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The present study makes an attempt to compare the Work-life Balance of women employees in Indian Public and Private sector organizations. This study has been conducted on 29 different service sector organizations in India, by using the primary data collected from 320 respondents based on own developed questionnaire consisting of 15 questions based on facilitators of Work-life Balance. The findings are based on analysis of the data through Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA.

Introduction:
Organizations across sectors are undergoing rapid changes because of increased market demand and the growing expectations of the stakeholders. Effective management of these changes are a necessity today in order to stay afloat. Several factors such as employee engagement, work culture and leadership are found to be the influencing factors in determining the effectiveness of management of these changes. Work-life Balance (WLB) has become an added dimension and a critical factor in the management of changes.

Many research studies also indicate that the millennial generation entering today’s workforce have a preference for organizations that support Work-life Balance. They are reluctant to sacrifice their personal lives for enormous work demands and are more likely to leave jobs with poor Work-life Balance. They are more willing to do the jobs that are rewarding, have flexible environment and that create a well-built personal life outside work.

“Work-life Balance is a continuous stylish designing of an employee’s life with achievement and enjoyment along with organizational changes”. Thus, Work-life Balance is an individual responsibility of proper designing of a time frame boundary between one’s work and personal life.

Work-life Balance is now a vital driver of career success and job choices for both men and women, and therefore it is an important consideration for organizations. Working hours, varied hours, and rotating shift work makes Work-life Balance a lot harder. The notion of Work-life Balance has taken its part from shifting women’s social role in the society. Women at present need to occupy herself in diverse roles at different points of time, i.e., for example mother versus worker. For working women equalizing a demanding career with life outside work is a complex task. The present study makes an effort to compare the Work-life Balance of employees working with Public and Private Service sector organizations.
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Review of Literature:
Lathifah and Rohman (2014) has done a study on ‘The Influence of Work- Family Conflict on Turnover Intentions with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable on Public Accountant Firms in Indonesia’ and observed the effect of work-family confliction turnover intentions with job satisfaction as an intervening variable. Work interfering with family (WIF) negatively influences job satisfaction. Turn over intentions is not influenced by work interfering with family WIF and family interfering with work (FIW) and is negatively influenced by job satisfaction.

Belwal et al. (2014) in a study ‘Work-life Balance, family-friendly policies and quality of work life issues: Studying employers’ perspectives of working women in Oman’, there is a difference in Work-life programs of public and private organizations. There is a need for public sector organizations to implement better Work-life Balance policies for women employees in public sector.

Carmeli (2003) in his study ‘The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence And Work Attitudes, Behaviour and Outcomes: An Examination Among Senior Managers’ attempted to examine the narrow gap between the extent to which senior managers with a high emotional intelligence employed in public sector organizations develop positive work attitudes, behaviour and outcomes. The study has found that emotional intelligence elevates positive work attitudes, altruistic behaviour and work outcomes. Emotional intelligence moderates the effect of work-family conflict on career commitment but not the effect on job satisfaction. Work-family policies implemented by an organization cannot provide the complete solution especially with respect to family interference with work. This is because employees are responsible to have own family balance.

Varshini and Ishwarya (2014) in their work ‘Work-life Balance among Women Employees In Banking Sector- A Study at State Bank of Mysore, Mysore’ reported that banking employees have average level of Work-life Balance and are generally happy with their working arrangements. Banks should provide flexible starting and ending time to the employees. Women employees should be given the facilities like flexi time, job sharing, crèche facilities, and necessary breaks so that employees feel that the organization is helping to coordinate the family and professional life.

Shamina (2014) in her study titled ‘Work-life Balance Issues in Public Sector Banks – An Empirical Study in Tiruppur District’ has pointed out the issues of Work-life Balance of public sector banking employees. Family friendly work practices are to be implemented in the public sector banks. Work life practices such as shift wise working hours, sharing managerial level responsibility with every employee of bank, preferred 5 day week, health camps, yoga, support from boss and breaks improves Work-life Balance of public sector banking employees.

Sethi (2014) has conducted a study on ‘Influence of Work-life Balance on Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Women Employees Working in Public and Private Sector Banks’ with the objective of finding the relationship between the Work-life Balance and organizational commitment among women employees working in Public sector and private sector banks. The major findings of the work revealed that (i) Work-life Balance is positively related to organizational commitment; (ii) there exists no strong relation of Work-life Balance with family support and organizational support, and (iii) family support is positively related to organizational support but its relation with organizational commitment is weak.

Browne and McCarthy (2011) in their study ‘The role of Work-life Balance policies in healthcare human resources management’ has tried to examine the positive impact of family-friendly and Work-life Balance practices for both individuals and organization for utilizing the quality of services provided in healthcare organizations. They have concluded that healthcare organizations in particular place a heavy demand of input from individuals both from a time perspective and the number of individuals required in order to provide services, most particularly the public sector healthcare workers face higher levels of stress and have less trust and confidence in their managers. Accommodating employer family-friendly policies can be a way to contribute towards personal control and has positive outcomes for employees. People who are happy and who are facilitated to minimize stress within their personal and work lives should be competent and capable of providing good quality work and service to their employers and organizations of which they form part.

Ashwini and Kumaraswamy (2014) in the work entitled ‘Work-life Balance with Special Reference to Public Sector Bank Employees in Karnataka’ has identified that (i) employees are tired because of work pressure due to changing and challenging global banking environment;(ii) stress related diseases like hyper tension, anxiety and frequent
headaches are quite common among the public sector bank employees and (iii) formal communication strategy plays a vital role to create awareness about HR policies among the bank employees working at different cadre at different and builds healthy relationship among the employees.

Objective of The Study:-
To examine the attitude of Public and Private Service sector women employees towards Work- life Balance.

Methodology of the study:–
• Data source and method of data collection: The study has been conducted mainly on primary data collected through questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of 30 statements. The questionnaire was distributed among the respondents of five different service sector industries, namely, educational, hospitality, financial, business process outsourcing and police service sectors in India and collected back upon being filled up by the respondents.
• Sample size and sampling: A total of 484 questionnaires were distributed among the respondents of which 426 responses were received. Out of the 426 responses, 320 were included in the study for being complete in all respects.
• Demographic profile of the respondents: The sample respondents of 320 women respondents included in the study had a distribution of 126 respondents from Public sector units and 194 respondents from Private sector units. Similarly, the respondents included 2 graduate, 40 postgraduates, and 278 professional or technical graduates.

Table 1:- Details of the demographic profile of the respondents.

| Category               | Sub Categories       | No. of respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Work Segment           | Public Sector        | 126                | 39.37%     |
|                        | Private Sector       | 194                | 60.62%     |
| Total                  |                      | 320                | 100%       |
| Educational Qualification | Graduate           | 2                  | 0.006%     |
|                        | Post Graduate        | 40                 | 0.107%     |
|                        | Professional or technical graduates | 278                | 88.75%     |
| Total                  |                      | 320                | 100%       |

• Tools and techniques used: Tools and techniques used: The important statistical techniques used in the study are One Way Anova and Descriptive Statistics. One Way Anova has been used to test the hypothesis and Descriptive Statistics for overall responses of the samples. SPSS 16.0 has been used for statistical calculations.
• Sample units: From the five service sector industries, i.e., education, hospitality, BPO, financial, and police, 29 different public and private sector organizations, namely, Osmania University, NIT AP, Adi Kavi Nanayya University, Andhra Mahila Sabha School of Informatics, Andhra Pradesh State Tourism, Telangana State Tourism, State Bank of India, Andhra Bank, UCO Bank, Canara Bank, A.P.Police, Telengana Police, Karpagam University, Aurora’s Post Graduate & Engineering College, Sri Rama Chandra University, Sri Vasavi College, Marriot International, Swagat Group, ICICI Bank, Axis Bank, Lakshmi Vilas Bank, Vijaya Bank, Hindustan Private Limited, Tech Mahindra, Quintiles, Cap Gemini, Tata Consultancy Services, Cognizant, and Accenture were taken as sample units.

Hypothesis:-

➢ $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of public and private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance.
Data analysis and Interpretation:
Descriptive statistics

Table 2: Descriptive statistics.

| Sl. No. Of Statements | Variable name                                      | All level mean | Standard Deviation | Mean      | Standard Deviation | Mean      | Standard Deviation |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|
|                      |                                                   | N= 320         |                    | Public sector unit | Private sector unit |
| 1                    | Onsite day care                                   | 2.59           | 1.464              | 2.16      | 1.353              | 2.87      | 1.468              |
| 2                    | Dependent/elder care facilities                   | 2.90           | 1.519              | 3.42      | 1.427              | 2.57      | 1.485              |
| 3                    | Well funded career development initiatives        | 3.03           | 1.465              | 3.41      | 1.455              | 2.78      | 1.421              |
| 4                    | Family medical allowance                          | 2.29           | 1.451              | 2.06      | 1.325              | 2.44      | 1.513              |
| 5                    | Emergency paid leave                              | 2.72           | 1.495              | 2.52      | 1.490              | 2.84      | 1.489              |
| 6                    | Pension system                                    | 2.49           | 1.211              | 2.98      | 1.190              | 2.17      | 1.118              |
| 7                    | Housing/relocation facility                       | 2.84           | 1.457              | 3.16      | 1.341              | 2.63      | 1.494              |
| 8                    | Online financial advices                         | 3.47           | 1.198              | 3.46      | 1.171              | 3.48      | 1.218              |
| 9                    | Shift premiums                                    | 3.38           | 0.965              | 3.28      | 0.935              | 3.44      | 0.965              |
| 10                   | Educational scholarships                          | 2.90           | 1.314              | 3.04      | 1.141              | 2.81      | 1.410              |
| 11                   | Health care allowance                             | 3.03           | 1.437              | 3.42      | 1.427              | 2.77      | 1.388              |
| 12                   | Nap room                                          | 3.62           | 1.174              | 3.62      | 1.094              | 3.62      | 1.225              |
| 13                   | Fitness programs                                  | 3.49           | 1.153              | 3.48      | 1.122              | 3.51      | 1.175              |
| 14                   | Creche facility                                   | 3.44           | 1.034              | 3.34      | 0.981              | 3.50      | 1.064              |
| 15                   | Counselling facilities                            | 3.28           | 1.402              | 2.96      | 1.433              | 3.49      | 1.344              |
| Total of 15 statements|                                                   | 45.47          | 19.739             | 46.31     | 18.885             | 44.92     | 19.777             |
| Aggregate average of 15 statements |                                           | 3.031          | 1.315              | 3.087     | 1.259              | 2.994     | 1.318              |

As can be observed from the descriptive statistics of Public and Private sector organizations given in Table 2 that there exists a difference in the facilitators of WLB provided by the Public and Private sector organizations, with the average mean of all statements of Private sector organizations taken together (i.e., 2.994) being less than that of the Public sector organizations (i.e, 3.087), indicating further that the Public sector organizations are better facilitators of WLB than the Private sector organizations covered under the study.

6.2. Hypothesis testing for analysis of variance among employees of Public and Private Service sector organizations and their response to Work-life Balance.

(Table 3 to Table 15)

Table 3:- Onsite day care for children is provided by organization to easily commute to work with children

| Source of Variation | SS      | df | MS   | F      | Sig (P Value) |
|---------------------|---------|----|------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 38.768  | 1  | 38.768 | 19.125 | 0.000         |
| Within Groups       | 654.604 | 318| 2.027 |        |               |
| Total               | 683.372 | 319|      |        |               |

It is seen from the Table 3 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.000 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.000, i.e., less than 0.050 rejects the hypothesis. Therefore, $H_0: \text{There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance}$ stands rejected at 5% level of significance, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘onsite day care’ facility provided by the sample organizations.
Table 4: Dependent/elder care facilities are provided by the organization to take care of family.

| Source of Variation | SS   | df  | MS     | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 55.662 | 1   | 55.662 | 26.017 | 0.000         |
| Within Groups       | 680.335 | 318 | 2.139  |        |               |
| Total               | 735.997 | 319 |        |        |               |

It is seen from Table 4 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.000 at 5% level of significance. As the p value is less than 0.050, the hypothesis, i.e., $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of public and private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance is thus rejected at 5% level of significance leading to the conclusion that respondents of different work segments have significant difference in attitude with regard to ‘dependent/elder care’ facility provided.

Table 5: Well funded career development initiatives are provided by the organization to groom the employees.

| Source of Variation | SS   | df  | MS     | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 30.738 | 1   | 30.738 | 14.946 | 0.000         |
| Within Groups       | 654.009 | 318 | 2.057  |        |               |
| Total               | 684.747 | 319 |        |        |               |

It is seen from Table 5 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.000 at 5% level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of public and private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands rejected at 5% level of significance. This leads to drawing the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘well funded career development initiatives’ provided by the sample organizations.

Table 6: To supplement medical expenditure, family medical allowance is provided by the organization.

| Source of Variation | SS   | df  | MS     | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 10.722 | 1   | 10.722 | 5.156  | 0.024         |
| Within Groups       | 661.250 | 318 | 2.079  |        |               |
| Total               | 671.972 | 319 |        |        |               |

It is observed from Table 6 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.024 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.024, i.e., more than 0.050 accepts the hypothesis. Therefore, $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘family medical allowance’ facility provided by the sample organizations.

Table 7: Paid leave in the times of emergency is provided by the organization.

| Source of Variation | SS   | df  | MS     | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 7.647 | 1   | 7.647  | 3.447  | 0.064         |
| Within Groups       | 705.475 | 318 | 2.218  |        |               |
| Total               | 713.122 | 319 |        |        |               |

It is observed from Table 7 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.064 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.064, i.e., more than 0.050 accepts the hypothesis. Therefore, $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Paid leave facility’ provided by the sample organizations.

Table 8: Pension system is provided by the organization for safety and security of employees.

| Source of Variation | SS   | df  | MS     | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|------|-----|--------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 49.635 | 1   | 49.635 | 37.732 | 0.000         |
| Within Groups       | 418.315 | 318 | 1.315  |        |               |
| Total               | 467.950 | 319 |        |        |               |

It is seen from Table 8 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.000 at 5% level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard...
to Work-life Balance stands rejected at 5% level of significance. This leads to drawing the conclusion that the
respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Pension system’
provided by the sample organizations.

**Table 9**: Assistance on housing/relocation facility is sponsored by the organization to retain the employees.

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS  | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|--------|----|-----|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 21.031 | 1  | 21.031 | 10.197 | 0.002         |
| Within Groups       | 655.841| 318| 2.062 |        |               |
| Total               | 676.872| 319|      |        |               |

It is evident from the Table 9 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.002 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’
value of 0.002, i.e., less than 0.050 rejects the hypothesis. Therefore, 

$H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands rejected, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Housing/relocation assistance’ provided by the sample organizations.

**Table 10**: Employees of the organization are facilitated with online financial advices for better economic sustainability in future

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS  | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|--------|----|-----|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 0.045  | 1  | 0.045| 0.031  | 0.860         |
| Within Groups       | 457.755| 318| 1.439|        |               |
| Total               | 457.800| 319|      |        |               |

Table 10 shows the result of one way ANOVA for the eighth variable, namely, ‘Online financial advice facility’ in relation to Work-life Balance. It is seen that the Asymp. Sig. Value (or) ‘p’ value is 0.860 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.860, i.e., more than 0.050 accepts the hypothesis. Therefore, $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Online financial advice facility’ provided by the sample organizations.

**Table 11**: Shift premiums (extra pay for over duty) for financial motivation are offered by the organizations.

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS  | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|--------|----|-----|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 2.093  | 1  | 2.093| 2.302  | 0.130         |
| Within Groups       | 281.154| 318| 0.909|        |               |
| Total               | 291.247| 319|      |        |               |

It is seen from the Table 11 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.130 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.130 is more than 0.050. Therefore, $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted at 5% level of significance, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Shift premium facility’ provided by the sample organizations.

**Table 12**: Educational scholarships for employees’ assistance are given by the organization.

| Source of Variation | SS     | df | MS  | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|--------|----|-----|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 4.055  | 1  | 4.055| 2.359  | 0.126         |
| Within Groups       | 546.745| 318| 1.719|        |               |
| Total               | 550.800| 319|      |        |               |

It is seen from the Table 12 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.126 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.126 is more than 0.050. Therefore, $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted at 5% level of significance, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Educational scholarships’ assistance provided by the sample organizations.
Table 13: Health care allowance for physical fitness is provided by my organization.

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 32.020| 1  | 32.020| 16.247 | 0.000         |
| Within Groups       | 626.727| 318| 1.971 |        |               |
| Total               | 658.747| 319|       |        |               |

It is seen from the Table 13 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.000 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.000, i.e., less than 0.050 rejects the hypothesis. Therefore, \( H_0 \): There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands rejected, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Health care allowance facility’ provided by the sample organizations.

Table 14: Nap room is provided in my organization to reduce fatigue of the employees.

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 0.000 | 1  | 0.000 | 0.000  | 0.997         |
| Within Groups       | 439.487| 318| 1.382 |        |               |
| Total               | 439.487| 319|       |        |               |

It is seen from Table 14 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.997 at 5% level of significance. As the p value is more than 0.050. The hypothesis, i.e., \( H_0 \): There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance is stands accepted at 5% level of significance leading to the conclusion that respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in attitude with regard to ‘Nap room facility’ provided the sample organizations.

Table 15: Fitness programs (Yoga /health club /gym facility) are adapted in my organization for better mental health

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 0.064 | 1  | 0.064 | 0.048  | 0.827         |
| Within Groups       | 423.923| 318| 1.333 |        |               |
| Total               | 423.987| 319|       |        |               |

It is seen from Table 15 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.827 at 5% level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis \( H_0 \): There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted at 5% level of significance. This leads to drawing the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Fitness programs’ offered by the sample organizations.

Table 16: Crèche facility is provided by my organization to improve the focus of employee’s on work

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 1.925 | 1  | 1.925 | 1.806  | 0.180         |
| Within Groups       | 338.825| 318| 1.065 |        |               |
| Total               | 340.750| 319|       |        |               |

It is seen from the Table 16 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.180 at 5% level of significance. A ‘p’ value of 0.180, i.e., more than 0.180 accepts the hypothesis. Therefore, \( H_0 \): There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands accepted, leading to the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have no significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Crèche facility’ provided by the sample organizations.

Table 17: Counselling facilities for stress management are offered in my organization.

| Source of Variation | SS    | df | MS    | F      | Sig (P value) |
|---------------------|-------|----|-------|--------|---------------|
| Between Groups      | 21.407| 1  | 21.407| 11.246 | 0.001         |
| Within Groups       | 605.281| 318| 1.903 |        |               |
| Total               | 626.687| 319|       |        |               |
It is seen from Table 17 that the Asymp. Sig. Value or ‘p’ value is 0.001 at 5% level of significance. Therefore, hypothesis $H_0$: There is no significant difference in the attitude of Public and Private sector employees with regard to Work-life Balance stands rejected at 5% level of significance. This leads to drawing the conclusion that the respondents of different work segments have significant difference in their attitude with regard to ‘Counselling facilities for stress management’ provided by the sample organizations.

Findings:-
1. There is a significant difference in Work-life Balance of women employees in Public and Private Service sector organizations.
2. Public service sector organizations are providing Work-life Balance facilitators in more number to women employees than that of Private Service sector organizations.
3. The facilities such as onsite day care, well funded care initiatives, health care allowance, pension system and housing relocation assistance are not being provided by both Public and Private Service sector organizations.

Conclusion:-
Organization in order to sustain in the present competitive situations need to attract the talented employees by facilitating Work-life Balance policies. Work-life Balance policies have the potential to improve employee morale, job satisfaction and performance level. Both the Public and Private Service sectors should give flexibility to women employees to plan their office hours around their personal commitments, option to work from home, and a friendly leave policy to help them juggle roles so as to maintain a proper Work-life Balance.
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