

## INFLUENCE OF WORK-LIFE BALANCE ON EMPLOYEE'S JOB ATTRITION

*Pooja Rani, Research scholar*

[Poojasukla1209@gmail.com](mailto:Poojasukla1209@gmail.com)

*Dr. Satinder Kumar, Assistant Professor*

[Kumarsatinder1981@gmail.com](mailto:Kumarsatinder1981@gmail.com)

*Department - school of management studies*

*Punjabi University, Patiala (Punjab)*

**Abstract:** The main purpose of this paper is to study the relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Employee's Job Attrition in IT and ITES Industry. In this way, there are many factors like as Absence of optimum Work Life Balance, Significant time lost due to commuting to and from home to office, higher work pressure, excessive work hours, stiff, time-bound deadlines, increasing materialistic aspirations, Over-demanding expectations and Bossy attitude of Superiors, spiritual values, lack of proper training, non-involvement in decision making that influence employee's job attrition in the organization. Therefore, job attrition plays a critical role in decrease the productivity level of organization.

**Keywords:** Motivation, Work Life Balance, Job Attrition, Job Satisfaction, Morale, Productivity.

### Introduction

Today's attrition is a normal and uncontrollable process that is playing a role in the reduction of a work force. There are many caused behind attrition such as: inadequate wage levels, salary issues, work shifts, joining a new company, best opportunity in another job related stress, lack of commitment towards the organization and job dissatisfaction, Sexual Abuse leading to employees moving to competitors, poor morale and low levels of motivation within the workforce, recruiting and selecting the wrong employees that reduce the staff members in an organization (Alao D. & Adeyemo A. B, 2013, Negi, 2013, Smikle et. al, 1996 & Mishra, 2007 ). Attrition means decrease the employees in the organization during employees retire or resign and are not replaced that is is negatively affecting an organization's productivity and performance (M. V. Nappinnai & N. Premavathy, 2013, Mehdi et. al, 2012). The employee attrition is a painful part of the management in Information Technology Enabled Services (ITeS) call centers. After all, like as providing attractive salaries, social security benefits, pick-up and drop facilities and swanky office spaces, still the ITeS call center's employees are leaving the organization (Pandey & Kour 2011).

### Types of job attrition

- 1.) **Control** – there are many reasons under control like as work stress, insufficient pay, lack of advancement, the company are possibilities, and lack of support or reward on the job.
- 2.) **Uncontrolled**- these issues included employee retirement, advancement to other parts of the organizations, promotions within the same group, illness, and changes in the employee's personal circumstances that is not possible for control by organization to employees leave the organization (Jain, 2013).

### **Work life Balance**

Work-family balance is maintained between work and family that is a lack of conflict or interference. Imbalance between work and life may be lead to high level stressor that has influenced the overall health and well-being of individuals (Frone, 2003). Work-life balance is defined as a state of equilibrium between the demands of both a work and personal life of individual that is included family-oriented and work/family supportive environment, nonworking outlets, and individualistic strategies (Kanwar et. al, 2009, Mazerolle & Goodman, 2013).

## **Review of Literature**

Suifan et. al, (2016), Malik et. al, (2010) proved that work life balance practices (manager support, job autonomy and schedule flexibility) has been helpful in positively affecting the turnover intention of the employee. Work life conflicts and higher stress that occurs from the management that is influenced the turnover intention. Better balance between work and life has responsible for employee job satisfaction that is decreasing the work pressures and turnover intentions of employee. Fayyazi and aslani, (2015) Investigated that work life balance has played mediating role between job satisfaction and employee turnover. Logical workload, manager support, teleworking and flexible schedules are important factors that helpful in managing their work and life. Allen (2001), Sengupta and Gupta (2014) indicated that less family-supportive experienced of employee increased work–family conflict, job dissatisfaction, turnover intentions, working condition, discrimination and lack of opportunities for growth in the organization.

FSOP (Family support organization) has also a significantly associated with work–family conflict, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. The supportive nature of supervisor who has sympathetic and support to the employee then work and personal life is possible. Noor and Maad (2008) showed that work life conflicts and stress have associated with employee turnover. There are so many practices, policies and strategies like as higher job satisfaction, flextime and work from office to home that is solved to conflicts regarding work life conflicts and employee turnover. (Mcnall et. al, 2015, Scandura & Lankau, 1997, Rajendra Singh & Khushbu Dubey, 2016). Beauregard & Henry, (2009) found that organizational performance, attitudes regarding job, social exchange processes, cost savings, productivity has enhanced and reduced turnover, work life conflicts through work-life balance practices. Banerjee & Guha, (2010) investigated causal factors such as getting better opportunity elsewhere and joined another company that influencing employee attrition and how to retain their operational employees in firms. Bennett et. al, (1993) examined that firm level variables such as firm characteristics, firm setting, firm demographics and benefit practices that influencing employee turnover in an organization. Boyar et. al, (2011) there are many reasons of turnover like as low financial obligation, lack of managerial support behind that encourage the employee to leaving their jobs. Family is another factor of employee attrition that also influences the employee attrition. Employee attrition has become a common problem in BPOs

sectors and employees faces many issues, challenges in BPOs sector so they leave the organization (Srivastava et. al, 2011). Yin Ho et. al (2010) showed push factors that are cause of attrition and pull factors strategy of employee's retention in the organization. Abdien (2019) highlighted that CS (communication satisfaction) has encouraged the employee to share views and information regarding their work between supervisor and employee that reduced the intention of leave organization. Alao & Adeyemo (2013) showed that employee Salary, Length of service and no any increment in their income that discouraged the employees that is predicting employee attrition in the institution. Planning intervention has positively influenced the learning performance that has reduced attrition and increased the learning performance rate of employee (Sitzmann and Johnson, 2012).

Losing knowledgeable, working environment, work life imbalance and poor training employees are the main cause to reducing the company's progress and performance in the market (Goswami & Jha, 2012). There are many motivational factors like as financial rewards, Psychological Factor, job characteristics, career development, recognition, supportive management, the job satisfaction of employee, Family friendly' practices ( parental leave, flexible scheduling and child) and work-life balance that reduce the employee turnover and increase the employee retention in the organization. These strategies are helpful in improving the employee job performance/productivity and reduce the work life conflicts and absenteeism (Aguenza & Som, 2012, Kim, 2012 and J. N. Scanlan et. al, 2013, Anafarta, 2011 and Saltzstein et. al, 2001, Earle 2003 ). Batt &Valcour, (2003) found that higher morale has ability to reduce stress, and control regarding their work and family life. Meaningfulness of the work or assessment of training needs have influenced by creative managers who has the ability to improve job satisfaction (Ertas, 2015 & Kim, 2012). Felstead et. al, (2002) WLB strategies adopted by employee to increase the profitability and productivity of the organization. The Employee has been doing their work at home that can be relevant and conceptually part of work-life balance, practices, policies and strategies. Finegold et. al, (2002) found that commitment for technical workers of all ages have strongly associated with satisfaction of ongoing skill development. Work-life balance, satisfaction and commitment have strongly associated with each other. Poor job satisfaction is responsible for the low morale and productivity. WLB has become an important part of higher job satisfaction (Kanwar et. al, 2009). Subhasree Kar & Misra (2013) showed that an organizational performance has affected by work life balance supportive culture. If the work life conflicts of employees can be controlled by an appropriate way, then it can help in the reduction the employee turnover.

### **Research Gap**

The literature review indicated that there is a number of studies regarding in which work life balance has been influenced employee's turnover/employee's retention in the organization. But as far as literature is concerned in the past studies, we are not able to find out the relationship between work life balance and employee's job attrition. Therefore, this objective is proposed to study the relationship between work life balance and employee job attrition because it has not been done earlier.

### **Research Methodology**

This study has been exploratory research and attempt has been made to fulfill the objective the relationship Between Work-Life Balance and Employee's Job Attrition in IT and ITES Industry with the help of a self-structured questionnaire. The sample size has been selected 200 from the employees of IT

and ITES i.e. Delhi NCR in India. However, this paper, we use the primary as well as secondary data has been used to achieve the objective of the study. For primary data collection, questionnaire has been prepared on a five point Likert scale and secondary data have been extracted from relevant offline and online research publications. The statistical tools have been used in this study like ANOVA, Mean and Percentage test the hypotheses with the help of Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS 20 VERSION).

The main research hypothesis of this study:

$H_0$  There is no significant difference among respondent's opinion (gender-wise, residence-wise, age-wise, education-wise, job-wise, family income-wise) with between work life balance and employee's job attrition.

## Data analysis and interpretation

**Table 1. To identify the relationship between Work-Life Balance and Job Attrition in IT and ITES Industry.**

| Sr. no. | Research statement   | Mean | S.D. |
|---------|--|------|------|
| 1       | Absence of optimum Work Life Balance in IT/ITES Industry is responsible for high job attrition                                   | 4.27 | 0.65 |
| 2       | Significant time lost due to commuting to and fro home to office leads to imbalance in optimum Work Life Balance among employees | 4.28 | 0.72 |
| 3       | A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better motivation of employees at a workplace                    | 4.03 | 0.70 |
| 4       | A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better job satisfaction of employees at a workplace              | 4.09 | 0.61 |
| 5       | A right balance between professional and personal life leads to lesser stress among employees at a workplace                     | 4.18 | 0.56 |
| 6       | A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better overall psychological health of employees at a workplace  | 4.27 | 0.71 |
| 7       | Companies with better Work Life Balance suffer less job attrition due to the increased morale and motivation of employees        | 4.29 | 0.62 |
| 8       | Optimum Work Life Balance among employees results in better job satisfaction leading to higher productivity of employees         | 4.35 | 0.63 |

**Table 1.1 Absence of optimum Work Life Balance in IT/ITES Industry is responsible for high job attrition**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | .796           | 3   | .265        | 1.075 | .361 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 48.359         | 196 | .247        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Residence           | Between Groups | 1.026          | 3   | .342        | 1.446 | .231 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 46.329         | 196 | .236        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 1.868          | 3   | .623        | 1.075 | .361 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 113.527        | 196 | .579        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |      |
| Education           | Between Groups | 1.441          | 3   | .480        | 2.277 | .081 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 41.354         | 196 | .211        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Type of Job         | Between Groups | .026           | 3   | .009        | .172  | .915 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 9.794          | 196 | .050        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 9.820          | 199 |             |       |      |
| Family Income       | Between Groups | .628           | 3   | .209        | .246  | .864 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 167.127        | 196 | .853        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 167.755        | 199 |             |       |      |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.1 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise, Age-wise, Education-wise, Job-wise and Income-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at 5 percent level of significant because p-values are greater than 0.05).

**Table 1.2 Significant time lost due to commuting to and fro home to office leads to imbalance in optimum Work Life Balance among employees**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | .940           | 4   | .235        | .950  | .436  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 48.215         | 195 | .247        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Residence           | Between Groups | .867           | 4   | .217        | .909  | .460  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 46.488         | 195 | .238        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 11.469         | 4   | 2.867       | 5.380 | .000* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 103.926        | 195 | .533        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |       |
| Education           | Between Groups | 3.138          | 4   | .784        | 3.857 | .005* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 39.657         | 195 | .203        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |       |

|               |                |         |     |      |       |      |
|---------------|----------------|---------|-----|------|-------|------|
| Type of Job   | Between Groups | .026    | 4   | .007 | .130  | .971 |
|               | Within Groups  | 9.794   | 195 | .050 |       |      |
|               | Total          | 9.820   | 199 |      |       |      |
| Family Income | Between Groups | 3.748   | 4   | .937 | 1.114 | .351 |
|               | Within Groups  | 164.007 | 195 | .841 |       |      |
|               | Total          | 167.755 | 199 |      |       |      |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.2 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise, Job-wise and Income-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05). But there is a significant difference in respondent opinion on the basis of Age and Education.

**Table 1.3 A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better motivation of employees at workplace**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | 4.081          | 3   | 1.360       | 5.916 | .001* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 45.074         | 196 | .230        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Residence           | Between Groups | 2.438          | 3   | .813        | 3.546 | .016* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 44.917         | 196 | .229        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 2.133          | 3   | .711        | 1.230 | .300  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 113.262        | 196 | .578        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |       |
| Education           | Between Groups | 4.129          | 3   | 1.376       | 6.977 | .000* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 38.666         | 196 | .197        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Type of Job         | Between Groups | .171           | 3   | .057        | 1.157 | .327  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 9.649          | 196 | .049        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 9.820          | 199 |             |       |       |
| Family Income       | Between Groups | 9.065          | 3   | 3.022       | 3.732 | .012* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 158.690        | 196 | .810        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 167.755        | 199 |             |       |       |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.3 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Job-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05). But there is a significant difference in respondent opinion on the basis of Gender, Residence, Education and Income. It may be on account of different life stage, aspirations, lifestyle and family responsibilities of employees.

**Table 1.4A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better job satisfaction of employees at workplace**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | 1.847          | 3   | .616        | 2.550 | .057 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 47.308         | 196 | .241        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Residence           | Between Groups | .645           | 3   | .215        | .902  | .441 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 46.710         | 196 | .238        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 2.651          | 3   | .884        | 1.536 | .206 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 112.744        | 196 | .575        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |      |
| Education           | Between Groups | .917           | 3   | .306        | 1.431 | .235 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 41.878         | 196 | .214        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Type of Job         | Between Groups | .178           | 3   | .059        | 1.204 | .309 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 9.642          | 196 | .049        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 9.820          | 199 |             |       |      |
| Family Income       | Between Groups | 5.085          | 3   | 1.695       | 2.042 | .109 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 162.670        | 196 | .830        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 167.755        | 199 |             |       |      |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.4 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise, Education-wise, Job-wise and Income-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significant because p-values are greater than 0.05).

**Table 1.5 A right balance between professional and personal life leads to lesser stress among employees a workplace**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | .808           | 2   | .404        | 1.647 | .195 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 48.347         | 197 | .245        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Residence           | Between Groups | .140           | 2   | .070        | .293  | .747 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 47.215         | 197 | .240        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |      |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 1.215          | 2   | .607        | 1.048 | .353 |
|                     | Within Groups  | 114.180        | 197 | .580        |       |      |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |      |
| Education           | Between Groups | .595           | 2   | .298        | 1.389 | .252 |



|               |                |         |     |      |       |      |
|---------------|----------------|---------|-----|------|-------|------|
|               | Within Groups  | 42.200  | 197 | .214 |       |      |
|               | Total          | 42.795  | 199 |      |       |      |
|               |                |         |     |      |       |      |
| Type of Job   | Between Groups | .143    | 2   | .072 | 1.458 | .235 |
|               | Within Groups  | 9.677   | 197 | .049 |       |      |
|               | Total          | 9.820   | 199 |      |       |      |
| Family Income | Between Groups | .919    | 2   | .460 | .543  | .582 |
|               | Within Groups  | 166.836 | 197 | .847 |       |      |
|               | Total          | 167.755 | 199 |      |       |      |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.5 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise, Age-wise, Education-wise, Job-wise and Income-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05).

**Table 1.6A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better overall psychological health of employees at workplace**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Gender              | Between Groups | 1.278          | 4   | .320        | 1.302 | .271  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 47.877         | 195 | .246        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Residence           | Between Groups | .534           | 4   | .133        | .556  | .695  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 46.821         | 195 | .240        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Age                 | Between Groups | 2.414          | 4   | .604        | 1.042 | .387  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 112.981        | 195 | .579        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |       |
| Education           | Between Groups | 2.864          | 4   | .716        | 3.497 | .009* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 39.931         | 195 | .205        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |       |
| Types of Job        | Between Groups | .076           | 4   | .019        | .380  | .822  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 9.744          | 195 | .050        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 9.820          | 199 |             |       |       |
| Family Income       | Between Groups | 1.532          | 4   | .383        | .449  | .773  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 166.223        | 195 | .852        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 167.755        | 199 |             |       |       |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.6 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise, Age-wise, Education-wise, and Income-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05). But there is a significant difference in respondent opinion on the basis of job.



**Table 1.7 Companies can improve Work Life Balance through better care of children and the elderly dependents of employees**

| Source of variation  |                | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Gender</b>        | Between Groups | 1.508          | 3   | .503        | 2.068 | .106  |
|                      | Within Groups  | 47.647         | 196 | .243        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Residence</b>     | Between Groups | 2.436          | 3   | .812        | 3.543 | .016* |
|                      | Within Groups  | 44.919         | 196 | .229        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Age</b>           | Between Groups | 8.566          | 3   | 2.855       | 5.239 | .002* |
|                      | Within Groups  | 106.829        | 196 | .545        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 115.395        | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Education</b>     | Between Groups | 1.890          | 3   | .630        | 3.018 | .031* |
|                      | Within Groups  | 40.905         | 196 | .209        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 42.795         | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Type of Job</b>   | Between Groups | .069           | 3   | .023        | .462  | .709  |
|                      | Within Groups  | 9.751          | 196 | .050        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 9.820          | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Family Income</b> | Between Groups | 7.325          | 3   | 2.442       | 2.983 | .032* |
|                      | Within Groups  | 160.430        | 196 | .819        |       |       |
|                      | Total          | 167.755        | 199 |             |       |       |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.7 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise and Job-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05). But there is a significant difference in respondent opinion on the basis of Residence, Education Age and Income. It may be on account of different life stage, aspirations, lifestyle and family responsibilities of employees..

**Table 1.8 Optimum Work Life Balance among employees results in better job satisfaction leading to higher productivity of employees**

| Source of variation |                | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| <b>Gender</b>       | Between Groups | .826           | 2   | .413        | 1.683 | .189  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 48.329         | 197 | .245        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 49.155         | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Residence</b>    | Between Groups | 1.063          | 2   | .532        | 2.262 | .107  |
|                     | Within Groups  | 46.292         | 197 | .235        |       |       |
|                     | Total          | 47.355         | 199 |             |       |       |
| <b>Age</b>          | Between Groups | 6.882          | 2   | 3.441       | 6.247 | .002* |
|                     | Within Groups  | 108.513        | 197 | .551        |       |       |

|                       |                |         |     |       |       |       |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|-------|
|                       | Total          | 115.395 | 199 |       |       |       |
| Education             | Between Groups | 1.330   | 2   | .665  | 3.158 | .045* |
|                       | Within Groups  | 41.465  | 197 | .210  |       |       |
|                       | Total          | 42.795  | 199 |       |       |       |
| Types of Job          | Between Groups | .095    | 2   | .047  | .957  | .386  |
|                       | Within Groups  | 9.725   | 197 | .049  |       |       |
|                       | Total          | 9.820   | 199 |       |       |       |
| Monthly Family Income | Between Groups | 7.285   | 2   | 3.642 | 4.472 | .013* |
|                       | Within Groups  | 160.470 | 197 | .815  |       |       |
|                       | Total          | 167.755 | 199 |       |       |       |

Source: Survey,

\*Significant at 0.05 level

**Interpretation:** Table 1.8 shows that there is no significant difference in respondent opinion (Gender-wise, Residence-wise and Job-wise) with respect to the above-mentioned hypothesis/research statement. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted (at the 5 percent level of significance because p-values are greater than 0.05). But there is a significant difference in respondent opinion on the basis of Age, Education and Income. It may be on account of different life stage, aspirations, lifestyle and family responsibilities of employees.

## Findings and conclusion

Absence of optimum Work Life Balance in IT/ITES Industry is responsible for high job attrition. When employees do not help work life balance they become to discontentment, lack of satisfaction and motivation which leads a declining in their productivity level ultimately leading to job attrition. Significant time lost due to commuting to and from home to office leads to imbalance in optimum Work Life Balance among employees. In big cities a lot of time gets wasted due to community long distances which fatigues employees over a period of time leading to a drop productivity level of employees. A right balance between professional and personal life leads to better motivation, better job satisfaction, better overall psychological health of employees at a workplace. It is because when the needs of professional life are adequately met employees feel a sense of contented motivation to do better for both professional and personal life leads to higher productivity level of employees. It is because when the needs of professional life are adequately met employees feel a sense of contented job satisfaction to do better for both professional and personal life leads to higher productivity level of employees. When employees are adequately satisfied and contented in their personal as well as professional life, it promotes a sense of well-being and a good psychological health of employees at a workplace. A right balance between professional and personal life leads to lesser stress among employees at the workplace. When employees are satisfied and contented then they feel lesser stress in both professional and personal life leads to higher productivity level of employees. Companies with better Work Life Balance suffer less job attrition due to the increased morale and motivation of employees. When employees have better Work Life Balance it improves their motivation and when motivation improves there is less job attrition because the morale of employees is adequately high and they don't have consent reason to switch jobs.

There are some solutions to short out the problem like as hardworking, disciplined, punctual and mentally alert executives and work life balance (Agarwal, 2015). Bhatnagar (2007) indicated that a good

level of engagement and talent management is helpful in increase employee retention in the ITES sector. Erickson & Roloff (2007) showed that turnover intentions and employee attrition is ultimately decreasing when organizational commitment increase. HR practices and HR policies are helpful in decreasing the job attrition in an organization (Agarwal & Mehta, 2014). A proactive retention strategy like intrinsic motivation and involvement factors are also helpful in reducing employee turnover and attrition.

## References

1. Agarwal, R. N. (2015). Stress, Job Satisfaction and Job Commitment Relation with Attrition with Special Reference to Indian IT Sector. *Proceedings of The 9th International Management Conference* (Pp. 720-731). Romania: Management and Innovation for Competitive Advantage.
2. Alao D. & Adeyemo A. B. (2013). Analyzing Employee Attrition using Decision Tree Algorithms. *Information Systems & Development Informatics*, 4(1), 17-28.
3. Ankita Srivastava, Yogesh Tiwari & Hradesh Kumar. (2011). Attrition and Retention Of Employees In BPO Sector. *IJCTA*, 2(6), 3056-3065.
4. Brijesh Kishore Goswami and Sushmita Jha. (2012). Attrition Issues and Retention Challenges of Employees. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 3(4), 1-6.
5. Collin B. Smikle, Deborah K. Spencer, Edna Fiedler, Kimberlee A. Sorem and Andrew J. Satin. (1996). The Impact of Sexual Abuse on Job Attrition in Military Recruits. *Military Medicine*, 161, 143-146.
6. Jessica Sze-Yin Ho, Alan G Downe and Siew-Phaik Loke. (2010). Employee Attrition in the Malaysian Service Industry: Push And Pull Factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9(1), 16-31.
7. Jyotsna Bhatnagar. (2007). Talent Management Strategy of Employee Engagement in Indian ITES Employees: Key to Retention. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 640-663.
8. M. V. Nappinnai & N. Premavathy. (2013). Employee Attrition and Retention in a Global Competitive Scenario. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 1(6), 11-14.
9. Mishra, P. S. (2007). Increasing Rate of attrition in BPO. *Management & Labour Studies*, 32(1), 7-21.
10. N. Pandey And G. Kaur. (2011). Factors Influencing Employee Attrition in Indian ITes Call Centres. *Indian Culture and Business Management*, 4(4), 419-435.
11. Nathan Bennett, Terry C. Blum, Rebecca G. Long and Paul M. Roman. (1993). A Firm-Level Analysis of Employee Attrition. *Group & Organization Management*, 18(4), 482-499.
12. Negi, G. (2013). Employee Attrition: Inevitable yet Manageable. *Journal of Research in Management & Technology*, 2, 50-59.
13. Richa N. Agarwal & Anil Mehta. (2014). Impact of Performance Appraisal and Working Environment on The Job Satisfaction and Attrition Problem in The Indian IT Industry. *Paradigm*, 18(1), 73-85.
14. Robin Adair Erickson & Michael E. Roloff. (2007). Analyzing the Effects of Organizational Support, Supervisor Support, and Gender on Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 15(1), 35-55.
15. Santoshi Sengupta and Aayushi Gupta. (2012). Exploring the Dimensions of Attrition in Indian Bpos. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), 1259-1288.
16. Scott L. Boyar, Reimara Valk, Carl P. Maertz Jr and Ranjan Sinha. (2012). Linking Turnover Reasons to Family Profiles for IT/BPO Employees in India. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 4(1), 6-23.

17. Sharmistha Banerjee & Sumana Guha. (2010). Employee Attrition in Engineering Firms: Case Study of DCIPS Pvt. Ltd, India. *International Conference On Industrial Engineering And Operations Management*, (Pp. 1-8). Dhaka.
18. BIBLIOGRAPHY Abdien, M. K. (2019). Impact of Communication Satisfaction and Work Life Balance on Employee Turnover Intention. *Journal of Tourism Theory and Research*, 5(2), 228 -238.
19. Alan Felstead, Nick Jewson, Annie Phizacklea and Sally Walters. (2002). *Human Resource Management Journal*, 12(1), 54-76.
20. Alan L. Saltzstein, Yuan Ting & Grace Hall Saltzstein. (2001). Work-Family Balance and Job Satisfaction: The Impact of Family-Friendly Policies on Attitudes of Federal Government Employees. *Public Administration Review*, 61(4), 452-467.
21. Allen, T. D. (2001). Family-Supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 414-435.
22. Anafarta, N. (2011). The Relationship Between Work-Family Conflict and Job Satisfaction: A Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Approach. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(4), 168-177.
23. Benjamin Balbuena Aguenza & Ahmad Puad Mat Som. (2012). Motivational Factors of Employee Retention and Engagement in Organizations. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 1(6), 88-95.
24. David Finegold, Susan Mohrman & Gretchen M. Spreitzer. (2002). Age Effects on The Predictors of Technical Workers' Commitment and Willingness to Turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 655-674.
25. Earle, H. A. (2003). Building a Workplace of Choice: Using the Work Environment to Attract and Retain Top Talent. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 2(3), 244 – 257.
26. Ertas, N. (2015). Turnover Intentions and Work Motivations of Millennial Employees in Federal Service. *Public Personnel Management* , 1-23.
27. Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-Family Balance. *American Psychological Association*, 143-162.
28. Horea Pitariu, Volodymyr Salamatov, Satoru Shima, Alejandra Suarez Simoni, Oi Ling Siu & Maria Widerszal-Bazyl . (2007). Cross-National Differences in Relationships of Work Demands, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intentions with Work-Family Conflict. *Personnel Psychology*, 805-835.
29. Jain, M. (2013). Employee Attrition-Causes and Remedies. *Journal of Social Welfare and Management*, 5(2), 69-73.
30. Justin Newton Scanlan, Pamela Meredith And Anne A. Poulsen. (2013). Enhancing Retention of Occupational Therapists Working in Mental Health: relationships Between Wellbeing at Work and Turnover Intention. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 395-403.
31. Kim, S. (2014). The Impact of Human Resource Management on State Government IT Employee Turnover Intentions . *Public Personnel Management*, 41(2), 257-279.
32. Laurel A. Mcnall, Aline D. Masuda & Jessica M. Nicklin. (2010). Flexible Work Arrangements, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intentions: The Mediating Role of Work-To-Family Enrichment . *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(1), 61-81.
33. Marjan Fayyazi & Farshad Aslani. (2015). The Impact of Work Life Balance on Employee' Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention: The Moderating Role of Continuance Commitment. *International Letters of Humanistic Social*, 51, 33-41.

34. Muhammad Imran Malik, Solomon Fernando Gomez, Mehboob Ahmad & Muhammad Iqbal Saif. (2010). Examining the Relationship of Work Life Balance, Job Satisfaction and Turnover in Pakistan. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 27-33.
35. Peterson, S. L. (2004). Toward a Theoretical Model of Employee Turnover: A Human Resource Development Perspective. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(3), 209-227.
36. Rajendra Singh & Khushbu Dubey. (2016). An Analytical Study on Work Life Balance in Employee Retention with Special Reference to IT And BPO Sectors. *Journal of Applied Management Science*, 2(8), 22-34.
37. Rosemary Batt and P. Monique Valcour. (2003). Human Resources Practices as Predictors of Work-Family Outcomes and Employee Turnover. *Industrial Relation*, 42(2), 189-220.
38. Saroj Noor & Nazia Maad. (2008). Examining the Relationship between Work Life Conflicts, Stress and Turnover Intention among Marketing Executives in Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(11), 93-102.
39. Stephanie M. Mazerolle and Ashley Goodman. (2013). Fulfillment of Work-Life Balance from the Organizational Perspective: A Case Study. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 48(5), 668-677.
40. Subhasree Kar & K. C. Misra. (2013). Nexus between Work Life Balance Practices and Employee Retention – The Mediating Effect of a Supportive Culture. *Asian Social Science*, 9(11), 62-69.
41. T. Alexandra Beauregard & Lesley C. Henry. (2009). Making the Link between Work-Life Balance Practices and Organizational Performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9-22.
42. Taghrid Suifan, Ayman Bahjat Abdallah & Hannah Diab. (2016). The Influence of Work Life Balance on Turnover Intention in Private Hospitals: The Mediating Role of Work Life Conflict. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(20), 126-139.
43. Terri A. Scandura & Melenie J. Lankau. (1997). Relationships of Gender, Family Responsibility and flexible Work Hours to Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 377-391.
44. Traci Sitzmann And Stefanie K. Johnson. (2012). The Best Laid Plans: Examining the Conditions under which a Planning Intervention Improves Learning and Reduces Attrition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 967-981.
45. Y. P. S. Kanwar, A. K. Singh And A. D. Kodwani. (2009). Work-Life Balance and Burnout as Predictors of Job Satisfaction in the IT-ITes Industry. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, 13(2), 1-13.