



An Empirical Study on the Effect of Work Stress and Work–Life Balance on Job Satisfaction Among Employees

GOKUL KUMAR. S, MAHIMA. V. J, KABINESH. S. A

Department of Management Studies

Coimbatore Institute of Technology, Coimbatore-641014.

How to Cite this Article:

S, G. K., J, M. V. & A, K. S. (2026). An Empirical Study on the Effect of Work Stress and Work–Life Balance on Job Satisfaction Among Employees. International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management, <i>02</i>(04).
<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i4.139>

License:

This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

© The Author(s). Published by International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management.



<https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i4.139>

ABSTRACT

In today's competitive work environment, employees often experience increasing job demands, extended working hours, and pressure, which can negatively impact their ability to maintain a balance between professional and personal life. This imbalance may lead to reduced job satisfaction, lower productivity, and higher turnover intention. The study examines the effect of work stress and work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees within an organizational context.

The study is based on primary data collected from 217 employees working in different departments such as Sales, Service, and Accounts. A structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale was employed to measure key variables, including work stress, work–life balance, and job satisfaction. Descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, correlation, and multiple regression analysis were used to analyse the data.

The findings reveal that employees experience a moderate level of work stress and work–life balance, while job satisfaction is relatively above average. A strong positive relationship was found between work–life balance and job satisfaction, indicating that improved balance significantly enhances employee satisfaction. The study also found that work stress does not have a significant direct impact on job satisfaction but influences it indirectly through work–life balance.

Additionally, extended working hours were identified as a significant factor negatively affecting both work–life balance and job satisfaction.

The study concludes that work–life balance is the most important determinant of job satisfaction. Organizations should focus on implementing employee-friendly policies, flexible work arrangements, and effective stress management strategies to enhance employee well-being and organizational performance. The findings provide valuable insights for HR managers and policymakers in designing strategies to improve employee satisfaction and productivity.

Keywords: Work Stress, Work–Life Balance, Job Satisfaction, Employee Well-being, Organizational Performance, Work Environment, Employee Engagement



INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDY

In today's dynamic and competitive work environment, employees are expected to perform efficiently while managing increasing job demands. This often leads to higher levels of work stress, which can negatively affect both their personal and professional lives. At the same time, maintaining a healthy work–life balance has become a critical factor in ensuring employee well-being and overall satisfaction. Organizations are now recognizing that employee productivity and retention are closely linked to how well employees are able to balance their work responsibilities with their personal life.

The present study focuses on the topic “Effect of Work Stress and Work–Life Balance on Job Satisfaction among Employees.” Job satisfaction is a key indicator of employee motivation, commitment, and performance. When employees experience excessive stress and poor work–life balance, it can lead to dissatisfaction, reduced efficiency, and increased turnover intention. On the other hand, a supportive work environment that promotes balance can enhance employee morale and organizational success.

The review of literature highlights the importance of these variables. Previous studies indicate that work–life balance has a positive influence on job satisfaction, while work stress has a negative impact. Research also shows that work stress can act as a mediating factor between work–life balance and job satisfaction. Additionally, factors such as supervisor support and social support play a crucial role in reducing stress and improving balance. These findings clearly establish that managing stress and promoting work–life balance are essential for improving employee satisfaction and performance.

This study attempts to bridge the gap between theoretical understanding and practical insights by examining how work stress and work–life balance affect job satisfaction using real-time employee data. The findings of this study will help organizations design better HR policies to reduce stress, improve balance, and enhance overall employee satisfaction.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Henry Egbezien Inegbedion (2024) “Work-Life Balance and Employee Commitment: Mediating Effect of Job Satisfaction” This study investigates how work–life balance affects employee commitment, with job satisfaction acting as a mediator. Based on survey data, the study finds that poor work–life balance leads to emotional exhaustion and reduced job satisfaction, which ultimately lowers organizational commitment. It highlights the importance of maintaining balance to ensure employee well-being and long-term retention.

Waqas Zaigham & Saqib Yaqoob Malik (2024) “Exploring the Relationships between Job Stress, Work-Life Balance, Employee Creativity, and Turnover Intention” This study analyzes the impact of job stress and work–life balance on employee outcomes such as creativity and turnover intention. The results show that high job stress negatively affects employee well-being, reduces creativity, and increases turnover intention. Poor work–life balance further intensifies stress levels. The study concludes that organizations must adopt stress management strategies to improve employee satisfaction and retention.

Nathania Jessica et al. (2023) “The Effect of Work Environment and Work-Life Balance on Job Satisfaction: Work Stress as a mediator” This study examines the influence of work environment and work–life balance on job satisfaction, with work stress acting as a mediating variable. Using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), the findings reveal that work–life balance significantly enhances job satisfaction while reducing stress levels. Work stress negatively impacts job satisfaction and partially mediates the relationship. The study emphasizes that a balanced work environment is essential for improving employee satisfaction and reducing psychological strain.



KDV Prasad & VK Satyaprasad (2023) “The Relationship between Remote Working and Work-Life Balance with Mediating and Moderating Effects of Social Support” This study explores how remote working affects work–life balance and the role of social support. The findings indicate that remote work alone does not guarantee better balance unless supported by strong organizational and social systems. Social support plays a crucial role in reducing stress and improving employee well-being, thereby enhancing productivity and satisfaction.

Perengki Susanto et al. (2022) “Work-Life Balance, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance of SMEs Employees: The Moderating Role of Family-Supportive Supervisor Behaviors” This study investigates the relationship between work–life balance, job satisfaction, and job performance among SME employees, with family-supportive supervisor behaviors as a moderating factor. Using SEM-PLS analysis on employee data, the findings reveal that work–life balance positively influences both job satisfaction and job performance. Job satisfaction partially mediates the relationship between work–life balance and performance. Additionally, supervisor support strengthens the relationship between work–life balance, job satisfaction, and job performance. The study highlights the importance of supportive leadership and organizational culture in improving employee outcomes.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the modern organizational environment, employees are increasingly facing high work demands, tight deadlines, and extended working hours, which contribute to rising levels of work stress. At the same time, maintaining a proper work–life balance has become difficult, especially when professional responsibilities interfere with personal life. This imbalance often leads to physical and mental strain, reduced productivity, and dissatisfaction among employees.

Job satisfaction is a crucial factor that determines employee performance, commitment, and retention. However, when employees experience excessive stress and are unable to balance their work and personal life effectively, their level of job satisfaction tends to decline. This can result in negative outcomes such as decreased motivation, poor performance, absenteeism, and increased turnover intention.

Although organizations have started implementing policies to improve work–life balance and reduce stress, the effectiveness of these measures varies across different employees and departments. Factors such as workload, working hours, supervisor support, and leave policies play a significant role in shaping employees’ perceptions and experiences.

Based on the review of literature, it is evident that work stress negatively impacts job satisfaction, while work–life balance has a positive influence. However, there is a need to examine how these factors interact in a specific organizational context using primary data.

Therefore, the problem addressed in this study is to analyze the effect of work stress and work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees, and to understand how these factors influence employee well-being and organizational outcomes. The study seeks to identify whether employees are able to maintain a balance between their work and personal life, the extent of stress they experience, and how these aspects affect their overall job satisfaction.



SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study focuses on examining the effect of work stress and work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees within a specific organizational context. It covers employees working in different departments such as Sales, Service, and Accounts, allowing for a comparative understanding of how job roles influence stress levels, work–life balance, and satisfaction. The study takes into account key demographic factors including age, gender, years of experience, and working hours to analyze their impact on employees' perceptions and experiences.

The scope of the study includes evaluating various aspects of work–life balance such as workload, working hours, leave policies, and supervisor support, along with job satisfaction factors like salary, motivation, recognition, work environment, and interpersonal relationships. The research is based on primary data collected through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, which helps in measuring employee opinions effectively.

This study aims to analyze the level of work stress, assess the work–life balance of employees, and identify the relationship between these factors and job satisfaction. It also seeks to provide practical suggestions for improving employee well-being and organizational performance. However, the study is limited to a specific sample and organizational setting, and it does not consider broader external factors such as economic conditions or wider organizational culture beyond the selected variables.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To examine the impact of work stress on employee job satisfaction.
- To analyze the influence of work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees.
- To evaluate the relationship between work stress, work–life balance, and job satisfaction.
- To assess the combined effect of work stress and work–life balance on employee job satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Collection:

This study utilized both primary and secondary data sources for research purposes.

Primary Data:

The primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire and distributed among employees using Google Forms and direct responses. A total of 217 responses were collected from employees working in different departments such as Sales, Service, and Accounts.

Secondary Data:

Secondary data was collected from academic journals, research articles, books, and previous studies related to work stress, work–life balance, and job satisfaction.

Research Design:

This study adopts a descriptive research design to analyze and describe the effect of work stress and work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees.

Sample Size:

A total of **217 samples** were collected for the study.



LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study is subject to certain limitations that may affect the generalization of the findings. The research is based on a sample of 217 respondents from a specific organization and selected departments, which may not represent the views of all employees in other organizations or industries. The study relies primarily on self-reported data collected through a questionnaire, and therefore the responses may be influenced by personal bias, perception, or willingness of the respondents to provide accurate information.

The scope of the study is limited to selected variables such as work stress, work–life balance, and job satisfaction, and does not consider other factors like organizational culture, leadership style, or external environmental influences that may also affect employee satisfaction. Additionally, the use of a convenience sampling method may limit the randomness of the sample and affect the overall representativeness of the data.

The study is also constrained by time and resource limitations, which restricted the data collection process and sample size. Furthermore, the findings are based on data collected at a specific point in time and may not reflect changes in employee perceptions over time.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

TABLE 1.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Mean WLB_Score	SD WLB	Mean JS_Score	SD JS
Department	Accounts	65	29.95	3.35	0.82	3.78	0.95
	Sales	86	39.63	3.28	0.85	3.55	1.02
	Service	66	30.41	3.32	0.84	3.63	0.98
Gender	Male	152	70.05	3.30	0.83	3.62	0.99
	Female	65	29.95	3.36	0.85	3.72	0.97
Age Group	Below 25	28	12.90	3.15	0.92	3.45	1.05
	25–35	108	49.77	3.35	0.82	3.68	0.97
	36–45	68	31.34	3.28	0.84	3.60	1.00
	Above 45	13	5.99	3.42	0.79	3.75	0.92
Experience	Below 1 year	28	12.90	3.22	0.88	3.58	1.01
	1–3 years	87	40.09	3.34	0.83	3.67	0.98
	4–6 years	52	23.96	3.28	0.85	3.60	1.00
	Above 6 years	50	23.04	3.32	0.82	3.64	0.99
Working Hours	Below 8 hrs	2	0.92	3.45	0.78	3.80	0.94
	8–9 hrs	130	59.91	3.38	0.81	3.72	0.96
	10–11 hrs	80	36.87	3.22	0.87	3.52	1.03
	Above 11 hrs	5	2.30	3.10	0.95	3.40	1.08

Source: Primary Data



INTERPRETATION

The demographic profile of the 217 respondents reveals a workforce predominantly composed of males (70.05%) aged 25-35 years (49.77%), with 1-3 years of experience (40.09%) working standard 8-9 hour shifts (59.91%), and Sales as the largest department (39.63%). Mean Work-Life Balance (WLB) scores hover around 3.32 across groups, with standard deviations of 0.82-0.92 indicating moderate consistency, though longer working hours (>10 hours: M=3.22, SD=0.87) and younger employees (Below 25: M=3.15, SD=0.92) report comparatively lower balance, suggesting workload intensity and career entry pressures as key stressors. Job Satisfaction (JS) averages 3.65 overall (SD=0.99), with females (M=3.72, SD=0.97) and older workers (Above 45: M=3.75, SD=0.92) exhibiting marginally higher satisfaction than males (M=3.62, SD=0.99) and Sales employees (M=3.55, SD=1.02), potentially reflecting gender-specific resilience or departmental differences in recognition and environment factors. These patterns align with the study objectives, indicating that extended hours inversely impact both WLB and JS while demographic maturity buffers satisfaction, warranting targeted interventions for junior staff and high-hour departments to enhance overall employee well-being.

TABLE 1.2 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF KEY CONSTRUCTS

Construct	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Work-Life Balance (WLB_Score)	217	3.32	0.84	1.00	5.00
Job Satisfaction (JS_Score)	217	3.65	0.99	1.00	5.00
Work Stress (Q11)	217	2.85	0.89	1.00	5.00

Source: Primary Data; **Scale:** 1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree

INTERPRETATION

Descriptive statistics of the key constructs reveal a workforce experiencing moderate work-life balance (M = 3.32, SD = 0.84), above-average job satisfaction (M = 3.65, SD = 0.99), and moderate stress levels (M = 2.85, SD = 0.89) among 217 employees surveyed on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). The WLB_Score distribution (range: 1.00-5.00) indicates substantial variability, with the standard deviation (0.84) suggesting diverse employee experiences in balancing workload manageability, family time, and organizational support—directly addressing study objective two—while the modest mean reflects room for enhancement through targeted interventions. Job satisfaction demonstrates stronger central tendency (M = 3.65) with greater dispersion (SD = 0.99), implying that while employees generally appreciate recognition, work environment, and incentives (objective one), outliers at the lower end (Min = 1.00) highlight pockets of dissatisfaction warranting investigation, particularly among high-stress subgroups identified in prior cross-tabulations. The reverse-coded stress measure (lower values = higher stress) averaging 2.85 signals pervasive moderate pressure from perceptions, corroborated by prior correlations (r = 0.352 with WLB), supporting objective three's relational examination and underscoring stress's indirect pathway through balance to satisfaction. Overall, these central tendencies and dispersions validate the dataset's capacity to empirically test the combined effects (objective four), with practical implications for organizations prioritizing WLB enhancements to elevate satisfaction beyond current moderate levels.



TABLE 1.3 RELIABILITY ANALYSIS – CRONBACH'S ALPHA COEFFICIENTS

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Interpretation
Work-Life Balance	9	0.823	Good
Job Satisfaction	9	0.891	Excellent
Work Stress	2	0.712	Acceptable

Source: Primary Data

Note: WLB and JS scales demonstrate strong internal consistency ($\alpha > 0.80$), supporting their composite score reliability for subsequent analyses. Stress measure shows acceptable reliability for the limited items.

INTERPRETATION

Reliability analysis confirms the robust internal consistency of the measurement scales employed in this empirical study on work stress, work-life balance (WLB), and job satisfaction among 217 employees. The Work-Life Balance construct (9 items) yields a Cronbach's alpha of 0.823, classified as "Good," indicating strong item interrelatedness and reliable aggregation into the WLB_Score composite, essential for accurately capturing the multidimensional influences of workload manageability, family time, leave policies, and supervisor support as outlined in study objective two. Job Satisfaction (9 items) demonstrates even higher reliability at $\alpha = 0.891$ ("Excellent"), validating the JS_Score as a dependable measure of satisfaction drivers like salary incentives, recognition, work environment, and intent to continue, directly supporting analyses of objectives one, three, and four. The Work Stress subscale (2 items) achieves acceptable reliability ($\alpha = 0.712$), sufficient despite limited items to assess stress perceptions and after-hours rumination, though future studies might benefit from expanded indicators. Collectively, these coefficients (all > 0.70) affirm scale psychometric integrity, enabling trustworthy regression and cross-tabulation findings that link poor WLB and elevated stress to diminished satisfaction, with practical implications for organizational interventions targeting these validated constructs.

TABLE 1.4 MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Predictors of Job Satisfaction (JS_Score)

Predictor	B (Unstd.)	SE	β (Std.)	t-value	p-value
(Constant)	1.850	0.210	—	8.810	< 0.001
WLB_Score	0.620	0.045	0.712	13.780	< 0.001
Q11_Stress (rev.)	-0.085	0.052	-0.084	-1.635	0.104
Working_Hours_10+hrs	-0.320	0.112	-0.145	-2.857	0.005
	$R^2 = 0.742$	Adjusted $R^2 = 0.737$	$F(3,213) = 176.45$	$p < 0.001$	

Dependent Variable: JS_Score | N = 217 | **p < 0.001



INTERPRETATION

Multiple linear regression analysis reveals that work-life balance (WLB_Score) emerges as the dominant predictor of job satisfaction (JS_Score), with a highly significant standardized coefficient of $\beta = 0.712$ ($B = 0.620$, $SE = 0.045$, $t = 13.780$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that each one-unit increase in WLB score elevates job satisfaction by 0.62 units, accounting for the lion's share of explained variance. The model demonstrates robust overall fit, explaining 74.2% of JS_Score variability ($R^2 = 0.742$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.737$; $F(3,213) = 176.45$, $p < 0.001$), underscoring WLB's pivotal role in the study's objectives linking work stress and balance to satisfaction outcomes. Extended working hours (10+ hrs) exert a significant negative effect ($\beta = -0.145$, $B = -0.320$, $SE = 0.112$, $t = -2.857$, $p = 0.005$), reducing satisfaction independent of other factors, while perceived stress (Q11, reverse-coded) shows a non-significant marginal impact ($\beta = -0.084$, $p = 0.104$), suggesting its influence operates primarily through WLB mediation rather than direct pathways. These findings, derived from 217 respondents, empirically validate the combined detrimental effects of poor balance and excessive hours on employee satisfaction, with practical implications for workload management and policy interventions targeting high-hour departments.

TABLE 1.5 PEARSON CORRELATION MATRIX

Variable	WLB_Score	Work Stress	JS_Score
WLB_Score	1.000	0.352**	0.854**
Work Stress	0.352**	1.000	0.005
JS_Score	0.854**	0.005	1.000

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

N = 217.

INTERPRETATION

Pearson correlation analysis unveils a robust positive association between Work-Life Balance (WLB_Score) and Job Satisfaction (JS_Score) at $r = 0.854$ ($p < 0.01$), confirming study objective three by demonstrating that enhanced balance perceptions—encompassing workload manageability, family time adequacy, and organizational support—substantially predict higher satisfaction levels among 217 employees, with each unit improvement in WLB corresponding to substantial satisfaction gains. A moderate positive correlation emerges between WLB_Score and Work Stress ($r = 0.352$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that elevated stress perceptions inversely relate to balance experiences, though the relationship's strength suggests stress operates as one among multiple WLB determinants rather than its sole driver, aligning with objective one's stress-satisfaction examination. Notably, the negligible direct correlation between Work Stress and JS_Score ($r = 0.005$, $p > 0.05$) reveals no significant independent pathway, implying stress impacts satisfaction predominantly through WLB mediation—a critical insight for objective four's combined effects assessment—wherein poor balance channels stress's detrimental influence. These interrelationships, statistically significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), underscore WLB's centrality as both stress mitigator and satisfaction catalyst, providing empirical foundation for organizational strategies prioritizing balance interventions over direct stress reduction to optimize employee well-being outcomes.



FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- The demographic profile indicates that the majority of respondents are from the 25–35 age group, with a higher representation from the Sales department and employees having 1–3 years of experience, reflecting a relatively young and early-career workforce.
- Employees working 8–9 hours per day form the largest group; however, those working extended hours (10+ hours) report comparatively lower work–life balance and job satisfaction levels.
- The overall work–life balance (WLB) among employees is at a moderate level (Mean = 3.32), indicating that employees are able to manage work and personal life to some extent, but there is significant scope for improvement.
- Job satisfaction (JS) is found to be above average (Mean = 3.65), suggesting that employees are generally satisfied, though variations exist across departments and demographic groups.
- Work stress levels are moderate (Mean = 2.85), indicating the presence of workplace pressure, but not at extreme levels for most employees.
- Reliability analysis confirms that the measurement scales for work–life balance ($\alpha = 0.823$) and job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.891$) are highly reliable, ensuring the validity and consistency of the study results.
- A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.854$) exists between work–life balance and job satisfaction, indicating that improvements in balance significantly enhance employee satisfaction.
- A moderate relationship ($r = 0.352$) is observed between work stress and work–life balance, suggesting that increased stress negatively affects employees' ability to maintain balance.
- There is no significant direct relationship between work stress and job satisfaction ($r = 0.005$), indicating that stress does not independently influence satisfaction.
- Multiple regression analysis reveals that work–life balance is the most significant predictor of job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.712$, $p < 0.001$), highlighting its dominant role in determining employee satisfaction.
- Extended working hours (10+ hours) have a significant negative impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.145$, $p = 0.005$), indicating that longer working hours reduce employee satisfaction levels.
- Work stress does not show a statistically significant direct effect on job satisfaction in the regression model, implying that its impact is largely indirect through work–life balance.
- The model explains 74.2% of the variance in job satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.742$), indicating a strong explanatory power of the selected variables.
- Overall, the findings establish that work–life balance is the key determinant of job satisfaction, while work stress influences satisfaction indirectly by affecting employees' ability to maintain balance.

SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY

- Organizations should prioritize improving work–life balance by implementing flexible working hours, remote work options, and realistic workload distribution to enhance employee satisfaction.
- Management should take steps to reduce excessive working hours, especially for employees working more than 10 hours per day, by introducing shift planning, workload sharing, and proper task allocation.
- Employers should design and implement effective stress management programs, such as counseling sessions, wellness initiatives, and stress-relief activities to support employee well-being.



- Supervisors and managers should provide strong support and guidance to employees, as supportive leadership plays a key role in improving work–life balance and reducing work-related stress.
- Organizations should encourage employees to take leave when required and ensure that leave policies are flexible and employee-friendly to prevent burnout.
- Regular employee feedback mechanisms should be established to identify issues related to stress, workload, and satisfaction, allowing timely corrective actions.
- Special attention should be given to young and less experienced employees, as they tend to experience lower work–life balance and higher stress levels due to career pressure.
- The organization should focus on improving recognition and reward systems, ensuring that employees feel valued and motivated in their roles.
- Training programs should be conducted to enhance time management and coping skills, helping employees manage both work responsibilities and personal life effectively.
- A positive and supportive work environment should be maintained to strengthen interpersonal relationships and improve overall job satisfaction.
- Departments with higher workload, such as Sales, should be provided with additional resources and support to manage job demands efficiently.
- Organizations should continuously monitor and evaluate employee satisfaction levels to ensure that HR policies remain effective and aligned with employee needs.

CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

The present study provides a comprehensive analysis of the effect of work stress and work–life balance on job satisfaction among employees, based on empirical data collected from 217 respondents. The findings clearly establish that work–life balance is a critical determinant of job satisfaction, demonstrating a strong and positive influence on employees' overall perceptions and attitudes toward their jobs. While employees reported moderate levels of stress and work–life balance, job satisfaction was found to be relatively higher, indicating that organizations are performing reasonably well in maintaining employee satisfaction, but still have significant scope for improvement.

The study further reveals that work stress does not have a significant direct impact on job satisfaction; rather, its influence is indirect and operates through work–life balance. This highlights the mediating role of balance in shaping employee satisfaction outcomes. Additionally, extended working hours were identified as a significant factor negatively affecting both work–life balance and job satisfaction, emphasizing the need for effective workload management.

Overall, the results underscore the importance of organizational policies that promote a healthy balance between work and personal life. By focusing on flexible work practices, supportive supervision, and employee-centric policies, organizations can effectively reduce stress levels and enhance job satisfaction. The study concludes that improving work–life balance is not only beneficial for employee well-being but also essential for achieving higher productivity, engagement, and long-term organizational success.



REFERENCES

1. Akinwale, O. E., & George, O. J. (2020). Work environment and job satisfaction among nurses in government tertiary hospitals in Nigeria. *Rajagiri Management Journal*, 14(1), 71–92.
2. Dartey-Baah, K., & Amoako, G. K. (2011). Application of Frederick Herzberg's two-factor theory in assessing and understanding employee motivation at work: A Ghanaian perspective. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(9), 1–8.
3. Dousin, O., Collins, N., & Kler, B. K. (2019). Work-life balance, employee job performance, and satisfaction among doctors and nurses in Malaysia. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(4), 306–319.
4. Hasan, H. (2021). Effect of work experience and work environment on job satisfaction. *Bongaya Journal of Research in Management*, 4(2), 7–10.
5. Hebbar, C. K. (2022). Impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction of hospital nurses: A case study. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 8(4), 183–187.
6. Heras, M. L., Rofcanin, Y., Escribano, P. I., Kim, S., & Mayer, M. C. J. (2021). Family-supportive organisational culture, work–family balance satisfaction, and government effectiveness: Evidence from four countries. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 31(2), 454–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12317>
7. Hofmann, V., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2017). The impact of emotional labor on employees' work-life balance perception and commitment: A study in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 65, 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.06.003>
8. Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. Harper & Brothers.
9. Hughes, J., & Bozionelos, N. (2007). Work-life balance as a source of job dissatisfaction and withdrawal attitudes: An exploratory study on the views of male workers. *Personnel Review*, 36(1), 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480710716768>
10. Inegbedion, H. E. (2024). *Work-life balance and employee commitment: Mediating effect of job satisfaction*. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 32(1), 78–95.
11. International Labour Organization. (2019). *Financing small businesses in Indonesia: Challenges and opportunities*. ILO.
12. Irawanto, D. W., Novianti, K. R., & Roz, K. (2021). Work from home: Measuring satisfaction between work–life balance and work stress during the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Economies*, 9(3), 96. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies9030096>
13. Jermstittiparsert, K., Suan, C., & Kaliappen, N. (2019). The mediating role of organizational commitment and the moderating role of perceived organizational support in the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of educationists in public sector institutes of Thailand. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 6(2), 150–171.
14. Jessica, N., et al. (2023). *The effect of work environment and work-life balance on job satisfaction: Work stress as a mediator*. *Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 12(3), 45–60.
15. Jyothi Sree, V., & Jyothi, P. (2012). Assessing work-life balance: From emotional intelligence and role efficacy of career women. *Advances in Management*.
16. Kanfer, R., & Kantrowitz, T. M. (2005). Ability and non-ability predictors of job performance. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological management of individual performance* (pp. 27–50). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013419.ch2>
17. Keelan, R. (2015). A Māori perspective on well-being. *He Kupu*, 4, 15.
18. Kelley, H. H., LeBaron-Black, A., Hill, E. J., & Van Meter, D. (2021). Perceived family and partner support and the work-family interface: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 37(3), 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2021a15>
19. Kurniawaty, K., Ramly, M., & Ramlawati, R. (2019). The effect of work environment, stress, and job satisfaction on employee turnover intention. *Management Science Letters*, 9(6), 877–886. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.3.001>



20. Prasad, K. D. V., & Satyaprasad, V. K. (2023). *The relationship between remote working and work-life balance with mediating and moderating effects of social support*. *Journal of Management Research*, 15(2), 101–118.
21. Susanto, P., et al. (2022). *Work-life balance, job satisfaction, and job performance of SMEs employees: The moderating role of family-supportive supervisor behaviors*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 60(4), 890–910.
22. Zaigham, W., & Malik, S. Y. (2024). *Exploring the relationships between job stress, work-life balance, employee creativity, and turnover intention*. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 39(1), 55–72.