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 **Abstract**

Emotions are a necessary component of our biological composition. It has a huge impact on our daily work lives and affects our behavior. The definition of emotional intelligence encompasses how we perceive our emotions, recognize emotions in others, and maintain and treat relationships. Employee emotional intelligence is better understood in organizations, which contributes to improved individual and organizational success. Employee work-life balance is a difficult problem now a days. It piques researchers' interest in determining the degree of satisfactory involvement or fit between multiple positions in a person's life. Organizations must ensure that a realistic work and life balance strategy is not only encouraged, but also mandated, benefiting and meeting the needs of both the company and its workers. Organizations that do not have real opportunities for workers to achieve work-life balance risk increasing the number of unhappy and unproductive employees, as well as increased attrition rates. This research is a sincere attempt to close the gap, especially in the area of emotional intelligence, by emphasizing the importance of work-life balance in the organizations. This research will kick off a series of serious and fruitful conversations about employee work life balance and emotional intelligence. This research will penetrate further down and put efforts to find out the actual relationship of work life balance and emotional intelligence of individuals job satisfaction level, relationship satisfaction, job balance, mental health, physical health, spiritual health and overall well-being.

#

1. **Work-life Balance**

In the last five years, there has been a surge in interest in work-life balance (Milkie & Peltola, 1999). Researchers have looked at the build from a number of angles. As a result, there is no straightforward and concise concept of work-life balance, and despite the study, the work-life interface remains unclear (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000). To be reasonable, the construct itself makes defining work-life balance challenging. Any concept is focused on highly personal and increasingly individual opinions. Individuals' subjective value for the many roles they play when "working" is, for example, contingent on their life cycle (Aryee & Luk, 1996; Lewis & Cooper, 1987). It's only natural that the roles that people are supposed to play change, increase, or disappear as they pass through different life's stages, from childhood to old age. Furthermore, the importance or attention put on each of the roles played can shift as life conditions change.

The concept of work-life balance in academic research is often influenced by the researcher's theoretical and philosophical perspective, as well as the social and demographic landscape at the time the study is conducted (e.g., Johnson, 1991; Marks & MacDermid, 1996). A classification is also dependent on adequately identifying "job or work" and "life," and then how the researcher treats the relationship between these two dominant domains as segmented (mutually exclusive), compensating (related), or spill-over (co-dependent) (Sumer & Knight, 2001).

A concept of work-life balance must also be differentiated from other theoretical frameworks, such as work-family balance, for the purposes of this analysis. Work-family balance is described as a person's ability to balance the time commitments of starting a family and raising children while also maintaining and focusing on their career growth (Aryee & Luk, 1996).

As a result, the current research took a holistic and non-hierarchical approach to describing work-life balance (Mead, 1964, cited in Marks &MacDermid, 1996). Individuals organize an equally optimistic contribution to all of their traditional role results, resulting in the promotion of favorable outcomes for their well-being, according to this principle (Marks &MacDermid, 1996).

The ability of an individual to fully engage in balancing the expenditure of their time, energy, emotional resources, and whole being between their own needs, the needs of those with whom they live and love (independent of offspring responsibilities), and the needs of those who provide them income, with an attitude of attentiveness, was described as work-life balance in the current study (Fallon, 2001).

Indeed, Marks &MacDermid (1996) coined the word "role balance" to describe such a non-hierarchical and broad concept of work-life balance, suggesting that an individual's ability to achieve a balanced work-life state was attitudinal. They recommended that future work-life balance research be free of any role-specific or role-segmenting focus. Unfortunately, the reality of the current workplace and workers contradicts the use of a wider construct of work-life balance analysis, such as position balance. Individuals' ability to positively fulfill all of their job commitments is constantly questioned as they are required to work longer and more flexible hours. It is beyond the range of this research to determine, define, and measure the impact of all of the various roles that employees opted to pursue on.

1. **Job Satisfaction**

Work is one of the most basic aspects of life (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Sweeney &Witmer, 1991). Satisfaction with one's job is linked to both the task completed and the individual's feelings about the tasks performed at work (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). Most notably, recent research shows that job satisfaction is strongly influenced by one's feelings about their current jobs; whether they are happy doing the tasks assigned to them at work (Hofmann & Tetrick, 2003; Seligman, 2002).

Balzer et al. (1997) provided the definition of job satisfaction used in this research, which is as follows:

“…the feelings a worker has about his or her job or job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives” (Page 10)

The meaning of job satisfaction proposed by Balzer et al. (1997), is quite interesting given with regards to the current scenario of work. Past experience of job satisfaction and job role may at this point don't have any significant bearing because of the serious changes in working conditions, expanding work hours, fluctuating working plans and escalating job demands (Allen, O'Connell and Peetz, 1999; Guest, 2002). An absence of alternate options may likewise be the current reality for some individuals (Peetz, 1998). Progressively, a person's job satisfaction might be resolved not just by their apparent "control" over their present work conditions and their present work satisfaction yet in addition by their capacity to discover comfort outside of their present work setting (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992).

The current market scenario favors cost reduction and increased productivity performance (Hochschild, 1997). From the viewpoint of the organization, the modern worker's efficiency is critical. Many businesses have increased the number of employees who work under flexible job conditions, such as contracts

or flexible hours. Organizations rationalize this transition by claiming that increased job flexibility would result in improved work-life balance (Hill, Hawkins, Ferris & Weitzman, 2001). Over the last decade, part-time and casual work has risen by nearly 45 percent (Kramar, 1998).

Job satisfaction has been shown to have an effect on an individual's mental and physical health as well as overall life satisfaction (Balzer et al., 1997; Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Earnshaw, Amundson & Borgen, 1990; Kinnunen & Natti, 1994). The effects of work and workforce alienation, job attachment and job insecurity, depression, burnout, physical and mental exhaustion, personal and job morale, stress and tension, enthusiasm and job aspiration have all been studied in relation to job satisfaction (Ameen, Jackson, Pasewark & Strawser,1995; Davy, Kinicki& Scheck, 1997; Guest, 2002; Lim, 1996; Mauno & Kinnunen, 1999; Warr, 1990).

1. **Relationship Satisfaction**

The importance of social interaction to one's mental and physical wellbeing cannot be overstated.

According to study, people who participate in social events on a daily basis have a higher degree of satisfaction (Myers, Sweeney &Witmer, 2000; Okun, Stock, Haring & Witter, 1994). The most intense social partnerships are probably marriage and close loving relationships. A significant number of studies have shown that having a happy marriage has a positive impact on one's health and well-being (e.g., McCabe, Cummins & Romeo, 1996). Relationship satisfaction influences recorded levels of confidence and intimacy as well as the quality of contact between partners, and it is a predictor of marriage longevity (Fincham& Linfield 1997).

One of the most well-established areas of relationship assessment is relationship satisfaction (Hendrick,1988). According to recent research, a person's level of satisfaction with their current loving relationship has an effect on their health and well-being, vulnerability to sickness, depression, stress, excessive alcohol consumption, and sexual functioning (Berry & Worthington 2001). Burns, Sayers, and Moras (1994) discovered that there was a positive connection between health and relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction has an impact on one's health and well-being, and one's health has an impact on one's relationship satisfaction.

According to contradictory studies, the connection between relationship quality and happiness is becoming increasingly shaky, as the institution of marriage fades and is replaced by alternative types of co-operative partnerships (e.g., Cramer, 1993; Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; McCabe et al, 1996). Changing family and social systems, as well as increased pressure to establish and sustain social contact outside of the typical family context, could be impacting an individual's relationship's relative importance.

1. **Holistic Health**

The World Health Organization redefined health in 1948, calling for a more holistic approach to health and illness:

*“… a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” (*Preamble to the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 1948, p. 100)

Such a concept of health not only emphasizes the absence of illness (Wardwell, 1994), but also stresses the importance of focusing on the positive aspects of health and taking into account the multi-dimensionality of what constitutes good health, also known as well-being (Vella-Broderick & Allen 1995).

In psychology, the multi-dimensionality of physiological and psychological well-being is not new. Maslow's (1968) definition of self-actualization and Rogers' (1961) concept of a fully functioning individual are only two of the many perspectives presented (Ryff, 1989). Although other factors such as social, emotional, environmental, educational, governmental, family, and community factors can influence health status (Cohen, 1988; Corsini, 1984; Hancock, 1985; Myers et al., 2000; Simper, 1985; Szasz, 1970), the three dimensions of mind, body, and spirit are increasingly referred to as the most significant (Myers, Sweeney &Witmer, 2000; Vella-Brodrick &Allen 1995). According to Cassel (1988) and Anderson and Morgan (1994) research, a balance between all three of these dimensions is needed for positive well-being.

Holistic wellness is dependent on the person constantly seeking to cultivate their mind, body, and spirit, by constructive practices believed to improve well-being in these fields, for those who want more than just the absence of illness or disease (Vella-Broderick, 1995).

The desire to gain knowledge, use rational cognitive processes, and develop an appreciation for aesthetics (mental well-being); the achievement of efficient functioning of the body's physical components, such as the absence of nausea or vomiting, headaches, indigestion, insomnia, and body aches and pains (physical well-being); and the practice of religious or existential acts (physical well-being) (Vella-Broderick, 1995).

Such activities include a desire to increase knowledge, use rational cognitive processes and develop an appreciation for aesthetics (mental well-being); the attainment of efficient functioning of the body’s physical components, such as the absence of nausea or vomiting, headaches, indigestion, insomnia and body aches and pains (physical well-being); and the practice of religious or existential activities centered around the pursuit of life satisfaction and the alignment of the individual’s being to a divine or higher purpose (spiritual well-being) (Vella-Broderick,1995).

According to recent studies, emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being can only be accomplished if a person has achieved both relationship and job satisfaction, as well as some semblance of a positive work-life balance (Marks, Huston, Johnson &MacDermid, 200

**Various scale is being developed by different researchers which is been discussed in detail-**

1. **Job Role Overload Scale-**

Job role Overload was measured using a thirteen-item scale originally developed by Reilly (1982). Marks &MacDermid (1996) revised the scale and included eight items and built it to measure employee role overload. The scale has also been tweaked to concentrate solely on role overload caused by the participants' work. The answers on the scale are also limited in time by the question predicate "Taking into consideration the past twelve months only." Individual things on the scale include "I can't seem to catch up in my work" and "There are so many demands on my time in my job."

The scale consists of eight items that are rated on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (strongly agree). All of the items are added together to give a total score for the respondents' job role overload over the previous 12 months, with a higher score suggesting further job role overload. With a reliability coefficient (α) of 0.89, the authors say that the scale has strong reliability and internal consistency (Marks &MacDermid, 1996).

1. **Role Ease Scale**

Marks and MacDermid created a scale to determine position ease (1996). Role ease is described as any perceived ease in carrying out one's role performances. In this study, the scale was adjusted to represent a general population study sample. The scale's answers are also limited in time by the following question predicate: "How easy is it to..." in the last twelve months only. “Have some ‘quality time' with your friend(s), including phone calls” and “Maintain touch with your parents” are two of the scale's individual items.

The scale consists of total five items that are rated on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (strongly agree). All of the items are added together to give a total score for the respondents' role ease over the previous 12 months, with a higher score suggesting greater role ease. With a reliability coefficient of.73, the author reports that the scale has high reliability and internal consistency (Marks &MacDermid, 1996).

1. **Work-Life Balance Scale.**

Work life Balance was assessed using a scale developed by Hill et al. (2001) and used at International Business Machines to assess employee satisfaction as well as their ability to align job demands with personal and family commitments. On an internal International Business Machines sample group of n = 6,451 people, the scale has strong internal consistency (Hill Hawkins & Miller, 1996). The scale is made up of 5 elements that assess the respondent's ability to reconcile the demands of work with their personal and dual-earner lives. “How much do you feel exhausted when you get home from work because of work stresses and problems?” and “When I go on holiday, I am able to withdraw from work and enjoy myself.”

The first item on the scale is a 7-point response scale ranging from 1 (extremely successful) to 7 (extremely unsuccessful) (extremely unsuccessful). Item two is rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) (almost always). Both items one and two are scored in reverse. The Work-Life Balance Scale's final 3 items use a 5-point answer scale ranging from 1 (extremely difficult) to 5 (extremely easy) (very easy). All of the items are added together to create a work-life balance score, with a higher score indicating better work-life balance. With a reliability coefficient of 0.83, the author claims that the scale has good reliability and internal consistency (Hill et al., 1996).

1. **Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS)**

The Relationship Assessment Scale, created by Hendrick (1988), is a global measure of relationship satisfaction that has been found to be a strong predictor of whether couples will remain together or part ways. The scale, which originally had 7 items, was updated in this analysis to include 5 of the 7 items from the previous scale. “How much do you love your partner” and “How much you wish you hadn't gotten into the relationship” are two of the questions asked in this report. Each object was graded on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely). Negative items on the scale are inverted, and all items are added together for a cumulative score, with a higher score suggesting greater relationship satisfaction.

With a reliability coefficient of 0.86, the author says that the scale has high reliability and internal consistency (Hendrick, 1988).

1. **Role Balance Scale.**

Marks and MacDermid created a scale to assess role balance (1996). The scale examines the respondent's proclivity to become fully involved, alert, and mindful when performing each role in their total role framework. The scale assesses the respondents' enjoyment in various positions, their capacity to devote sufficient attention to a particular role, their commitment balance across roles, and their value distribution across roles. “Nowadays I seem to appreciate every aspect of my life equally well” and “I try to bring a lot of myself into everything I do” are two things on this scale.

With a reliability coefficient of 0.68, the authors say that the scale has strong reliability and internal consistency (Marks & MacDermid, 1996

1. **Subjective work-life balance value measure**

The questionnaire contained a two-point test of the subjective importance placed by the respondents on the balance of work and personal life. First of all: "What value do you put on your own needs for the balance between work and personal lives?" and secondly: "What value do you consider your spouse place on their need for a balance between work and personal life?"

Each item has been calculated using an 11-point rating scale between 0 (not valuable) and 10 (very valuable) and gives an indication that the individual places value on achieving work and life equilibrium for himself and whether the individual sees their partner giving value to work and life balance.

1. **Job Competence Scale.**

Job Competence level were assessed using a Warr scale (1990). The scale tests the psychological capabilities (or psychological health) of respondents to address experienced problems in the field-specific working environment. Articles in this scale tap into the capacity of the respondent to handle their current position rather than utter skill levels. The subjects covered here are "I can do my work really well" and "I have difficulty with my job." Six elements that are dealt with using a five-point range 1 (strictly disagree) to 5 are part of the work competency scale (strongly agree).

Three of the items on this scale are replaced with all items, which are then rounded up with a higher score that indicates greater job competence. The author states that the scale is accurate and internally compatible with reliability coefficient of 0.68 (Warr, 1990).

1. **Job Aspiration Scale.**

Job aspiration was measured on a Warr scale (1990). The scale tests the mental health of the respondents to ensure they are able to be involved in the domain-specific job role interested. Both items are, "I like doing new stuff in my work" and "I don't really care how things turnout in my job." The job aspiration scale comprises six items which are answered by a five-point measurement varying between 1 (very disagreeable) and 5 (strongly agree). Negative items total scores are taken in minus then total of the same are reverse scored.

Higher score shows higher job aspiration and registered. The author stated that the scale had a strong reliability and internal consistency of 0.62. (Warr, 1990).

While the reliabilities of job/work aspiration and employment aspiration scales are less than desired, they are still included because they contribute to perceptions of job satisfaction conceptually.

1. **Job Spill-over Scale.**

Job spill-over was measured using a scale developed by Warr (1990). The scale measures the respondents’ negative job spill-over only and as such is interested in the carry-over of job experiences into other activities and feelings experienced by the respondent. Items included within this scale are, “After I leave my work, I worry about job problems” and “My job makes me feel quite exhausted at the end of the workday”. The job spill-overscale consists of four items that are responded to using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Items on the scale are summed with a higher score indicating greater negative job spill-over.

The author claims strong reliability and internally consistent measurement with 0.78 reliability coefficient (Warr, 1990).

**XVI. Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and Job In General (JIG) Scale.**

The JDI and JIG scales were used for work and job satisfaction (Balzer et al., 1997). The JDI tests the current level of satisfaction of the respondents according to five aspects of the respondents' work

1. Work in present job,
2. Other co-workers,
3. Promotion opportunities,
4. Current Salary & Benefits
5. Job Supervision.

A 6th factor of individuals working, job satisfaction (commonly), is calculated by the JIG scale and was also used to calculate job satisfaction independently.

The respondents must think about each aspect of their current work separately and answer to each of the areas discussed in order to explain this facet of their work, "yes," "no," or "cannot decide." For instance, the words "Barely enough to survive," "Well paying," "less as I deserve" and "Insecure" are included in the present Pay's job facet.

The two work facets of Opportunities for Promotion and Present Pay include nine items with the remaining three work facets, and the Job in General scale, including eighteen items each. Half of the words and phrases are positively worded with all negatively worded items reverse scored. In accordance with the user manual for the JDI and JIG a 'yes' response to a positive item receives 3 points, a 'no' response receives 0 points and a 'cannot decide' response receives 1 point. Scores for each of the five facets and the Job In General scale are summed separately with scores obtained on the two work facets of Opportunities for Promotion and Present Pay doubled to provide equal comparison between all facets of the respondent’s work and job in general. Higher scores indicate greater work and job in general satisfaction. The authors claim good reliability and internal consistency for the report with reliability coefficients as follows as per (Balzeretal.,1997).

* Satisfaction with present work coefficients of 0.90
* Satisfaction with promotions coefficients of 0.87
* Satisfaction with supervision coefficients of 0.91
* Satisfaction with co-worker’s coefficients of 0.91
* Satisfaction with present pay coefficients of 0.86
* Satisfaction with job in general coefficients of 0.9

**XV. Mental, Physical and Spiritual Well-being Scale (MPS Scale)**

The MPS Scale is a 30-item instrument that incorporates mental, physical and spiritual subscales developed by Vella-Brodrick (1995). Each of the three subscales consists of 10items, each measuring positive aspects of the three facets of health as well as some appraisal of illness and sickness.

The mental subscale defines optimal mental functioning as a desire to increase knowledge, to develop an appreciation of aesthetics and to use rational cognitive processes. Like Do you "Watch Quiz shows," "Read novels" and "Think before you act," individual elements in this 10-point sub-Scale.

The physical subscale focuses on aspects of the respondents’ physical health, specifically objective and measurable health and illness. Individual items in this 10-item subscale include; "Over the past year, have you suffered from nausea and/or vomiting" and "Over the past year, have you gone on a diet to lose or gain weight".

The spiritual subscale explores two dimensions of spirituality, religious and existential. The former explores religious aspects of spirituality, namely the respondent’s relationship with a higher being, whilst the latter focuses onthe development of self, by focusing on issues relating to ethics, morality, self-actualization, self-worth, self-purpose and, peace with one's self. Individual subjects in this 10-item subscale include: 'Think about ethical or moral questions,' 'Do you talk about spiritual matters' (e.g., meaning of life, faith, inner peace, death, etc.)? And, "You are reaching out to a divine aid through tough times (e. g.: God or a superior being, church or worship spot, prayer, priest etc.).

Each of the 30 items is responded to using a five-point scale ranging from1 (never) to 5 (often). Negatively worded items are reverse-scored with all items summed to provide measures of mental, physical and spiritual well-being. A higher score on each of the subscales, as well as the overall health assessment, indicates greater level mental, physical, spiritual and overall well-being.

The author claims good reliability and internal consistency for the report with reliability coefficients as follows (Vella-Brodrick& Allen,1995).

* Mental well-being coefficient of 0.75
* Physical well-being coefficient of 0.81
* Spiritual well-being coefficient of 0.85

**XVI. Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.**

Social desirability was measured using a modified version of the short-version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Form C (Reynolds, 1982). The short-version consists of thirteen items answered in a true-false manner, with several of the items negatively worded. In the present study the instrument used a five-point scale ranging from 1 (true) to 5 (false). Negatively worded items are reverse scored and then all items were reverse scored and summed with a higher score on this scale is indicative of more socially desirable responses. The author claims good reliability and validity for the scale with a reliability coefficient of 0.76 (Reynolds, 1982). In spite of its small number of items, this reliability is well equated with the original 33-item scale (Reynolds, 1982).

**XVII. Data Analysis**

The mean, standard deviation, internal consistency reliabilities, all the theoretical ranges, (Cronbach’s α) or coefficient of alpha for all types of variables and sub-tests measures are presented in the table below

**Table 1. Means, standard deviations, internal consistency reliabilities (coefficient alpha), for the different measures**

| **Measure** |  **Mean**  **(*M*)** |  **SD** |  **Alpha Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Emotional Recognition/Expression | 35.83 | 5.25 | 0 .76 |
| Understanding others Emotions | 72.84 | 7.99 | 0.88 |
| Emotions Direct Cognition | 32.84 | 4.98 | 0.76 |
| Emotional Management | 38.99 | 5.51 | 0.77 |
| Emotional Control | 31.02 | 4.23 | 0.62 |
| Total Emotional Intelligence |  211.52 | 19.72 |  0.92 |
| Social Desirability | 36.48 | 5.67 | 0.61 |
| Relationship Satisfaction | 23.01 | 2.56 | 0.69 |
| Present work Satisfaction | 35.98 | 16.42 | 0.89 |
| Co-worker Satisfaction | 38.29 | 12.82 | 0.90 |
| Promotion Satisfaction | 28.98 | 15.93 | 0.86 |
| Pay Satisfaction | 27.98 | 7.93 | 0.79 |
| Supervisor Satisfaction | 37.02 | 11.97 | 0.76 |
| Job in general satisfaction | 37.02 | 13.95 | 0.89 |
| Job role overload | 31.67 | 13.92 | 0.92 |
| Role ease | 22.12 | 7.53 | 0.89 |
| Role balance | 32.40 | 6.38 | 0.62 |
| Work-life balance | 16.98 | 4.12 | 0.72 |

Table 1 continued

| **Measure** |  **Mean (*M*)** |  **SD** | **Alpha Coefficient** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Job competence | 22.96 | 3.65 | 0.65 |
| Job aspiration | 22.94 | 4.02 | 0.70 |
| Negative job spill-over | 11.78 | 4.02 | 0.86 |
| Mental well-being | 30.87 | 5.32 | 0.62 |
| Physical well-being | 32.45 | 7.30 | 0.74 |
| Spiritual well-being |  24.67 |  7.45 |  0.84 |
| Work-life balance value(self)\* |  8.47 |  1.78 | - |
| Work-life balance value(partner)\* |  8.14 |  1.92 | - |

The means, standard deviations and alpha coefficients were identical to the aforementioned. However, statistic translation into normality was found insufficient. Data seemed to be moderately negative.

Since the study was based on a large measurement, the participants did not suffer any discomfort answering.

No deviations in the data were observed when the scales were inspected and still produces sufficient internal consistencies towards the end of the questionnaire.

Results for the subjective combination of work and lives (self and partner) suggest that the balance of work and life is very significant (M = 8.47, SD = 1.78)

**Validating these section of the study’s three key independent variables**

**Job satisfaction.**

The correlation coefficients of Pearson between these variable and other working places measures were calculated in order to establish the suitability of using the variable, job in general satisfaction (JIG; Balzer et al., 1997).

The Pearson’s correlation coefficients for Job in General (JIG) and other measures of work are shown in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, Job in General (JIG) was not linked to social desirability and strongly associated with the Job Description Index subtests (Balzer et al., 1997).

The correlation with Pay satisfaction was not significant. The current wage level was, however, linked to Job In General (JIG) moderately. The aspiration for employment was significantly positive for Job In General (JIG), but not significantly associated with work expertise.

Job role overload and negative job spill-over were significantly negatively correlated with Job in General (JIG) whilst work-life balance was significantly positively correlated with Job in General (JIG).

**Table 2. Correlation coefficients between Job in General (JIG), other workplace measures and related demographic variables**

| **Measure** | **Job in General (JIG)** |
| --- | --- |
|  Job status (Full Time/Part Time) |  0.16 |
|  Average hours worked |  0.09 |
| Average hours worked un-paid |  0.21 |
| Salary level |  0.38\*\* |
| Education level |  0.08 |
| Work-life balance value (self) |  0.01 |
| Work-life balance value (partner) |  0.02 |
| Present work satisfaction |  0.89\*\*\* |
| Co-worker satisfaction |  0.74\*\*\* |
| Promotion satisfaction |  0.52\*\*\* |
| Pay satisfaction |  -0.04 |
| Supervisor satisfaction |  0.62\*\*\* |
| Job role overload |  -0.37\* |
| Work-life balance |  0.42\*\* |
| Job competence |  0.01 |
| Job aspiration |  0.54\*\*\* |
| Negative job spill-over |  -0.39\*\* |
| Social desirability |  -0.14 |

 Note : \**p* < 0.05, \*\**p* < 0.01,\*\*\* *p* < 0.001 *(two-tailed significance)*

These findings suggest that Job in General (JIG) is a condition influenced by an individual's internal and intra-personal resources, as well as the internal workings of one's workplace structure

To best estimate the degree to which the workplace indicators used in the analysis accounted for the main variable of job in general satisfaction, a number of simultaneous regressions were performed. The final regression is shown in Table 3.

Due to multicollinearity, Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) suggest excluding a variable with a correlation coefficient greater than r = 0.70 as a main variable in a regression equation. Due to their high degree of multicollinearity with the main variable of job in general satisfaction (r =0.87, p= 0.001 and r =0.72, p=0.001, respectively), all work on current job satisfaction and satisfaction with coworker were excluded from the regression equation.

**Table 3**

**Simultaneous regression analysis predicting JIG**

| **Predictor** |  **Beta**  **(β)** |  **T** |  **R R2 ΔR2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Job Aspiration |  0.36 |  3.28\*\* | 0.76 0.51 0.54  |
| Supervision Satisfaction |  0.42 |  3.87\*\*\* |  |
| Promotion Satisfaction |  0.23 |  2.01\* |  |
|  Note: \**p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\**p* < 0.001 |

The model was statistically important, accounting for 57.1 percent of the variance in job in general (JIG) satisfaction (F (3, 47) = 20.38, p 0.001). Each variable was a significant predictor, and thus contributed uniquely to the regression model's prediction of job in general satisfaction (JIG).

**Relationship Satisfaction**

The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick, 1988) was chosen as the main variable for measuring relationship satisfaction, and Pearson's correlation coefficients for this variable with other variables were determined. Table 4 shows the Pearson's correlation coefficients for RAS and other measures.

**Table 4 Correlation coefficients between relationship satisfaction (RAS), other measures and related demographic variables**

|  **Measure** | **Relationship satisfaction** |
| --- | --- |
| Average hours worked | 0.07 |
| Average hours worked un-paid | -0.04 |
| Relationship length | 0.28 |
| Work-life balance value(self) | 0.20 |
| Work-life balance value(partner) | 0.19 |
| Work-life balance | 0.27 |
| Role Ease | 0.46\*\*\* |
| Job role overload | -0.13 |
| Negative job spill-over | -0.31\* |
| Social desirability | -0.02 |

 Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\**p* < 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 (*two-tailed significance)*

Relationship satisfaction was not significantly associated with social desirability, as seen in Table 4. Relationship satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated with role ease and negatively correlated with negative job spillover.

**Role Balance**

To see whether using role balance (Marks &MacDermid, 1996) as a key variable for measuring work-life balance is acceptable, Work-life balance measures were used to calculate Pearson's correlation coefficients for this variable. Table 5 displays the Pearson's correlation coefficients for position alignment and other work-life balance indicators.

Role balance (Marks &MacDermid, 1996) is substantially positively associated with role ease and work-life balance, as shown in Table 5. Negative job spill-over is extremely significantly negatively correlated with role balance, and job role overload is moderately significantly negatively correlated with it.

Role balance is, unexpectedly, substantially positively associated with work status, meaning that role balance declines with full-time jobs. Role balance is moderately and substantially negatively associated with normal working hours, which supports this hypothesis. Work-to-life spillover increases as the amount of hours working increases, resulting in reduced personal time and work-to-life conflict (r =0.27, p 0.05).

**Table 5 Correlation coefficients between the key variable of role balance, other work-life balance measures and related demographic variables**

|  **Measure** | **Role Balance** |
| --- | --- |
| Average hours worked |  -0.30\* |
| Average hours worked un-paid |  -0.17 |
| Salary level |  -0.09 |
| Education level |  0.17 |
| Work-life balance value(self) |  0.16 |
| Work-life balance value(partner) |  0.13 |
| Role Ease |  0.60\*\*\* |
| Work-life balance |  0.52\*\*\* |
| Job role overload |  -0.32\* |
| Negative job spill-over |  -0.44\*\* |
| Social desirability |  -0.20 |

Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\**p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 *(two-tailed significance)*

To determine which of the work-life balance variables best accounted for the variance in scores for the main variable of role balance, a number of hierarchical regressions were performed. The final hierarchical regression is shown in Table 6.

The first variable in the regression equation was the measure of work-life balance, which is meant to predict an individual's overall work-life balance. The second variable in the regression equation was role ease, which was thought to mean how well the person managed his or her work-life balance.

**Table 6 Hierarchical regression analysis predicting role balance**

| Predictor | Beta (β) |  T |  R |  R2 |  Δ R2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Stage One |  |
| Work-life Balance | 0.52 | 4.15\*\*\* | 0.51 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Stage Two |  |
| Work-life Balance | 0.06 | 0.30 | 0.60 | 0.35 | 0.09 |
| Role Ease | 0.54 | 2.63\* |  |  |  |
| Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |

At Stage one, the hierarchical regression model accounted for 28% of the variance in role balance scores using the component of work-life balance (F (1, 49) = 17.21, p 0.001), and 34.8 percent of the variance in role balance scores once role ease was applied (F (2, 48) = 13.13, p 0.001). When predicting the variability in role balance ratings, the model shows that role ease, or how well one organizes one's life, mediates the impact of work-life balance.

Job satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and emotional intelligence are all variables that can be used to predict role balance.

The Pearson's correlation coefficients of the two main variables, work satisfaction (JIG; Balzer et al., 1997) and relationship satisfaction (RAS; Hendrick, 1988), as well as the five dimensions of emotional intelligence, total emotional intelligence, and social desirability, with the variable of position balance are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7 Correlation coefficients between Role Balance and its predictor variables, JIG, relationship satisfaction and the five dimensions of**

**emotional intelligence**

| Variables |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |  7 |  8 |  9 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | Role Balance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Job Satisfaction | 0.46\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Relationship Satisfaction | 0.28 | 0.36\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Emotional recognition/expression | 0.23 | 0.13 | 0.24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Understanding others emotions | -0.00 | 0.22 | 0.24 | 0.53 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Emotion’s direct cognition | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.50\*\*\* | 0.29 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Emotional Management | 0.33\* | 0.48\*\*\* | 0.32\* | 0.46\*\*\* | 0.57\*\*\* | 0.38\*\* |  |  |  |
| 8 | Emotional Control | 0.46\*\*\* | 0.40\*\* | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.23 | -0.07 | 0.56\*\*\* |  |  |
| 9 | Total Emotional Intelligence | 0.28 | 0.35\* | 0.31\* | 0.760\*\*\* | 0.82\*\*\* | 0.61\*\*\* | 0.84\*\*\* | 0.49\*\*\* |  |
| 10 | Social desirability | -0.18 | -0.13 | -0.03 | -0.00 | 0.05 | 0.18 | -0.17 | -0.45\*\*\* | -0.08 |

Note: \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001 *(two-tailed significance)*

Job satisfaction was significantly associated with role balance, but not with relationship satisfaction. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, was found to have a strong positive association with relationship satisfaction. Role balance was found to be strongly associated with two dimensions of emotional intelligence: emotions direct cognition and emotional control. This means that role balance is influenced by how a person feels about various roles when making decisions, and that role balance is also influenced by an individual's ability to handle and control emotional extremes.

Relationship satisfaction had a modest and substantial positive correlation with the emotional intelligence dimension of emotional management, while job satisfaction had a significant positive correlation with the emotional intelligence dimension of emotional management.

Table 7 reveals that, while the five dimensions of emotional intelligence are strongly associated with one another, there is no evidence of multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

The emotional intelligence component of emotional regulation was found to be significantly associated with social desirability. The negative relationship indicates that as an individual's understanding of their emotional range rises, as does their capacity to regulate the extremes of these emotions (e.g., intense anger), their propensity to react with socially acceptable responses to potential outbursts in the extremes of their emotions (e.g., "I never get very angry") decreases.

Relationship satisfaction, work satisfaction, and total emotional intelligence all played a role in predicting the variance in role balance ratings/scores, according to a hierarchical regression.

**Table 8 Hierarchical regression analysis predicting role balance using the variables relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction and total emotional intelligence**

| **Predictor** |  **Beta**  **(β)** |  **T** |  **R R2 *Δ* R2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage One** |
| Relationship satisfaction |  0.16 |  1.05 |  0.45 |  0.20 |  0.20 |
| Job satisfaction |  0.39 |  2.71\*\* |
| **Stage Two** |
| Relationship satisfaction |  0.13 |  0.86 |  0.46 |  0.21 |  0.01 |
| Job satisfaction |  0.35 |  2.37\* |
| Total emotional intelligence |   0.13 |  0.83 |
|  Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 20% of the variance in role balance scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 5.91, *p* < 0.01) and 21% of the variance in role balance scores when total emotional intelligence was added (*F* (3,46) = 4.15, *p*<0.05).

In the regression equation, only work satisfaction was a significant predictor of role balance.

Following that, using the five dimensions of emotional intelligence, a series of regression tests were conducted to see which elements of emotional intelligence could be used to predict the variability in role balance scores. The hierarchical regression with the highest predictive power is shown in Table 9.

**Table 9 Hierarchical regression predicting role balance using the variables relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction and emotional intelligence dimensions**

| **Predictor** |  **Beta (β)** |  **T** | **R R2 *Δ* R2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Step One** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.16 |  1.03 |  0.45 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.38 |  2.71\*\* |
| **Step Two** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.19 |  1.34 |  0.61 |  0.37 |  0.17 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.28 |  1.92 |
| Emotional recognition/expression | 0.25 |  1.69 |
| Understanding others emotions | -0.32 | -2.14\* |
| Emotional control | 0.36 | 2.66\* |

 Note: \**p* <0.05, \*\**p* <0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 20.1% of the variance in the role balance scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 5.91, *p* < 0.01) and 37.3% of the variance in role balance scores once the dimensions of emotional intelligence, emotional recognition or expression and understanding of others emotions and emotional control were added (*F* (5, 44) = 5.23, *p* < 0.001).

The emotional intelligence dimension of emotional control, as well as the dimension of knowing others' emotions, were also important at Step 2. The last statistic is intriguing because it suggests that lowering the emotional intelligence in terms of understanding others' emotions enhances role balance. In predicting the variation in role balance scores, the emotional intelligence aspects of emotional control and knowing others' emotions tend to mediate the impact of work satisfaction.

Predicting the role relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, emotional intelligence and role balance has on mental, physical and spiritual well-being The Pearson’s correlations between the three dependent variables mental, physical and spiritual well-being and pertinent demographic variables are shown in Table10.

As shown in Table 10 relationship satisfaction is highly positively correlated with physical well-being but not with mental or spiritual well-being. Satisfaction with job in general is positively correlated with mental well-being and moderately positively correlated with physical well-being but not spiritual well-being.

**Table 10 Correlations between dependent and independent measures**

| **Measure** | **Mental well- being** | **Physical Well-being** | **Spiritual well-being** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender (1= Male, 2 =Female) | 0.22 | -0.29 | 0.15 |
| Average hours worked | -0.19 | -0.20 | -0.11 |
| Average hours worked un-paid | 0.03 | -0.23 | 0.02 |
| Salary | 0.07 | -0.10 | -0.11 |
| Education | 0.05 | -0.06 | 0.13 |
| Relationship status | 0.04 | -0.06 | 0.06 |
| Relationship length | 0.15 | 0.22 | -0.10 |
| Emotional Recognition/expression | 0.17 | 0.28 | 0.19 |
| Understanding others emotions | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.25 |
| Emotions direct cognition | -0.05 | 0.18 | 0.19 |
| Emotional management | 0.37\* | 0.18 | 0.26 |
| Emotional control | 0.47\*\* | 0.20 | 0.42\*\* |
| Total Emotional Intelligence | 0.34\* | 0.33\* | 0.36\* |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.17 | 0.47\*\* | 0.12 |
| Present work satisfaction | 0.35\* |  0.15 | 0.10 |
| Co-worker satisfaction | 0.39\* | 0.20 | 0.15 |
| Promotion satisfaction | 0.09 | -0.07 | -0.21 |
| Pay satisfaction | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.02 |
| Supervisor satisfaction | 0.31 | 0.25 | -0.10 |
| Job in general satisfaction | 0.45\*\* | 0.32\* | 0.21 |
| Job role overload | -0.29 | -0.54\*\*\* | -0.25 |
| Role Ease | 0.40\*\* | 0.62\*\*\* | 0.28 |
| Role Balance | 0.51\*\*\* | 0.35\* | 0.21 |
| Work-life balance | 0.41\*\* | 0.56\*\*\* | 0.19 |
| Job competence | 0.31\* | 0.44\*\* | 0.41\*\* |
| Job aspiration | 0.23\* | 0.16 | -0.05 |
| Negative jobs pill-over | -0.43\*\* | -0.58\*\*\* | -0.33\* |
| Mental well-being | - | 0.19 |  0.48\*\*\* |
| Physical well-being | 0.19 | - | 0.26 |
| Spiritual well-being | 0.48\*\*\* | 0.26 | - |
| Social desirability | -0.19 | -0.25 | 0.07 |

Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\**p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 *(two-tailed significanc*

The measures of work-life balance and role balance; job role overload, role ease, role balance, work-life balance and negative job spill-over, are correlated or linked to physical well-being, with the exception of job role overload, which is linked to mental well-being.

Role ease, role balance and work-life balance are all significantly positively correlated with mental well-being and physical well-being. Job role overload and negative job spill-over are significantly negatively correlated with both mental well-being and physical well-being but not with spiritual well-being. Only negative job spill-over is significantly negatively correlated with spiritual well-being.

Total emotional intelligence is significantly positively correlated with mental, physical and spiritual-well-being as shown in Table 10. The sub-dimensions of, emotional management and emotional control seem to account for this significance with both emotional management and emotional control significantly positively correlated with mental well-being and emotional control significantly positively correlated with spiritual well-being.

It is quite surprising to see that Job competence, a measure of one’s psychological resources (or mental health) for dealing or coping with experienced difficulties in one’s current job, is significantly positively correlated with mental, physical and spiritual well-being, suggesting that enhancing holistic well-being may only be possible once one is coping in the important domain of work.

A number of hierarchical regression analyses were performed to determine the degree of predictability the key variables, relationship satisfaction, job satisfaction, emotional intelligence, including the five dimensions of emotional intelligence, and role balance had in predicting the variability of mental, physical and spiritual well-being scores.

**Mental well-being.**

Hierarchical regression was conducted to predict mental well-being in to three different phases.

Phase 1 - Job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction

Phase 2 - Job satisfaction and total emotional intelligence at and

Phase 3 - Job satisfaction and role balance

The results of this regression are in Table 11.

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 20.2% of the variance in mental well-being scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 5.95, *p* < 0.01), with job satisfaction found to be a statistically significant predictor of mental well-being at phase one.

**Table 11. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting mental well-being**

| **Predictor** | **Beta (β)** |  **T** |  **R** |  **R2** |  **ΔR2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage - One** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.08 | 0.60 | 0.45 | 0.20 |  0.20 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.40 | 2.95\*\* |
| **Stage - Two** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.04 | 0.32 | 0.48 | 0.23 |  0.03 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.35 | 2.50\* |
| Total emotional intelligence | 0.18 | 1.34 |
| **Stage – Three** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.55 | 0.30 | 0.07 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.25 | 1.75 |
| Total emotional intelligence | 0.15 | 1.12 |
| Role balance | 0.29 | 2.11\* |
| Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |

A further 3% of the variability in mental well-being was significantly predicted while performing the stage two. After the inclusion of total emotional intelligence into the regression equation (*F* (3, 46) = 4.64, *p* < 0.01), with job satisfaction remaining as the only significant predictor of mental well-being. Role balance was incorporated in the regression model at the stage three and accounted for a further 7% of the variance in mental well-being scores (*F* (4, 45) = 4.87, *p* < 0.01).

However, the results indicate that at stage three role balance mediates the effects of job satisfaction in accounting for the variance in mental well-being scores.

In addition, a number of hierarchical regression analyses were performed to determine the predictability of five dimensions of total emotional intelligence had in determining the variability of mental well-being scores. As a result, only, regression analysis with the greatest predictability was reported.

A three-stage hierarchical regression was conducted to predict mental well-being.

Job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction at the first stage, the emotional intelligence dimension of emotional control at the second stage and role balance at the third stage. The results of this regression are in Table 12.

**Table 12. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting mental well-being**

| **Predictor** |  **Beta (β)** |  **T** |  **R** |  **R2** |  **Δ R2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage - One** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.08 | 0.60 |  0.45 |  0.20 |  0.20 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.40 | 2.95\*\* |
| **Stage – Two** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.11 | 0.86 |  0.54 |  0.30 |  0.09 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.26 | 1.86 |
| Emotional control | 0.32 | 2.46\* |
| **Stage –Three** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.07 | 0.56 |  0.58 |  0.33 |  0.04 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.21 | 1.48 |
| Emotional control | 0.25 | 1.79 |
| Role balance | 0.22 | 1.53 |
|   Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 20.2% of the variance in mental well-being scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 5.95, *p* < 0.01), with job satisfaction found to be a statistically significant predictor of mental well-being at

**Stage One** - 9.3% of the variability in mental well-being was predicted at this phase.

**Stage Two** – After the inclusion of emotional control into the regression equation (*F* (3, 46) = 6.42, *p* <0.001), with job satisfaction no longer a significant predictor of mental well-being.

The results generated at Phase two indicate that the emotional intelligence dimension of emotional control mediates the effect of job satisfaction on mental well-being.

**Stage Three** – The role balance was entered into the regression model and accounted for a further 3.5% of the variance in mental well-being scores (*F* (4,45) = 5.56, *p* < 0.001).

The results indicate that at stage three neither emotional control nor role balance uniquely and independently account for the variance in mental well-being scores.

**Physical well-being.**

A three-stage hierarchical regression was conducted on the dependent variable of physical well-being.

**Stage One** - Job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction

**Stage Two** - Job Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction and Total Emotional Intelligence

**Stage Three** - Job Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, Total Emotional Intelligence and Role Balance

The results of this regression are in Table 13.

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 19% of the variance in physical well-being scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 5.50, *p* < 0.01).

Relationship satisfaction found to be a statistically significant predictor of mental well-being at Stage One. The addition of total emotional intelligence or role balance at Stage two and Stage three respectively added significantly to the prediction of physical well-being.

A number of additional hierarchical regression studies were carried out to see how well the five dimensions of total emotional intelligence predicted the variability of physical well-being scores. None added to the predictability of physical well-being.

**Table 13. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting physical well-being**

| **Predictor** | **Beta** **(β)** |  **T** |  **R** | **R2** | **Δ R2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage–One** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.36 | 2.61\* | 0.44 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.13 | 0.98 |
| **Stage–Two** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.35 | 2.46\* | 0.44 | 0.19 | 0.00 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.11 | 0.83 |
| Total emotional intelligence | 0.04 | 0.35 |
| **Stage–Three** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction | 0.34 | 2.39\* | 0.44 |  0.19 | 0.00 |
| Job satisfaction | 0.11 | 0.72 |
| Total emotional intelligence | 0.04 | 0.32 |
| Role balance | 0.02 | 0.17 |
|  Note: \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |
|  |

**Spiritual well-being.**

Hierarchical regression was conducted on the dependent variable of spiritual well-being in three categories.

**Stage One**

Job Satisfaction and Relationship Satisfaction

**Stage Two**

Job satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction and Total Emotional Intelligence

**Stage Three**

Job satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction, Total Emotional Intelligence and Role balance.

The results of this regression are in Table 14.

The hierarchical regression model accounted for 5.2% of the variance in spiritual well-being scores using the variables of relationship satisfaction and job satisfaction (*F* (2, 47) = 1.28, *p* > 0.05).

At stage one neither job satisfaction nor relationship satisfaction found to be a statistically significant predictor of spiritual well-being.

A further 8.8% of the variability in spiritual well-being was predicted after the total emotional intelligence was incorporated into the regression equation (*F* (3, 46) = 2.49, *p* > 0.05) at stage two. At stage two we found that the Emotional intelligence was a significant predictor of spiritual well-being.

Role balance was included at stage three into the regression model and it did not indicated any additional variance in physical well-being scores.

A number of additional hierarchical regression analyses were also performed to determine the predictability of the five dimensions of total emotional intelligence had in determining the variability of spiritual well-being scores. Only Emotional control was discovered to be a significant indicator, acting similarly to total emotional intelligence as reported earlier.

**Table 14. Hierarchical regression analysis predicting spiritual well-being**

| **Predictor** | **Beta (β)** | **T** | **R** | **R2** |  **Δ R2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage One** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relationship satisfaction |  0.02 | 0.08 | 0.23 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Job satisfaction |  0.23 | 1.48 |
| **Stage Two** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction |  -0.07 |  -0.38 |  0.37 | 0.14 |  0.09 |
| Job satisfaction |  0.14 |  0.89 |
| Total emotional intelligence |  0.33 |  2.18\* |
| **Stage Three** |  |
| Relationship satisfaction |  -0.08 | -0.44 | 0.38 |  0.15 |  0.01 |
| Job satisfaction |  0.11 | 0.65 |
| Total emotional intelligence |  0.32 | 2.08\* |
| Role balance |  0.10 |  0.58 |
| **Note:** \**p*< 0.05, \*\* *p*< 0.01, \*\*\**p*<0.001 |

**XVIII. Findings**

It was important to investigate the person's role structure, including the many and varied predictors that have the potential to influence a total system, in order to learn what was going on with the study's sample demographic. The problem of insufficient sample size is common in studies of role balance and work-life balance, and it is one that must be addressed (Marks, Huston, Johnson &MacDermid, 2001). Because of the broad ratio of variables to sample size, caution should be exercised when interpreting the results presented in this report.

The current thesis had three main objectives.

1. First, consider what constitutes work-life balance and what factors influence one's level of work-life balance;
2. Second, how can one enhance their understanding of the factors that influence one's work-life balance?
3. Third, what effect does one's perceived work-life balance have on one's overall well-being?

In this analysis, a strong association between relationship satisfaction and work satisfaction was discovered, confirming the study's first hypothesis.

As a consequence, there seems to be a spillover relationship between the two roles of relationship and job. This result is not unexpected, and it backs up previous studies (e.g., Allen, Herts, Bruck& Sutton, 2000; Barnett, 1994; Grzywacz& Marks, 2000; Judge, Watanabe, 1994; Kinnunen et al., 2002).

In contrast to Marks and MacDermid's (1996) initial hypotheses, which predicted a non-hierarchical architecture for role balance, their data indicated that during periods of greater role overload, work-life balance becomes a hierarchical distribution of role performances. More critical tasks are given a higher subjective weighting to help the person decide how to best distribute their limited internal resources (Aryee & Luk, 1996). In the absence of children in the relationship, the current study was interested in how employees managed the two main roles of marriage and work. The current study's findings are intriguing because they show how the study's sample population weights the partnership and job roles. While job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction were both significantly positively correlated, only job satisfaction was significantly correlated with position balance, the study's primary work-life balance indicator. Job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction accounted for 20.2 percent of the variance in position balance in the resulting hierarchical regression predicting work-life balance, with only job satisfaction being a relevant predictor of work-life balance.

This finding shows that relationship satisfaction has no impact on one's perception of work-life balance, but it does highlight the value of job satisfaction in achieving work-life balance. This result suggests that job satisfaction and maintaining a high level of happiness at work are given more weight, possibly at the expense of relationship satisfaction.

This finding contradicts recent research by Milkie & Peltola (1999), which found that marital satisfaction was a major predictor of both partners' work-life satisfaction.

This has serious implications for one's relationship. If the demands of one's job increase, such as work intensity or working hours, one can be tempted (or forced)

to devote more internal and time resources to ensuring job satisfaction. The employee can continue to re-allocate internal and time resources to work as a result of the higher position performance weighting for job and job satisfaction, to the point where negative job spillover becomes a problem for the individual. There is very likely to be a negative effect on relationship satisfaction at this stage.

Relationship satisfaction and its effect on work-life balance, according to research, is becoming

increasingly shaky as the modern family's makeup changes. In a study of work-family conflict for middle-aged families with children, Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) found that work-to-family spillover had no effect on marital satisfaction.

However, Kinnunen et al. (2002) found conflicting findings with a similar sample population to Netemeyer et al.; marital satisfaction was substantially and negatively affected by increased work-to-family spillover.

In short, one's ability to retain job satisfaction is the most important factor in achieving work-life balance. The current study's findings suggest that this can be facilitated by reducing the volatility of workplace demands (e.g., reducing the amount of work required), developing appropriate supervisor and coworker relationships, maintaining interest and motivation in one's current work, and, to a lesser extent, ensuring pay equity between one's pay and the perceived value of work completed (refer Table 2 & Table 3). Additionally, the ease with which one can handle or deal with job demands aids in maintaining one's work-life balance. Evidently, it appears that role ease is more a function of how well a person organizes their role performances than what or how much they actually do (Marks &MacDermid, 1996).

The current research was also interested in how individuals can enhance their work-life balance experiences, specifically their experiences with the two main positions investigated in the study, job satisfaction and relationship satisfaction. Marks and Macdermid (1996) suggested that future research into role balance concentrate on the construct from a personal perspective rather than the moral or systemic perspective, based on Johnson's (1991) phenomenological analysis of personal, moral, and structural engagement within social structures.

Work-life balance is more sustainable through shifting one's attitude toward one's own work-life balance from a "have to" and "ought to" attitude to a "want to" attitude, rather than trying to reallocate one's time more equitably amongst different position performances. To put it another way, achieving work-life balance entails altering one's perception of one's own work-life balance.

The current study was inspired by this suggestion, and emotional intelligence was chosen as the subject of investigation because previous studies had shown that emotions have an impact on how people view situations (Chan &Margolin, 1994; Seligman, 2000; Spector & Goh, 2001). Emotions, in other words, have an effect on one's subjective and situational attitude.

Emotional intelligence was supposed to predict position balance beyond what work satisfaction and relationship satisfaction already predicted. This theory was shown to be right. Total emotional intelligence was not a major predictor of role balance, but two dimensions of total emotional intelligence, knowing others' emotions and emotional regulation, did mediate the influence of job satisfaction on role balance prediction.

Understanding others' emotions was found to be a negative predictor of role balance, implying, perhaps counterintuitively, that in order to improve role balance, one must reduce one's emotional intelligence in this region. When Ciarrochi, Deane, and Anderson (2002) investigated the importance of emotional intelligence in stress management, they found a similar result.

Emotional control, or the ability to control the extremes of one's emotions, was also found to be a major predictor of role balance. This is an unsurprising finding, implying that coping capacity, rather than whether or how much is actually done, determines work-life balance (Marks &MacDermid, 1996).

The ability to effectively regulate and monitor emotions and respond in a personally positive and productive manner determines one's ability to encourage good coping and avoid unhelpful rumination, fear, or stress (Ciarrochi et al., 2002; Salovey, Bedell, Detweiler& Mayer, 1999). Instead of seeing the situation as overwhelming, exhausting, or beyond their resources as the stresses of work-life disparity mount, an individual's cognitive or behavioral attempts to regulate or handle the situation are affected by their emotional control (Gardner & Stough, 2003; Kinnunen et al., 2003; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

There is a need for further research into the importance of emotional intelligence in achieving a healthy work-life balance. The current research's results are promising, but further research is needed to confirm them.

This study looked at the effects of effective and ineffective role balance on one's holistic health, specifically one's emotional, physical, and spiritual well-being.

The desire for challenge, to gain information, and to increase the sophistication of one's cognitive processes can be compared to mental well-being. The acquisition of the peak state of flow and the growth of self (or "maximal self"; Seligman, 2000) is a process of increasing one's complexity through continuous differentiation and integration (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). The ability to achieve flow is dependent on mental well-being. During periods of coping or survival, an individual's mental well-being is unavailable (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Seligman, 2000).

Previous studies have looked at the impact of low work satisfaction on mental wellbeing (e.g., Myers et al., 2000; Seligman, 2000; Witmer, Rich, Barcikowski, &Mague, 1983) as well as negative emotionality, anxiety, poor coping, and stress symptomology (e.g., Myers et al., 2000; Seligman, 2000; Witmer, Rich, Barcikowski, &Mague, 1983). (Compton et al., 1996; Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). Important causal associations between mental ill-health and the aforementioned factors were discovered in previous studies. Greater job satisfaction, work-life balance, and emotional regulation are all linked to improved mental health, according to the findings of this report.

It was suggested that the experience of work-life balance would also have an effect on one's physical well-being. As a result, it was projected that work satisfaction and relationship satisfaction would have a direct impact on physical well-being. Relationship and work satisfaction were found to account for 19 percent of the variance in physical well-being in the current study, with relationship satisfaction being the most important indicator. Emotional intelligence, surprisingly, did not seem to be a major indicator of physical well-being. Gardner and Stough (2003) explain the disparity by claiming that, while there is research on emotions and physical health, there is no supported and corroborated or substantiated research on emotional intelligence and, specifically, physical health.

The current study's non-significant relationship between emotional intelligence and physical well-being may also be an artifact of the emotional intelligence measure used. Since the SUIET was designed primarily as a workplace indicator of emotional intelligence (Palmer &Stough, 2001), it does not properly account for non-work aspects of an individual's emotional behavior. This may also explain why there was no statistically significant connection between relationship satisfaction and each of the five dimensions of emotional intelligence in the current study.

Spirituality has been described as the perception of a being or force that exists outside of the physical realm (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Myers et al., 2000). The pursuit of spiritual well-being includes elements of existentialism, religiosity and life intention, morality and ethics, self-awareness, and self-actualization (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992; Vella-Brodrick, 1995). Spirituality has been described as a central characteristic of healthy people (Seaward, 1995), with spiritual well-being serving as the root of all other forms of well-being (Chandler, Holden, & Kolander, 1992), especially mental and physical well-being (Westgate, 1996). (Larson & Larson, 1991).

It was suggested that the experience of work-life balance will have an effect on spiritual well-being. It was predicted that work satisfaction and relationship satisfaction would have a huge impact on spiritual well-being. Spiritual well-being, on the other hand, was incorrectly expected in the current research. Relationship satisfaction and work satisfaction did not predict spiritual well-being, implying that spiritual well-being is formed independently of social or loving relationships.

In this research, emotional intelligence was found to be a strong predictor of spiritual well-being. Beyond partnership and work satisfaction, total emotional intelligence accounted for 8.8% of the difference in spiritual well-being ratings. Emotional regulation was found to be an important predictive dimension of emotional intelligence in subsequent regression studies. According to Maslow (1954, cited in Papalia & Wendkos-Olds, 1992), self-actualization is only possible if one recognizes the diversity of emotional reactivity.

Recent research into spirituality and emotional education in children has shown that feelings, not cognition, are responsible for bringing moral and spiritual awareness to children (Scheindlin, 2003). According to the same study, educators should encourage deep emotional involvement, the perception of emotional strength, and the targeting of emotional expression as a prelude to developing relational consciousness and spiritual awakening. The current study backs up previous results, claiming that emotional intelligence, as well as the experience and comprehension of all emotions, contribute to spiritual well-being. More research into the main determinants of spiritual well-being is needed. Emotional intelligence, on the other hand, tends to be a factor that merits consideration.
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