | 61.5 |
| | Banking | 30 | 38.5 |
| Marital Status | Married | 61 | 78.2 |
| | Unmarried | 17 | 21.8 |
| | Up to +2 | 4 | 5.1 |
| Education | Graduation/equalling | 18 | 23.1 |
| | Post-graduation/above | 56 | 71.8 |
| Salary | Below 25000 | 26 | 33.3 |
| | 25000-60000 | 38 | 48.7 |
| | Above 60000 | 14 | 17 |
| Designation | Managerial | 23 | 29.5 |
| | Non-managerial | 55 | 70.5 |
| Age | Up to 30 | 31 | 39.7 |
| | 31-45 | 27 | 34.6 |
| | Above 45 | 20 | 25.6 |

4.2 Work-Life Conflict Level of Respondents

The work-life conflict has got two dimensions work interference with personal life (WIPL) and personal life interference with work (PLIW). Table 2 illustrates that the respondents experience low level of conflict (when the mean value of the scale is above 4, it indicates the absence of conflict) WIPL (5.04) and PLIW (5.55). And therefore, low level of work-life conflict also (5.30). Which postulates that the respondents have situation of work-life balance (according to Clark (2000) work-life balance is the absence/minimum work-life conflict) rather than work-life conflict.

Table 2 Work-Life Conflict

| Scale | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|--------------------|----|------|----------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| WIPL | 78 | 5.04 | 1.11 | .412 ^{NS} | .118 ^{NS} |
| PLIW | 78 | 5.55 | 1.05 | .433 ^{NS} | -.629 ^{NS} |
| Work-Life Conflict | 78 | 5.30 | .89 | .405 ^{NS} | .049 ^{NS} |

(NS = Not Significant, $p > .05$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$)

4.3 Demographics and Work-Life Conflict

Personal demographics and work-life conflict- Age, gender and educational qualification constitute the personal demographics. Therefore, the relationship between personal demographics and work-life conflict were examined through the study of relationship between variables such as age, gender and educational qualification and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW).

Table 3 Personal demographics and Work-Life Conflict

| Variables | WIPL | | | PLIW | | |
|--------------------|-------|----|--------------------|-------|------|--------------------|
| | t/F/r | df | Sig. | t/F/r | df | Sig. |
| Age (r) | .126 | | .273 ^{NS} | .135 | | .250 ^{NS} |
| Gender (t) | .193 | 76 | .847 ^{NS} | 1.49 | 76 | .138 ^{NS} |
| Education (ANNOVA) | .462 | 76 | .631 ^{NS} | .979 | 2,75 | .381 ^{NS} |

(NS = Not Significant, $p > .05$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; r = correlation; t = 't' test)

Table 3 shows that there is only very weak (no correlation) positive insignificant correlation between age and WIPL, $r = .126$, $p > .05$; and also between age and PLIW, $r = .132$, $p > .05$. That is there is no relationship between age and WIPL and also between age and PLIW. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H1a: There is relationship between age and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between age and work-life conflict. Table 3 further demonstrate that there is no significant relationship between gender and two sub-scales (WIPL t ($df = 76$) = .193, $p > .05$; and PLIW t ($df = 76$) = 1.49, $p > .05$) of work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H1b: There is relationship between gender and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between gender and work-life conflict. The ANNOVA statistics illustrated in the table 3 explore the relationship between educational qualification and work-life conflict of the respondents. Asper the statistics of the table 2, there is no significant relationship between educational qualification and WIPL, $F(2,75) = .463$, $p > .05$; and also between educational qualification and PLIW, $F(2,75) = .979$, $p > .05$. Which in turn indicates that there is no significant relationship between educational qualification of the respondents and their reported level of work-life conflict. Hence, the hypothesis 'H1c: There is relationship between educational qualification and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between educational qualification and work-life conflict.

The result of the analysis indicates that all the personal demographic variable considered (age, gender and educational qualification) failed to demonstrate any kind of statistically significant relationship with work-life conflict. Which postulates that there is no relationship between personal demographic and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis H1: Personal demographics and work-life conflict are related' was rejected and concluded that there is no evidence to validate the relationship between personal demographics and work-life conflict.

Family demographics and work-life conflict- the relationship between family demographics and work-life conflict was studied by evaluating the relationship between family related variables such as marital status, family type, child status and spouse work status with two sub-scales of work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW).

Table 4 Family Demographics and Work-Life Conflict

| Variables | WIPL | | | PLIW | | |
|--------------------|------|----|--------------------|------|----|--------------------|
| | t | df | Sig. | t | df | Sig. |
| Marital Status | .609 | 76 | .545 ^{NS} | 1.62 | 76 | .111 ^{NS} |
| Family Type | .304 | 76 | .762 ^{NS} | .579 | 76 | .564 ^{NS} |
| Child Status | .805 | 76 | .310 ^{NS} | .172 | 76 | .101 ^{NS} |
| Spouse Work Status | .968 | 58 | .337 ^{NS} | .018 | 58 | .986 ^{NS} |

(NS = Not Significant, $p > .05$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; r = correlation; t = 't' test)

Table 4 illustrates the relationship between variables related to family demographics and work-life conflict. While examining the relationship between marital status and work-life conflict, table 4 demonstrate that marital status does not had any statistically significant relation either with WIPL, $t(76) = .609$, $p > .05$; or with PLIW, $t(76) = .162$, $p > .05$. Which in turn indicates that marital status does not had any relationship with work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H2a: There is relationship between marital status and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between marital status and work-life conflict. Table 4 further illustrates the relationship between family type and work-life conflict and that neither WIPL, $t(76) = .304$, $p > .05$; nor PLIW, $t(76) = .579$, $p > .05$ had any statistically significant relation with family type. Which postulates there is no significant relationship between family type and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H2b: There is relationship between family type and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between family type and work-life conflict. With regard to child status, table 4 shows that the child status does not had any statistically significant relationship with both sub-scales of work-life conflict. That is with WIPL $t(76) = .805$, $p > .05$; and with PLIW, $t(76) = .172$, $p > .05$. Which means there is no statistical evidence for relationship between child status and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H2c: There is relationship between child status and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between child status and work-life conflict. Table 4 also exhibit the relationship between spouse work status and work-life conflict. The statistics illustrated in the table 3 conforms that there is no significant relationship between spouse work status and with WIPL, $t(58) = .968$, $p > .05$ and also with PLIW, $t(58) = .018$, $p > .05$. Which indicates the absence of relationship between spouse work status and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H2d: There is relationship between spouse work status and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between spouse work status and work-life conflict.

The analysis of family demographics indicates that family demographics viz. marital status, family type, child status and spouse work status does not have any statistically significant relationship with work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H2: Family demographics and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW) are related' was failed to accept and because of the absence of statistical evidence conforming the relationship between family demographics and work-life conflict. Hence, it was concluded that there is no relationship between family demographics and work-life conflict.

Work demographics and work-life conflict- the relationship between work demographics and work-life conflict was studied by evaluating the relationship between work related demographic variables such as job (academic/banking), employee designation (managerial/non-managerial), salary and year of experience with two sub-scales of work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW).

Table 5 Work Demographics and Work-Life Balance

| Variables | WIPL | | | PLIW | | |
|-----------------|-------|--------|--------------------|------|--------|--------------------|
| | t/F | df | Sig. | t/F | df | Sig. |
| Job (t) | 1.018 | 76 | .312 ^{NS} | .063 | 76 | .950 ^{NS} |
| Designation (t) | 1.43 | 76 | 1.58 ^{NS} | .938 | 76 | .351 ^{NS} |
| Salary (ANNOVA) | 2.260 | (2,75) | .111 ^{NS} | .809 | (2,75) | .449 ^{NS} |
| Experience (r) | .232 | | .041* | .150 | | .190 ^{NS} |

(NS = Not Significant, $p > .05$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; r = correlation; t = 't' test)

Table 5 shows the relationship between variables related to family demographics and work-life conflict. While examining the relationship between job and work-life conflict, table 5 demonstrate that job does not had any statistically significant relation either with WIPL, $t(76) = 1.018$, $p > .05$; or with PLIW, $t(76) = .063$, $p > .05$. That is there is no statistical evidence to conform the relationship between job and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H3a: There is relationship between job and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between job and work-life conflict. Table 5 further illustrates the relationship between employee designation and work-life conflict and that neither WIPL, $t(76) = 1.43$, $p > .05$; nor PLIW, $t(76) = .938$, $p > .05$ had any statistically significant relation with employee designation. Which postulates that there was no significant relationship between employee designation and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H3b: There is relationship between employee designation and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there is no relationship between employee designation and work-life conflict. With regard employee salary, table 5 shows that the employee salary does not had any statistically significant relationship with both sub-scales of work-life conflict. That is with WIPL $F(2,76) = 2.26$, $p > .05$; and with PLIW, $t(2,75) = .809$, $p > .05$. Which means there is no statistical evidence for relationship between child status and work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H3c: There is relationship between employee salary and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that the employee salary level does not had the potential to influence the work-life conflict. Table 5 also exhibit the relationship between employee experience and work-life conflict. The statistics illustrated in the table 5 conforms that there is statistically significant weak positive correlation between employee experience and WIPL, $r = .232$, $p < .05$. Whereas there is no significant correlation between employee experience and PLIW $r = .150$, $p > .05$. The relationship between employee experience and WIPL is inconclusive in nature as the strength of correlation was weak positive. Therefore, requires further validation before conforming the relationship. Hence, the hypothesis 'H2d: There is relationship between experience of the employee and work-life conflict' was rejected and concluded that there was no sufficient evidence to conform the relationship between employee experience and work-life conflict.

The analysis of work demographics indicates that family demographics viz. job, employee designation, salary level and year of experience (except the case of experience and WIPL) does not have any statistically significant relationship with work-life conflict. Therefore, the hypothesis 'H3: Work demographics and work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW) are related' was failed to accept and because of the absence of statistical evidence conforming the relationship between work demographics and work-life conflict. Hence, it was concluded that there is no relationship between work demographics and work-life conflict.

The analysis demonstrated that there was no statistical evidence to validate the relationship between demographics and work-life conflict. All the three dimensions of the demographics viz. personal (age, gender, and education), family (marital status, family type, child status, and spouse work status) and work (job, designation, salary, and experience) failed to exhibit any statistically significant relationship either with WIPL or with PLIW, except the case employee experience and WIPL. The relationship between experience and WIPL was inconclusive in nature as the strength of correlation is weak positive ($r = .232^*$) though it is significant. Therefore, it can be clinched that demographic profile does not have any direct relation with work-life conflict of the employees. Which is in turn mandate the indirect (mediation/moderation) effect of demographics as well as the presence of factors other than demographics that effect the work-life conflict of the employees.

5. CONCLUSION:

Demographics does not exhibit any relationship with both dimensions of work-life conflict (WIPL and PLIW), except the case of experience and WIPL. Where a weak positive ($r = .232^*$) statistically significant correlation was found. Which can be only considered as inconclusive and requires further validation before conforming the relationship as the strength of correlation is weak. Lack of flexibility at work, long working hours, non-accessibility to resources and support, absence of knowledge about work-life conflict, load overload., were the main sources of work-

life conflict (several studies Vernon, 2013; Simard, 2011; Walia, 2011; Gurney, 2009; Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordeaux, & Brinley, 2005). The respondents of the study were well educated (95 percent have graduate degree) and worked under organised sector (college professors and banking professionals belongs to public sector) with better standard of living together with greater access to resources. The respondents reported to have minimal level of conflict (work-life conflict scale mean = 5.30) which in turn represent the balance between work and personal life (Clark). Which postulates that the respondents of the were not faced with the issue of work-life conflict in their life. Studying the relationship between demographic and work-life conflict with a sample of minimum work-life conflict can be considered as a limitation of this study. Hence, there is a need to replicate the study with different population before validating the result.

REFERENCES:

1. Amina, Hanudin. "Borneo Islamic Automobile Financing: Do Demographics Matter?" *Labuan e-Journal of Muamalat and Society* Pp-68-81. (2007):
2. Clark, Sue Campbell. "Work/Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work/Family Balance." *Human Relations* ,Pp- 747-770. (2000): <<http://hum.sagepub.com/content/53/6/747> >.
3. Eby, Lillian T., et al. "Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002)." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* (2005): 124-197.
4. Fisher-McAuley, Gwenith, et al. "Modeling the Relationship between Work/Life Balance and Organizational Outcomes." (2003): 1-30. 8 August 2016. <<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260516221> >.
5. Frone, Michael R. "Work-Family Balance." Quick, James C. and Lois E. Tetrick. *Handbook of Occupational Health psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association, 143-162. 2003.
6. Frone, Michael R., Marcia Russell and M. Lynne Cooper. "Prevalence of workfamily conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable?" *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 723-729. (1992):
7. Frone, Michael R., Marcia Russell and Mary Lynne Cooper. "Antecedents and Outcomes of Work-Family Conflict: Testing a Model of the Work-Family Interface." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77.1: 65-78. (1992)
8. Gurney, Sarah. *Gender, work-life balance and health amongst women and men in administrative, manual and technical jobs in a single organisation: a qualitative study*. PhD Thesis. University of Glasgow . Glasgow : University of Glasgow, 2009. <<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1641/> >.
9. Hayman, Jeremy. "Psychometric Assessment of an Instrument Designed to Measure Work Life Balance." *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management* 13.1: Pp-85-91. (2005)
10. Hobson, Charles J., Linda Delunas and Dawn Kesic. "Compelling evidence of the need for corporate work/life balance initiatives: results from a national survey of stressful life-events." *Journal of Employment Counseling*: Pp-38-44. (2001)
11. Joseph, Joshin. "A Study on Work-Life Balance with reference to Service Sector in Kerala." in Press.
12. Kahn, Robert L., et al. *Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
13. Klein, Matthew C. *How much do demographics really matter?* 8 December 2015. <<https://ftalphaville.ft.com/2015/12/07/2146264/how-much-do-demographics-really-matter/>>.
14. Loshin, David. *BeyeNetwork*. 19 December 2013. <<http://www.b-eye-network.com/17191>>.
15. McMillan, Heather S. *Examining the Relationship between Work/Life Conflict and Life Satisfaction in Executives: The Role of Problem-Focused Coping Techniques*. PhD Thesis. Tennessee: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 2011.
16. Michel, Jesse S., Malissa A. Clark and Angela A. Beiler. "Work-life conflict and its effects." *Handbook of work-life integration among professionals*. Pp-58-76. 2013.
17. Pjesivac, Ivanka. "Do Demographics Matter?" *Journalism Practice* (2016): 606-626.
18. Simard, Madeleine. *Employees' perceptions of Work Life Balance*. Master Degree Thesis. Waterloo: University of Waterloo, 2011.
19. Varghese, Susan. "Management of Work Life Balance in the Banking Sector." SNDT Womens University, 2015. <<http://hdl.handle.net/10603/70324>>.
20. Vernon, Waleska A. *Factors Responsible for Work-Life Conflict: A Study Comparing the Teaching and Legal Professions*. Master Degree Thesis. Ontario: University of Western Ontario, 2013.
21. Vijayakumar, J. K. and Manju Vijayakumar. "Importance of doctoral theses and its access: a literature analysis." *TGJ*:Pp- 67-75. (2007)
22. Walia, Parminder. *Work Life Balance of Working Professionals - A Study of IT and ITES Industry*. Punjabi University. Patiala, 2011.