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Exploring the Linkages between Control over Flexible Work Schedules, Work/Life Balance and Job Satisfaction of Office Based Employees

The impact of flexible work arrangements on employee attitudes has been well documented. However, limited studies have attempted to explain the underlying mechanisms of flexible work arrangements that contribute to positive employee outcomes. The purpose of this paper is to explore the relationships between work schedule control, work/life balance, and job satisfaction of office based employees. Direct linkages were found between work schedule control and the three dimensions of work/life balance (work interference with personal life, personal life interference with work, and work/personal life enhancement). Furthermore, the results indicate a positive relationship between work/life balance and job satisfaction. Overall, the findings suggest that employee control of flexible schedules appears to be a key element in achieving work/life balance for many employees.
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There have been many changes to the workforce and in employee’s lives that have led to increased concern for the boundary between work and non work (Hochschild 1997). To adapt to these changes, many organisations have implemented flexible work arrangements to help employees balance their work and non work lives. Research (Rubin 1979; Ronen & Pimps 1981; Stains & Pleck 1986; Barber, Dunham & Formisano 1992; Pierce & Dunham 1992; Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright & Neuman 1999; Hall & Liddicoat 2005) examining the impact of flexible work arrangements has generally shown that these initiatives have a positive influence on the work and non work attitudes of employees. However, these results are not supported by other studies. For example, Hicks and Klimoski (1981) found that flexible work arrangements had a non significant impact on the work and non work attitudes of employees. Moreover, empirical investigations (e.g., Dunham, Pierce & Castaneda 1987; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman 2001) exploring the work related benefits of flexible work arrangements have concluded that in some cases these initiatives can have little influence on employee attitudes. Furthermore, some researchers (Pocock 2003; Rasmussen & Corbett 2008) have even concluded that flexible work schedules can have a negative influence on employee outcomes.
To better understand the results from previous flexible work arrangement investigations attention has increasingly focused on the underlying elements of flexible work practices that may attribute to positive employee outcomes. For example, researchers (Macan 1994; Tausig & Fenwick 2001, Eaton 2003) have suggested that perceived schedule control may be a possible underlying mechanism of flexible work arrangements that have the potential to impact employee attitudes. Indeed, Tausig and Fenwick (2001) concluded that work schedule control has a greater impact on work/life balance attitudes than the flexible work schedule provided by the organisation. Thus, a better understanding of how control of flexible work arrangements impact work/life balance may provide further insights into the findings of previous flexible work investigations.

This study will endeavour to link employee control of workplace flexibility policies to work/life balance. In addition, this paper will explore the relationship between work/life balance and job satisfaction with employees operating on flexible work schedules. While the advantages and disadvantages of flexible work schedules are well documented (Stevens & Elsworth 1979; Dunham, et al. 1987; Pierce, Newstorm, Dunham & Barber 1989; Baltes, et al. 1999; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris & Weitzman 2001; Baker, Avery & Crawford 2007; Rasmussen & Corbett, 2008), limited studies have attempted to explain the underlying mechanisms and conditions that contribute to positive employee outcomes. That is, with the exception of a few studies (Tausig & Fenwick 2001; Eaton 2003) there is a lack of empirical research that has integrated employee control of flexible work policies to the study of flexible work arrangements. Research of this nature could prove useful in delineating why some studies (Hicks & Klimoski 1981; Dunham, et al. 1987) have not always been able to explain a direct relationship between flexible work practices and positive attitudinal outcomes shown by other studies (Stevens & Elsworth 1979; Ronen & Pimps 1981; Stains & Pleck 1986; Barber, et al. 1992; Baltes, et al. 1999). Therefore, the principle purpose of this paper is to gain a better understanding of how control of flexibility policies influences the work/life balance of office based employees in an Australian work setting.
THEORETICAL INFLUENCES

Work Schedule Control and Work/Life Balance

A number of researchers (Pierce & Newstorm 1980, Ronen 1981, Pierce & Dunham 1986, Frone, Russell & Copper 1992, Baltes, et al. 1999, Edwards & Rothbard 2000, Grzywacz & Marks 2000, Eaton 2003) have offered conceptual paradigms to justify the positive employee outcomes provided by flexible work schedules and work schedule control. For instance, Edwards & Rothbard (2000) suggest that the quality of life model (Ronen 1981) provides a possible conceptual framework for flexible work schedules. The model proposes that organisations recognise the pressure on employees to deal with an increasingly stressful and dynamic work environment. For example, by granting employees greater schedule control, organisations can often create a better fit between the boundaries of work and non work activities. When needs in both work and non work areas are fulfilled, employees can experience both work and non work satisfaction. Baltes, et al. (1999) believe that the elegant job enrichment paradigm presented by Hackman and Oldham (1976) is another theoretical framework that can be used to explain the effects of flexible work schedules. Indeed, previous research has found that increased job autonomy is positively liked to job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham 1980), and to personal and family life satisfaction (Voydanoff 1998). Consequently, for some employees the use of flexible work arrangements can affect the core characteristics of a job, specifically employee autonomy, and as a result can have a positive effect on employee outcomes (Baltes, et al. 1999, Eaton 2003).

Work/Life Balance and Job Satisfaction

Previous research exploring the causes and consequences of work/life balance has found that this construct is related to a number of employee outcomes. For instance, Allen, et al. (2000) found a relationship between work and non work integration and life satisfaction. Also, Frone, Russell and Cooper (1992) reported that effective work and personal life integration is related to a host of
employee work attitudes. Indeed, many other recent empirical experiments (Hill, et al. 1998; Fisher-McAuley, et al. 2003; Podratz 2004), which have examined the construct of work/life balance, have generally shown linkages with positive employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction. These researchers have employed a variety of theoretical conceptualisations to understand how work and personal life balance impacts employee outcomes.

The spillover, congruence, and segmentation models have been widely used in the work/life literature. Spillover theory purports that what happens at work can ‘spill over’ to affect non work life or alternatively what occurs at home can impact work life (Stains 1980). The congruence model (Morf 1989) attributes the cause for the positive relationship between work and non work to a third variable, such as personality variables or social factors (Frone, et al. 1992). According to the segmentation model (Evans & Bartolome 1984) work and non work domains are separate from each other, and as a result there is a non significant relationship between what happens at work and what happens away from work. Segmentation, congruence, and spillover theory models have each served as a basis for previous work/life research. However, while empirical support has been found for each of these models it has been suggested that they have not been integrated into a single comprehensive theory to guide work/life research (Grandey & Cropanzano 1999). The conservation of resources theory holds promise as an approach for guiding research examining the work and non work lives of employees (Edwards & Rothbard 2000). According to this theory stress is a reaction to an environment in which an employee is threatened by a loss of resources, experiences an actual loss of resources, or fails to gain expected resources (Hobfoll 1989). More specifically, when resources are expended to accomplish desired work and non work goals, and these goals are not reached, the perception may be a lack of work/life balance (Edwards & Rothbard 2000). If there is an actual loss of resources then this stressor may lead to a number of negative outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction.
HYPOTHESES

A great deal of empirical research (Hicks & Klimoski 1981; McGuire & Liro 1986; Macan 1994, Hill, et al. 2001; Tausig & Fenwick 2001) has found that the availability of flexible work schedules had little effect on employee work/life balance and job satisfaction. Rather, a study by McGuire and Liro (1986) found that the adoption of work schedule flexibility had more impact on job satisfaction and employee personal life than the individual flexible work schedule used by employees. Moreover, Macan (1994) contends that schedule control, specifically personal control over work schedule ‘time’, had a greater impact on the work and non work attitudes of office based employees than the availability of flexible work initiatives provided by the organisation. In addition, Tausig and Fenwick (2001) observed, in an empirical study of wage and salaried employees, that what increases perceived work/life balance for employees is control over scheduling and timing of work. These research findings, along with previous theoretical frameworks were used to develop the first of three main hypothesis predicting that employee work schedule control will be linked to work/life balance.

In this study, work/life balance is conceptualised based on previous research (Fisher 2001; Fisher-McAuley, Stanton, Jolton & Gavin 2003; Hayman 2005) that includes the negative influence of work on personal life as well as positive enhancement between work and non work. These studies suggest that work/life balance is comprised of three dimensions: work interference with personal life (WIPL), personal life interference with work (PLIW), work/personal life enhancement (WPLE). Therefore, it is predicted that work schedule control will be related to three dimensions of work/life balance. These points of view underpin the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Work schedule control will be inversely related to WIPL.

Hypothesis 2: Work schedule control will be inversely related to PLIW.

Hypothesis 3: Work schedule control will be positively related to WPLE.
A salient feature of the work/life literature (Fisher-McAuley, et al. 2003; Saltzstein, Ting & Hall 2001; Podratz 2004) presents a convincing connection between work/life balance and job satisfaction. The ability to balance work, family and personal life are aspects that employee’s may consider when evaluating their job (Fisher-McAuley, et al. 2003). Moreover, Adams and Jex (1999) identified that balancing work and family commitments was a stressor for administrative employees that was linked to job dissatisfaction. In addition, based on previous work/life research that has established a correlation between work/family balance and job satisfaction (Adams, King & King 1996; Saltzstein, Ting & Hall 2001), a similar relationship is expected between work/life balance and job satisfaction. Consequently, these arguments imply the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3: WIPL will be inversely related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: PLIW will be inversely related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: WPLE will be positively related to job satisfaction.

METHOD

Sample and Procedures

Data was collected from administrative employees in a large University in Western Australia. Questionnaires were placed in the internal mailbox of each of the respondents. A total of 1190 questionnaires were administered to employees in six divisions of the university over a two week period to reduce the possibility of common method variance. In total, 710 self report questionnaires were returned, indicating a response rate of almost 60 percent. The response rate is agreeably better than response rates from surveys using samples of Australian data (e.g., Abernethy 1996; Pearson & Duffy 1998). The majority of respondents were female (64 percent of respondents), reflecting the nature of the administrative staff employed within the university (Healthy Life Style Office 2002). The respondents utilised a variety of work schedules including flexitime (nearly 43 percent of respondents), flexiplace (14 percent of respondents), job share (8.5
percent of respondents), and standard fixed hour schedules (34.5 percent). In addition, 58 percent of respondents had children living at home, and nearly 12 percent of survey staff had eldercare responsibilities. Overall, the characteristics of the sample generally represented the demographics of the university’s office base employees.

**Measures**

*Work Schedule Control*

The subjective measure of employee work schedule control consisted of six items adapted from a 22 item scale developed by Dwyer and Ganster (1991). In a sample of white collar office workers, the scale yielded an internal consistency reliability of 0.87. Subjects were required to indicate the amount of influence or control they have in their jobs on a seven point interval scale (1=no control to 7=complete control). Exploratory factor analysis (principle components, Varimax rotation) and reliability estimates were performed to assess the psychometric properties of the scales. The factor analysis resulted in a single factor construct with eigenvalues of greater than one and item factor loadings ranging from .80 to .61 (eigenvalues = 4.32, accounting for 33.25% of the variance). The reliability analysis resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .85 and all items in the scale met the .35 criterion for item-total correlation. The arithmetic mean of the six items was determined for the measurement of work schedule control.

*Work/Life Balance*

Employee work/life balance was measured with a 15 item scale adapted from an instrument reported by Fisher-McAuley, Stanton, Jolton and Gavin (2003). The original scale consisted of 19 items designed to assess three dimensions of work/life balance: work interference with personal life (WIPL), personal life interference with work (PLIW), work/personal life enhancement (WPLE). The factor analysis of the items confirmed the three dimensions of the work/life balance scale and reported factor loadings ranging .87 to .57. The item “because of my job, I am in a
better mood at home” had a lower factor loading than desired (.57). However, this item was subsequently retained because it contributed positively to the reliability assessment. The final Cronbach alpha values for the three factors were .93 for WIPL, .90 for PLIW, and .77 for WPLE. Higher arithmetic means indicate that respondents report having experienced that situation more frequently. For the WIPL and PLIW sub scales higher means are purported to indicate lower levels of work/life balance. The WPLE sub scale is worded positively and higher means indicate higher levels of perceived work/life balance.

**Job Satisfaction**

The overall level of job satisfaction was assessed using a section of the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham 1975). A global, rather than a facet measure, was chosen for the use in this study because the researcher is interested in how work/life balance relates to job satisfaction as a whole, rather than how work/life balance relates to specific aspects of the job. The instrument developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975) consists of four items referring to satisfaction with work, the job and how often they (the employees) feel like quitting their job. Two of the items are reversed scored. Responses were made on a seven point Likert scale (ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree). The factor analysis resulted in a single factor construct with eigenvalues of greater than one and item factor loadings ranging from .88 to .70 (eigenvalues = 3.37, accounting for 33.7% of the variance). The reliability analysis resulted in a Cronbach alpha of .62 and all items in the scale met the .35 criterion for item-total correlation. An arithmetic mean of the five job satisfaction items was acquired.

**Control Variables**

There are a number of demographic and work related variables that have been found to influence the relationship between work and non work. Specifically, previous work/life literature (Tausig & Fenwick 1993; Baltes, et al. 1999; Voydanoff 1998; Eaton 2003, Haar & Spell 2003) proposes
numerous variables that may impact employee work/life balance and the use of flexible work schedules. These variables include parental status, gender, hours worked and salary. This study controlled for parental status (coded 1 = one or more dependents, 0 = no dependents), gender (coded 1 = female, 0 = male), hours worked (per week), and salary (coded 1 = under $20,000 per annum to 5 = more than $80,000 per annum).

**Data Analysis**

To examine the relationships between work schedule control and work/life balance (Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3), hierarchical regression analysis were performed. Step one contained the control variables (parental status, gender, hours worked and salary). Step two consisted of the predictor variable work schedule. In all, three regression models resulted, one for each of the criterion variable (WIPL, PLIW and WPLE). To test the effects of work/life balance on job satisfaction (Hypotheses 4, 5 and 6), hierarchical regression was conducted with the control variables being entered followed by the predictor variables. In addition, structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to further explore the pattern of relationships between the study variables.

**RESULTS**

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations for all the study variables are shown in Table 1 (page 19). The results presented in Table 1 have two main features. The first key feature is the study variables were all assessed using seven point scales, with means score ranging from 4.68 to 2.21. Higher means generally indicate higher levels of the particular variable, with the exception of two work/life balance constructs (WIPL and PLIW), which measure negative interference with work or personal life. Therefore, for these two constructs, lower mean scores represent higher levels of employee work/life balance. A second key feature of Table 1 is all of the examined
variables are significantly inter correlated. Work schedule control is significantly correlated to WIPL \( (r = -0.42, p < .001) \), PLIW \( (r = -0.31, p < .001) \), and WPLE \( (r = 0.42, p < .001) \).

The results of the regression analysis for Hypotheses 1, 2 and 3 are presented in Table 2 on page 19. These results indicate that work schedule control significantly relates to the dimensions of the work/life balance; WIPL, PLIW and WPLE (at the \( p < .001 \) level). The amount of variance explained for the three assessments were acceptable for two of the sub scales (WIPL and PLIW), providing a reasonable level of confidence in interpreting the results for Hypotheses 1 and 3. However, the results for Hypothesis 2 should be interpreted with limited confidence. Consequently, these results provide support for Hypotheses 1 and 3, and partial support for Hypothesis 2. Next the three dimensions of work/life balance were tested as predictors of job satisfaction (Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6). Table 3 (page 20) presents the results of WIPL, PLIW, and WPLE as antecedents of job satisfaction. WIPL, PLIW and WPLE were all significantly related to job satisfaction at the \( p < .001 \) level. The amount of variance explained for the three assessments provide a moderate level of confidence in interpreting the results. Consistent with the previous regression assessments and correlation analyses, PLIW displayed the weakest variance statistics when compared with the other dimensions of work/life balance. However, the overall results presented in Table 3 provide support for Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6.

Path analysis was performed with AMOS 5.0 with maximum likelihood estimation. The conceptual model is presented along with each path coefficient and the model fit statistics in Figure 1 (page 21). The results presented in Figure 1 indicate that the conceptual model, and the data generally fit well (normed \( \chi^2 = 1.042 \), GFI = 0.980, AGFI = 0.921, CFI = 1.000, RMSEA = 0.008). Furthermore, the majority of the standardised path estimates reported in Figure 1 show significant coefficients at the \( p < .01 \) level, despite
one non significant standardised path relationship (PLIW to job satisfaction). The results of the path analysis using the entire data set (n=710) revealed that work schedule control was significantly related to the three work/life balance dimensions of WIPL, PLIW and WPLE. In addition, two of the work/life balance dimensions substantially contributed to job satisfaction. However, PLIW had a non significant effect on job satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

The results presented in this paper provide additional support for examining the influence of work schedule control as a precursor of work and personal life balance. Existing work/life studies (Pierce, et al. 1989; Barber, et al 1993; Baltes, et al 1999; Hill, et al. 1998; Saltzstein 2001; Reade 2004) have largely concentrated on the direct influence of flexible work schedules on employee work and non work attitudes. The empirical results presented in the current study indicate strong support for the limited anecdotal evidence presented by some research (Tausig & Fenwick 2001; Hill, et al 2001) that schedule control is a key component of flexible work initiatives, which is linked to employee work/life balance. Indeed, the study results indicate that work schedule control was an important aspect for all employees, not just those operating on flexible work policies, in achieving a better balance between work and non work life. This finding provides added assurance to future researchers, who focus on the antecedents of work/life balance, of the linkages between schedule control and work/life balance.

Another useful extension of the study results for a practising manager is the confirmation of the relationship between work/life balance and job satisfaction. While some studies have focused on the impact of work/family conflict (Adams & Jex 1999; Allen, et al. 2000) and work/family balance (Hill, et al. 2001; Saltzstein, et al. 2001) on job satisfaction, only a few studies (Fisher-
McAuley, et al. 2003, Daves 2004) have explored the linkages between work/life balance and job satisfaction. The connection between the three dimensions of work/life balance and job satisfaction indicates that employees that can successfully integrate their work and personal life have a better attitude toward the job situation. For example, the observations suggest that there is a direct link between work interference with personal life and job satisfaction. These findings reinforce and suggest that interference or conflict from work can inhibit employees achieving non work responsibilities, and is a critical factor for job satisfaction (Rothausen 1994; Fisher 2001). Overall, for practising managers and administrators, the evidence supporting the assertion that work/life balance enhances job satisfaction may help the arguments for increased organisational resources to implement work/life balance initiatives.

**CONCLUSION**

This paper empirically investigated the importance of considering the complex interrelationships between control over flexible work schedules, work/life balance, and job satisfaction. The principle finding of the study was that work schedule control was linked to work and personal life balance. Furthermore, the evidence from the study was supportive of the observation that enhancing the integration of work, family and personal life can lead to increased job satisfaction. Despite the findings presented in this paper, the research has only begun to elucidate the complex relationships that might transform management practice and research interest. Indeed, the findings presented in this study are possibly suggestive, but an important consideration is that the results are not definitive. Therefore, future researchers might consider the research paradigm developed for this research across different industries, in particular where flexible work arrangements are utilised by office based employees, which may provide further understanding and consolidation of the study findings.
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Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (n =710)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Schedule</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. WIPL</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PLIW</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WPLE</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
- a. Correlations $r \leq .16$, $p \leq .05$; $r \leq .20$, $p \leq .01$; and $r \leq .23$, $p \leq .001$.  
- b. Bold values on the diagonal are the reliability assessments.  
- c. s.d. = Standard deviations of the means  
- d. WIPL = Work interference with personal life, PLIW = Personal life interference with work, and WPLE = Work and personal life enhancement.

Table 2: Regression analysis for the effect of work schedule control work on WIPL, PLIW and WPLE (n=710)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>WIPL</th>
<th>PLIW</th>
<th>WPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 – Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>.122*</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked</td>
<td>-.229**</td>
<td>-.133*</td>
<td>.203**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.201***</td>
<td>.110***</td>
<td>.152***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F change</td>
<td>40.119***</td>
<td>9.003***</td>
<td>31.245***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 - Predictor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work schedule control</td>
<td>-.422***</td>
<td>-.305***</td>
<td>.419***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ change</td>
<td>.220***</td>
<td>.113***</td>
<td>.205***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F statistic</td>
<td>153.63</td>
<td>72.69</td>
<td>149.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
- a. * $p < .05$, and ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.  
- b. WIPL = Work interference with personal life, PLIW = Personal life interference with work, and WPLE = Work and personal life enhancement.
Table 3: Regression analysis for the effect of WIPL, PLIW and WPLE on Job satisfaction (n=710)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 – Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental status</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked</td>
<td>-.251**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.159***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F change</td>
<td>30.177***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 – Predictor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIPL</td>
<td>-.500***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIW</td>
<td>-.369***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPLE</td>
<td>.537***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F statistic</td>
<td>253.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>.288***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a. * p < .05, and ** p < .01, *** p < .001.
       b. WIPL = Work interference with personal life, PLIW = Personal life interference with work, and WPLE = Work and personal life enhancement.
Figure 1: Path Model – Conceptual Model (n=710)

Notes: a. Standardised estimates of the path coefficients are shown. Non significant path is in bold.
b. $\chi^2$/df = 1.042, GFI = 0.980, AGFI = 0.921, CFI = 1.000, RMSEA = 0.008
c. WIPL = Work interference with personal life, PLIW = Personal life interference with work, and WPLE = Work and personal life enhancement.
d. * p < .01, and ** p < .001.