Assessing Life Satisfaction among Higher Education Faculty: The relationship between work-life balance, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and life satisfaction

[1] Leena, [2] Dr. Raminder Pal Singh, [3] Dr. Kiranjeet Kaur

[1] Research Scholar, Department of Applied Sciences and Humanities
[2] Professor, Department of School of Business and Commerce Studies
[3] Professor, Department of Applied Sciences and Humanities
[3] Shaheed Bhagat Singh State University, Ferozepur, Punjab, India

Abstract

Purpose - Life satisfaction plays an important role in retaining more employees as satisfied employees are vital for organizational growth. This study aims to analyse the impact of work-life balance, emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India.

Design/methodology- This study uses a cross-sectional research under which data has been collected from 200 faculty of top 100 NIRF institutes in India. To analyse data the SPSS software has been used with correlation and factor analysis to confirm relationships between variables of the study.

Findings- Results indicate that WLB, EI and self-efficacy have a significant and positive impact on the life satisfaction of faculty. Therefore, the findings reveal that WLB, EI and self-efficacy play an important role in increasing the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India.

Research limitations/implications- This study will help in understanding the subsequent impact of variable on the life satisfaction of their faculty. It will help organizations retain more satisfied employees, reduce absenteeism and ultimately improve performance.

Originality/value- The study main contribution is to increase the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India, as well as insightful for the government, management and organization to understand the various factors that are crucial to the life satisfaction of their faculty.

Keywords: work-life balance, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, life satisfaction, faculty, higher education institutes

Paper type: Research paper

Introduction

The study of life satisfaction is an emerging demand in today's world and has more importance in today's stressful lives. Life satisfaction (LS) can define as the degree to which a person positively evaluates the overall quality of life as a whole **(Toker, 2012).** In other words, it can also be defined as the degree to which an individual evaluates the overall

quality of their life in areas such as work, family, friends, education, and relationships with others (**Arias-Gallegos** *et al*., **2018).**

Life satisfaction plays a crucial role in the growth of organisations. In today's competitive world, organisations can only survive if their human resources are satisfied. In the study of **Karabchuk and Soboleva (2020),** it has been stated that work is a significant contributor to subjective well-being in general and life satisfaction in particular. In addition to building a strong relationship between an employee and an organisation, there is a need for organisations to ensure a high level of employee satisfaction and commitment (**Khan** *et al*., **2016)**. Employees who are satisfied are more likely to deal with problems and issues in their work lives in a productive and effective manner (**Pasupuleti** *et al*., **2009**), which makes them open-minded and creative thinkers. It also aids in lowering turnover intentions. Another benefit of life satisfaction in the workplace is improving employee performance (**Rode** *et al*., **2007)**. All such benefits make it important for the organisation to look at the concept of life satisfaction for the growth of the organisation.

To avail of these benefits, organisations must learn to balance their employee's working and non-working lives. Researchers in the field of life satisfaction place emphasis on the development of work-life balance. According to **Kalliath and Brough (2008)**, work-life balance is the perception of an individual that is related to the compatibility of work and non-work activities and promotes growth in accordance with an individual's current life priorities.

Work-life balance (WLB) doesn't indicate spending an equal amount of time while performing personal and professional roles, it means effectively managing time between professional and personal life without sacrificing one or the other. Most of the researchers examined organisational policies that facilitate WLB, such as part-time working (**Gregory and Milner, 2009**) and flexible hours (**Anderson** *et al*., **2002)** while few researchers studied self-regulatory behaviours that employees use to attain WLB (**Eby** *et al*., **2005),** and they found out that there are some unofficial techniques that individuals use to shape their own work-life balance, such as time management (**Golden and Geisler, 2007**), work management by limiting the workload (**Roberts, 2008**), and simplifying the capacity to handle the workload (**Antonioni, 1996)**. All such behaviour can be characterised as crafting techniques. So, it is insightful to see work-life balance contributes in achieving life satisfaction.

Many individuals who experience issues balancing life demands also experience emotional exhaustion caused by psychological and emotional demands made on people (**Boles** *et al*., **1997).** So**,** another important variable to study as a predictor of life satisfaction is emotional intelligence. Employees with high EI are in touch with their emotions, and they can regulate them in a way that promotes well-being and the ability to perform in coping with environmental demands to promote balanced living (**Waite and Gallagher, 2001)**. Emotional intelligence is the ability to understand, recognise, use, express, and manage our own and others emotions (**Ismail and Yeo, 2016)**. Overall, EI is defined as a set of abilities that can be trained, whereby people obtain information from their emotions and use it to guide their thinking and actions for optimal adaptation (**Hodzic** *et al*., **2018).**

Emotions are an inseparable part of every person's life. So, managing, controlling, and regulating emotion is necessary, but it is possible if an individual has a sound belief in his or her ability (**Hussain** *et al*., **2022**). This ability can be termed "self-efficacy.". A person with

high self-efficacy can face various difficulties **(Zhou *et al*., 2021),** experience a psychological flow **(Gu *et al*., 2020),** and lead a more satisfying life. Self-efficacy has a significant impact on life satisfaction **(Suldo and Huebner, 2006)**.

Thus, using a top-down and bottom-up approach as a frame of reference, the objective of this study is to connect WLB, EI, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction using a sample of faculty from the top 100 NIRF ranking institutes in India. There have been numerous studies on life satisfaction in the management field, but the majority of them were conducted on doctors, police servicemen, entrepreneurs, staff managers of the public and private sectors, army officers, academic and clinical faculty, and so on. There are very few studies on the faculty of higher education institutes. Rapid changes in the educational system make the teaching profession more difficult. Time constraints, a lack of a schedule, mental overload, emotional exhaustion, educational innovations, diversity in the classroom, family pressure, social roles, and so on are some of the challenges that teachers face today. All of these issues contribute to poor performance, increased turnover, anxiety, and depression, a lower quality of work and life, and the deterioration of mental health. All of these negative effects are enough to cause teacher dissatisfaction. As a result, research into teacher life satisfaction is required. So, to fill this research gap, this study examines the impact of work-life balance, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes.

Literature review and hypotheses development

Bottom-up approach

This approach is defined by **Diener (1984).** He proposes that people who live with a significant amount of positive experience can be satisfied with their lives. According to this approach overall life satisfaction is a total of satisfaction in different domains of life **(Erdogan *et al*., 2012)**. Satisfaction with health, income, safety, education, family, leisure time, and job collectively influence overall life satisfaction **(Kuykendall *et al*., 2015).**

Bottom-up theory supports the spillover theory, which explains how satisfaction or dissatisfaction in one domain of life can 'spillover' into another. Positive experiences at work can lead to greater life satisfaction, while negative experiences can detract from it. Understanding this dynamic is essential for developing strategies that help to achieve balanced satisfaction across life's domains **(Valery *et al*., 2023)**. Previously, researchers studied the concept of work-life balance by considering only two domains, such as work life and non-work life **(Casper *et al*., 2018; Sirgy and Lee, 2018)**, but in the non-work life domain, other factors such as income, health, age, education, etc. are also important **(Gragnano *et al*., 2020)**. This approach helps in studying the aspect of work-life balance beyond family by including other factors. By viewing work-life balance through the lens of the bottom-up theory, researchers and practitioners can more effectively analyse how to optimise satisfaction in both work and non-work life domains, ultimately aiming to boost overall life satisfaction.

Top-down Approach

According to **Diener (1984)**, overall life satisfaction is a consistent and strong characteristic of an individual. He suggests that one's overall satisfaction with life is influenced primarily

by an internal set of factors such as attitudes and dispositions rather than external circumstances. According to **(Montag and Panksepp, 2017),** life satisfaction is determined by personality disposition which manifests in relatively stable cognitive and affective qualities, resulting in an individual displaying stable behaviour. In relation to emotional intelligence, a person with high emotional intelligence is likely better equipped to regulate their emotions, maintain a positive attitude, and manage their interpersonal relationships, which can contribute to a higher sense of life satisfaction. Various researchers prove in their study that individual with high level of emotional intelligence can increase their life satisfaction **(Extremera *et al*., 2011; Naseem, 2018; Luque-Reca *et al*., 2022).**

Self-efficacy as another factor influencing life satisfaction refers to the belief one has in his or her ability to perform the course of action **(Bandura, 2001).** Studies **(e.g., Jex and Bliese, 1999)** have shown that both emotional intelligence and self-efficacy influence people to pursue their lives. According to the study of **Stone and Bailey (2007),** higher self-efficacy leads to higher life satisfaction, while lower self-efficacy leads to depression, stress, and anxiety.

Thus, by using both approaches, it provides a useful framework for understanding the life satisfaction of faculty in higher education institutes in India by considering work-life balance, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy as the most important factors.

Work-life balance

Kalliath and Brough (2018) define work-life balance as the effort of an individual to maintain an optimum balance between work and non-work activities. The issue of work-life balance emerges due to the increasing strength of the female workforce, innovations in technology, cultural changes, diversity of family structure, etc. **(Greenhaus and Kossek, 2014).** As a result, organisations are now more concerned about realising the importance of work-life balance within their environment **(Michel *et al.*, 2019)**.

Even the effects of work-life balance on employees' work and life outcomes are vague **(Casper *et al*., 2018),** because the impact of work-life balance on work and life outcomes is dependent on how the work-life balance construct is measured **(Wayne *et al*., 2017).** Work-life balance has been measured in large-scale social surveys to identify the most influential factors **(Ruppanner, 2013; Annink *et al*., 2016; Hagqvist *et al*., 2017)**. The majority of large-scale surveys (for example, the European Social Survey (2009), the European Working Conditions Survey (2003), the International Social Survey Programme (2013), etc.) reveal that in past research, work-life balance has been moved around work to family and family to work constructs, but there is much more to 'life' than 'family'.

One of the researchers, **Casper *et al*. (2018)**, found in their study that 66% of the definitions focused only on work and family. However, many researchers have called for a real expansion of the WLB concept **(Keeney *et al*., 2013; Kelliher *et al*., 2019).** They have considered non-family domains and family domains in general. **Keeney *et al*. (2013)** identified eight life domains in order to study how work interferes with life—health, family, household management, friendships, education, romantic relationships, community involvement, and leisure—and all such domains can be called non-work domains. Thus, it is

crucial to understand whether non-work domains other than family domains impact work-life balance and contribute to life satisfaction.

Work-life Balance and Life Satisfaction

Researchers in the field of life satisfaction place emphasis on the development of work-life balance. **Carlson *et al.* (2000)** determines life satisfaction as the last outcome of work-life balance. They prove that when job and family satisfaction increase, consequently, life satisfaction also increases. Good work-life balance gives a feeling of job satisfaction and also helps to achieve higher retention rates in the institution **(Lakshmi and Kumar, 2011)** because employees who work in organisations that encourage WLB may indicate a higher level of workplace engagement and hence amplify their productivity **(Akter *et al*., 2020).** In this context, **Kar and Misra (2013)** reveal that employees who receive employer support for work-family balance are more satisfied at work and feel more belonging, which ultimately contributes to increasing life satisfaction. Even **Cain *et al*. (2018)** conducted research on chef executives from North America and found that work-life balance is positively associated with life satisfaction. Also, **Noda (2020)** investigates the effect of work-life balance on life satisfaction using data on men and women in OECD countries. In this study, the work-life balance policy leads to an improvement in LS for both men and women. Another researcher, **Best and Chinta (2021),** indicates that household income (HI) is a significant determinant of WLB and LS. This study investigates the levels and relationships of WLB and LS among the self-employed in the USA and the possible influence of HI on this relationship. **Aloulou *et al*. (2023)** reveal that a work-life balance has a positive influence on life satisfaction with the mediating effect of job satisfaction. Based on the literature, we hypothesise the following:

H1. WLB is not significantly related to life satisfaction

Emotional Intelligence

Another important variable to study as a predictor of life satisfaction is Emotional Intelligence (EI). **Goleman (1995)** has popularized the concept of emotional intelligence with the key message being if you are able to manage your emotions, then you are more likely to be successful in life. It can be defined as a type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' emotions, to differentiate among them, and to use the information to guide one's thinking and actions **(Mayer and Salovey, 1993).** If an individual is emotionally intelligent, he/she is capable of achieving personal and professional goals and also improves his/her performance in the work place **(Yadav, 2011).** Thus, emotional intelligence is the ability to understand, recognise, use, express and manage our own and others emotions **(Ismail and Yeo, 2016).** Overall, EI is defined as a set of abilities that can be trained, whereby people obtain information from their emotions and use it to guide their thinking and actions for optimal adaptation **(Hodzic *et al*., 2018).** EI is an important factor for better performance and growth of an individual **(Jorfi *et al*., 2010)**. Researchers in the fields of finance, marketing, and HR are more concerned about EI due to its direct impact on organisational growth **(Beigi and Shirmohammadi, 2011; Wu, 2011; Bande *et al.*, 2015).** So, it has become pivotal to analyse the EI of employees while studying their life satisfaction.

Emotional Intelligence and Life Satisfaction

Emotional intelligence has gained significant attention in the field of management, as it is believed to play a crucial role in employees' overall well-being and satisfaction in their work lives **(Hac, 2019).** Research studies have shown that employees with high levels of emotional intelligence tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction, engagement, and overall well-being in the workplace **(Di Fabio *et al.,* 2012).** Employees with high EI are in touch with their emotions and can regulate them in a way that promotes well-being and the ability to cope with environmental demands, leading to a more balanced life **(Waite and Gallagher, 2001).** This study of EI and subjective well-being (SWB) may provide insight into the mechanisms by which people use emotional information to engage in a more satisfied and happier life **(Diener *et al.*, 2003).** EI proves to be a better tool for individual-level analysis in organisations because it helps in evaluating the impact of the workplace on its employees, which contributes to their life satisfaction **(Bali and Raj, 2019).** Even **Naseem (2018)** proves that employees with higher emotional intelligence will perceive less stress and a higher level of happiness and life satisfaction. He also found out that married males are more efficient in controlling stress with EI than females. It is widely acknowledged that people with high levels of emotional intelligence report higher levels of life satisfaction **(Lopez-Zafra *et al.*, 2019).** A meta-analysis revealed that people with high EI, especially emotional clarity and mood repair, are more likely to experience higher levels of life satisfaction than those who are less emotionally intelligent **(Extremera *et al.*, 2011)**. Emotional intelligence has also been found to be a positive predictor of life satisfaction in adolescents **(Guasp Coll *et al.*, 2020),** undergraduates **(Ain *et al.*, 2021),** teachers **(Luque-Reca *et al.*, 2022),** and adults from China (**Kong *et al.*, 2020**). Conversely, in the study of **Holinka (2015),** emotional intelligence is negatively correlated with life satisfaction. So, on the basis of the above literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: Emotional intelligence is not significantly related to life satisfaction.

Self-efficacy

The term 'self-efficacy' has been defined by various researchers throughout the literature. According to **Bandura (1977)**, self-efficacy refers to the strong belief of an individual about their abilities to perform a particular job successfully. **Liu *et al.* (2011)** depict it as a judgement of what one can do with them. In the words of **Hussain *et al.* (2022),** self-efficacy can be defined as the faith of a person to perform certain work. If a person has a high sense of self-efficacy, they may have a negative relationship with failure. Even **Bakker and Demerouti (2017)** state that highly efficacious people can deal with unforeseen situations because they believe they will have a positive outcome. It is important for organisations to build a culture that helps employees maximise their self-efficacy because it ultimately contributes to organisational success **(Hadi, 2023).**

Self-efficacy and Life Satisfaction

A person with high self-efficacy can face various difficulties **(Liu *et al.*, 2021),** experience a psychological flow, and lead a more satisfying life. Self-efficacy has a significant impact on life satisfaction **(Suldo and Huebner, 2006)**. Researchers contend that self-efficacy is positively related to life satisfaction because of the positive emotion and satisfaction people feel when they perform well in a specific domain **(Lent *et al.*, 2005).** In the study of

Gayathri and Karthikeyan (2016), high self-efficacy leads to work-family enrichment and family-work enrichment, this leads to life satisfaction. Recent studies have found that general self-efficacy is strongly related to the life satisfaction of college students **(Azizli *et al*., 2015)**. In the work of **Wright *et al*. (2017)** findings indicates that students with greater avoidant anxiety attachment patterns reported lower levels of career decision self-efficacy and coping efficacy, which then has a positive relationship with life satisfaction. Even **Tian *et al*. (2022)** indicates that recreation specialisation and self-efficacy have a direct and positive effect on runners' flow experience, and recreation specialisation, self-efficacy, and flow experience are positively associated with runners' life satisfaction. Based on the preceding empirical proof and theoretical approach, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Self-efficacy is not significantly related to Life Satisfaction

Methodological issues

A quantitative cross-sectional survey was used to collect data about the study of the life satisfaction of the faculty of the top 100 National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF) institutes in India. Institutions covered under the NIRF represent top-performing institutes that ensure the highest quality of universities and higher education systems **(Docampo, 2013),** and for better ranking coverage, the Ministry of Education has identified various parameters for the institutions, such as sanctioned and approved intake, outreach and executive development programmes, sponsored research projects and industrial consulting projects, faculty members received highly reputed national/international awards, research publications and citations, patents filed and granted, etc. **(Ali, 2022). To** fulfil these parameters, faculties are supposed to perform all such duties, which are additional to teaching. This additional workload becomes the reason for the work-life imbalance and makes faculty emotionally exhausted, resulting in dissatisfaction in life. A convenience sampling method has been used to collect the data. A total sample size of 200 married couples, aged between 25 and 55 years and having children aged 1–15 years, has been collected.

Data collection

A structured questionnaire that is cross-culturally valid has been used to collect data from the respondents between February and April 2024. Data has been collected from the faculty of NIT Jalandhar, Guru Nanak Dev University, Punjab, Punjab University, Chandigarh University, Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, Delhi University, IIT Bombay, IIT Ropar, IIT Madras, IIT Dhanbad, IIT Mandi, IIT Indore, IIT Varanasi, NIT Wrangal, NIT Calicut, Mumbai University, Anna University, Chennai, Satyambha Institute of Science and Technology, Chennai, and Jadavpur University, Kolkata. Most of the data has been collected with the help of a Google Form sent through email to the institutes that are outside Punjab, and the rest of the data has been collected by adopting the drop-off/pick-up method of questionnaires for the respondents at the various institutes that lie in Punjab. **Junod and Jacquet (2023)** confirm that this approach has been deemed appropriate as it reduces decline rates and non-response bias in surveys.

Work-life balance has been measured by using the work-non-work balance crafting scale developed by **Kerksieck *et al*. (2022),** which contains 16 items and has three dimensions

named emotional crafting, physical crafting, and relational crafting. Items on this scale have been rated on a five-point Likert scale (5 being strongly agreed and 1 being strongly disagreed). The reliability of this scale is 0.74, which is statistically significant. Similarly, emotional intelligence has been measured using the scale of the Schutte self-report emotional intelligence test (SSEIT), developed by **Schutte (1998).** This scale contains 33 items divided into four dimensions, such as perception of emotions, managing one's own emotions, managing others emotions, and utilising emotions. These items are rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability of this scale is 0.90. The 10 items of the revisit general self-efficacy scale developed by **Zhou (2016)** have been adapted to assess self-efficacy. It includes two dimensions: action self-efficacy and coping self-efficacy. These items have been rated on a five-point Likert scale (5 being strongly agreed and 1 being strongly disagreed). The reliability of this scale is satisfactory, i.e., 0.89. Life satisfaction has been measured using the scale of the life satisfaction instrument developed by **Na-Nan and Wongwiwatthananukit (2020).** It contains 18 items, which are divided into four dimensions: relationships with family and others, life and society, personal life and working life, and self-development. Items on this scale have been assessed using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reliability of this scale is 0.855, which is statistically significant.

The data gathered from the survey has been entered into an Excel spreadsheet and exported to SPSS. Although scales are reliable, to assess the reliability of the data, the test-retest method has been used. After that, descriptive, correlation and factor analysis has been used as a statistical measure.

Analysis and results

Reliability

Reliability is a method which measures the stability and accuracy of the results of an analysis on repeated trials **(Garver and Mentzer, 1999).** To ensure the reliability of the data, a '4-week' test-retest reliability method has been conducted on 30 faculty of higher education institutes in India. In Table 1, Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) has been computed to check test-retest reliability.

S. No.	Variables	r
1	Perception of emotion	0.842
2	Managing own emotions	0.746
3	Managing others' emotions	0.812
4	Utilization of emotions	0.982
5	Action Self-efficacy	0.712
6	Coping self-efficacy	0.832
7	Emotional Crafting	0.767
8	physical Crafting	0.845
9	Relational Crafting	0.912
10	Relationship with family and other people	0.856
11	Personal life	0.718
12	Life and Society	0.945

			Table-I
13	Working life and self-development	0.825	**test-retest**

After confirming the reliability, a descriptive test has now been applied to check the normality of the data. It helps researchers understand the distribution and characteristics of the variables under investigation**.** Table 2 depicts the result of descriptive analysis, which confirms the normality of the data and permits the use of other statistical tools to analyse the data.

Descriptive Analysis

Table II shows the descriptive analysis of the study which includes mean (M), standard deviation (SD), skewness and kurtosis of the variables to ensure the normal distribution of the data.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	
Perception of emotion	200	36.75	4.589	-0.121	0.466	
Managing own emotions	200	36.4	4.083	-0.014	-0.215	
Managing others' emotions	200	31.58	3.963	-0.489	1.080	
Utilization of emotions	200	24.23	3.168	-0.444	0.646	
Action Self-efficacy	200	19.96	2.877	-0.826	2.461	
Coping self-efficacy	200	18.98	3.227	-0.517	0.288	
Emotional Crafting	200	30.32	3.896	-0.074	-0.288	
physical Crafting	200	7.67	1.610	-0.641	0.655	
Relational Crafting	200	22.23	3.462	-0.087	0.021	
Relationship with family and other people	200	25.24	3.191	-0.392	0.01	
Personal life	200	14.87	2.995	-0.498	0.066	
Life and Society	200	12.08	2.098	-0.497	-0.148	
Working life and self-development	200	21.05	2.752	-0.425	0.305	**Table-II Descriptive Analysis**

From the above table, the value for perception of emotions (M=36.75, S.D=4.580), for managing own emotions (M=36.40, S.D=4.083), for managing others emotions (M=31.58, S.D=3.963), for

utilisation of emotions (M=24.23, S.D=3.168), for action self-efficacy (M=19.96, S.D=2.877), for coping self-efficacy (M=18.98, S.D=3.227), for emotional crafting (M=30.32, S.D=3.896), for physical crafting (M=7.67, S.D=1.610), for relational crafting (M=22.23, S.D=3.462), for relationship with family and others (M=25.24, S.D=3.191), for personal life (M=14.87, S.D=2.995), for life and society (M=12.08, S.D=2.098) and for working life and self development (M=21.05, S.D= 2.752) has been shown. The data has been checked for normality by comparing the skewness and kurtosis of the interval-scaled items, and it is clear from the above table that all items lie within the required range, i.e., between +3 and -3. Thus, it can be concluded that the data is normally distributed.

Correlation Analysis

Table III shows the correlation analysis between independent and dependent variables of the study

	Variables	Relationship with family and other people	Personal life	Life and Society	Working life and self-development	Overall Life satisfaction
	Work-life balance (WLB)	0.424	0.325	0.365	0.340	0.470
	1. Emotional Crafting	0.382	0.294	0.257	0.238	0.385
	2. Physical Crafting	0.066	0.101	0.083	0.166	0.133
	3. Relational Crafting	0.399	0.282	0.413	0.346	0.459
	Emotional Intelligence (E.I.)	0.474	0.327	0.391	0.369	0.505
	1. Perception of emotion	0.323	0.169	0.149	0.211	0.284
	2. Managing own emotions	0.423	0.295	0.430	0.422	0.502
	3. Managing others' emotions	0.442	0.338	0.421	0.322	0.489
	4. Utilization of emotions	0.387	0.301	0.312	0.270	0.413
	Self-efficacy (S.E.)	0.413	0.33	0.444	0.481	0.533
	1. Action S.E.	0.401	0.324	0.408	0.462	0.511
Table-III	2. Coping S.E.	0.355	0.28	0.403	0.419	0.464

Correlation Analysis	**Source(s):** Table by authors

Pallant (2020), provide the guidelines for the value of r. According to him, if the value of r = 0.10 to 0.29, then the correlation is small, r = 0.30 to 0.49 indicates a medium correlation, and if the value of r= 0.50 to 1.0, it indicates a large value of correlation coefficient. The correlation results presented in Table 3 show that all variables of the study are significantly and positively correlated. Specifically, results show that work-life balance and life satisfaction (r= 0.470 and p < 0.01), emotional intelligence and life satisfaction (r= 0.505 and p < 0.01), self-efficacy and life satisfaction (r= 0.533 and p < 0.01) are significantly related to each other.

Along with this test, Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) has been conducted to assist factor analysis and assess the eligibility of the data. Table 4 indicates the KMO value, i.e., 0.877, which is greater than 0.500, and Bartlett's test value, which is less than 0.05, i.e., 0.000. These values imply many acceptable results for conducting factor analysis.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling Adequacy		0.877
Barlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-square	1106.2
	Df	78
Table - IV KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity	Sig.	0
	Source(s): Study are original works by the authors	

Factor analysis has been done in SPSS. With the help of the principal component analysis method, three factors have been extracted (with eigen values higher than 1), explaining 62.03% of the variance. Table 5 lists the 13 variables that have been determined to be significant enough to affect the dependent variable (i.e., life satisfaction). Variables are grouped and ordered by size of loading to make interpretation easier. Items with loadings lower than 0.300 and those loading on multiple components have been removed.

Factor Analysis

	Components			
	Variables	**1**	**2**	**3**
	Managing own emotions	0.782	0.308	0.131
	Perception of emotion	0.779	-0.033	0.171
	Managing others' emotions	0.74	0.26	0.322
	Utilization of emotions	0.654	0.19	0.291
Table-V: Factor analysis	Action Self-efficacy	0.644	0.417	0.001
	Coping self-efficacy	0.638	0.395	-0.028
	Relational Crafting	0.477	0.417	0.167

Life and Society	0.233	0.756	0.01
Personal life	0.055	0.744	0.184
Working life and self-development	0.223	0.709	0.058
Relationship with family and other people	0.305	0.702	0.088
physical Crafting	0.103	0.017	0.882
Emotional Crafting	0.371	0.248	0.716

Discussion

There are four objectives of this study. The first objective is to analyse the impact of work-life balance on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India. The second goal is to analyse the impact of emotional intelligence on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India. The third aim is to analyse the impact of self-efficacy on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India, and the last aim is to identify the most dominant variable that affects life satisfaction the most.

With respect to the first objective, the outcomes of this study are in line with other studies such as **Zheng *et al. (2015)*, and Kong *et al*. (2020).** The results of correlation analyses indicate that work-life balance is significantly and positively correlated with life satisfaction among faculty. The results indicate that faculty of higher education institutes who live a balanced life by adopting the crafting approach have a higher level of life satisfaction. These results align with the bottom-up approach, demonstrating that overall life satisfaction is a total of satisfaction in different domains of life. Specifically, dimensions of the work-life balance crafting approach, such as emotional crafting and relational crafting, have a significant impact on life satisfaction, but physical crafting is not significantly related to life satisfaction. This result indicates that when an individual attempts to balance his or her work and non-work domains of life, he or she can use strategies of emotional and relational crafting such as alteration of their perception towards work, creating positive emotions at work **(Zhang & Parker, 2019),** maintaining relationships at work and at home **(Struges, 2012), etc**. This kind of crafting helps in creating work-life balance, which, as a result, contributes to increasing life satisfaction. As shown in Table 3, emotional and relational crafting is positively and significantly correlated with life satisfaction and its dimensions. This output emphasises that if an employee uses emotional and relational crafting strategies, it will result in better relationships with family and others, greater personal satisfaction, a better image in society, and help to improve working life and hence, increase life satisfaction.

But on the other hand, strategies of physical crafting such as working from home **(Kaufman-Scarborough, 2006),** adopting portable technology such as mobile phones, tabs, etc. **(Golden and Geisler, 2007),** and reducing the number of working days **(Roberts, 2008)** are not so effective in addressing the work-life balance issue. This result indicates that when employees shape their own work-life balance, physical crafting strategies do not contribute to increasing life satisfaction. So, this study does not support H1.

With regard to the second objective, this study indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. The findings of this study are consistent with various previous findings **(Ignat and Clipa, 2012; Sun *et al*., 2014;**

Urquijo *et al***., 2016).** On the basis of the result of this study, emotional intelligence with four dimensions, such as perceived emotions, managing one's own emotions, managing other emotions, and utilising emotions, is able to examine its unique contribution to life satisfaction. First, perception of emotion is significantly and positively correlated with relationships with family and others but has a medium relationship with working life and self-development and a weak relationship with personal life, life, and society. This result signifies that if an employee has the capacity and ability to recognise and identify emotions in others, they can have better relationships with their family members and other people, which helps strengthen their working life but is not so effective in enhancing their personal and social lives. On the other hand, another dimension of emotional intelligence, i.e., managing one's own emotions, is positively and significantly correlated with each dimension of life satisfaction. This output depicts that if an employee has the skill to deal with their own emotions, it can lead to high life satisfaction. The third dimension of emotional intelligence, managing others emotions, is also positively and significantly correlated with all the dimensions of life satisfaction, which implies that if an employee can regulate others emotions to meet the expectations of a particular role or situation, they can achieve satisfaction in every domain of life, which ultimately contributes to life satisfaction. And the last dimension of emotional intelligence is the utilisation of emotions, which is also significantly and positively correlated with all dimensions of life satisfaction. This result states that when an employee makes adaptive use of emotion arousal, it leads to higher life satisfaction. So, overall, this study indicates that emotional intelligence has a strong and positive relationship with life satisfaction. Hence, this study rejects H2.

The third objective of this study is to analyse the impact of self-efficacy on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India. Self-efficacy refers to the strong belief of an individual to perform a particular task successfully **(Bandura, 1977)** and can deal with unforeseen situations with positive attitude which ultimately affects their satisfaction level. The result of this study indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and life satisfaction. It means that faculties that score high on self-efficacy will have a high level of life satisfaction. This result is consistent with the results of other studies, such as Dora (2003), Cutler **(2005), Lightsey** *et al. (2013),* **Azizli** *et al. (2015),* **and Medrano-Urena** *et al.* **(2020).** On the basis of this study, self-efficacy has two dimensions: action self-efficacy and coping self-efficacy, both of which are positively and significantly correlated with all dimensions of life satisfaction. This result provides evidence that if an individual has confidence in their ability to successfully perform an action and has the ability to cope effectively with life challenges, they can successfully create good relationships with family and other people, enhance their personal and social lives, and grow in their working lives. In short, self-efficacy helps in achieving life satisfaction. The result of this study aligns with the top-down approach, which states that overall satisfaction with life is influenced by an internal set of factors. Hence, H3 is rejected.

To fulfil the fourth objective, the statistical tool of factor analysis has been used to identify the pattern of the most dominant factor in life satisfaction. As presented in Table 5, three components are extracted. According to the first component, when an individual score high on emotional intelligence, is highly self-efficacious, and is also capable of creating work-life balance, they can achieve life satisfaction, especially in context with their relationships with family and other people. So, to achieve life satisfaction, an individual has to be emotionally intelligent, self-efficacious, and have a good work-life balance. The second component

indicates that an individual can be satisfied in life if he or she is efficacious in action and can do relational crafting well. So, according to this component, to achieve satisfaction in life, an individual has to be self-efficacious and adopt relational crafting strategies. And the third component identifies that for good work-life balance, an individual has to score high on managing others emotions, which means that if an individual knows how to regulate the emotions of others, they can create good work-life balance.

Conclusions

This paper aims to identify the impact of work-life balance, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy on the life satisfaction of faculty at higher education institutes in India. The findings indicate that all three variables have a significant and positive impact on life satisfaction. However, one dimension of work-life balance, i.e., physical crafting, is not statistically significant with the dimensions of life satisfaction. These findings highlight the importance of good work-life balance, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy in order to achieve satisfaction in life. The study contributes to the theoretical development of our understanding of work-life balance, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and life satisfaction and provides practical insights for organisations to retain more satisfied employees and promote employee well-being.

Implications

It will be an insightful study for the government, management, and educational institutes to better understand the various factors that contribute to faculty life satisfaction. This insight will help in retaining employees for long term and enhancing their performance. It will assist them in understanding the importance of work-life balance, as well as emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, and their subsequent impact on their faculty's life satisfaction. The implications will be significant for faculty as well. They will be able to work on their own emotional intelligence and self-efficacy, increasing their life satisfaction and, as a result, their performance.

Limitations and future research areas

This study has used national-level data to identify the relationship between work-life balance, emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy and the life satisfaction of faculty at the top 100 NIRF institutes in India. However, these data have been collected from 20 institutes in India that fall under the top 100 categories. Future research should consider more institutes to generalise the results. Another limitation of this study is that it relies on cross-sectional data and uses quantitative data analysis to analyse the relationship between study variables. So, other studies should conduct qualitative research, which provides more comprehensive descriptions of the opinions provided by respondents.

References

Ain, N. U., Munir, M., & Suneel, I. (2021). Role of emotional intelligence and grit in life satisfaction. *Heliyon*, *7*(4), e06829.

Akter, K., Ali, M., & Chang, A. (2020). Work–life programmes and organisational

outcomes: the role of the human resource system. *Personnel Review*, *49*(2), 516-536.

ALI, M. G. A. (2022). Detailed Review of National Institute Ranking Framework (NIRF) India Rankings including Uncertainty and Sensitivity. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, *7*(Special Issue (December 2022)), 418-428.

Aloulou, W. J., Amari, A., Ramadani, V., & Alboqami, A. A. N. (2023). Saudi teleworkers and determinant factors of their work-life balance and satisfaction: Testing a sequential mediation model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *188*, 122312.

Anafarta, N. (2011). The relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A structural equation modeling (SEM) approach. *International journal of business and management*, *6*(4), 168-177.

Anderson, S. E., Coffey, B. S., & Byerly, R. T. (2002). Formal organizational initiatives and informal workplace practices: Links to work–family conflict and job-related outcomes. *Journal of management*, *28*(6), 787-810.

Annink, A., Den Dulk, L., & Steijn, B. (2016). Work–family conflict among employees and the self-employed across Europe. *Social indicators research*, *126*, 571-593.

Antonioni, D. (1996). Designing an effective 360-degree appraisal feedback process. *Organizational dynamics*, *25*(2), 24-38.

Aquino, J. A., Russell, D. W., Cutrona, C. E., & Altmaier, E. M. (1996). Employment status, social support, and life satisfaction among the elderly. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *43*(4), 480.

Arias-Gallegos, W. L., Huamani-Cahua, J. C., & Caycho-Rodríguez, T. (2018). Satisfaction with life in school children in the city of Arequipa. Purposes and Representations, *6*(1), 351-407.

Azizli, N., Atkinson, B. E., Baughman, H. M., & Giammarco, E. A. (2015). Relationships between general self-efficacy, planning for the future, and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *82*, 58-60.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *22*(3), 273.

Bali, Y., & Raj, S. (2019). A review on the role of emotional intelligence in different management environments. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, *8*(3).

Bande, B., Fernández-Ferrín, P., Varela, J. A., & Jaramillo, F. (2015). Emotions and salesperson propensity to leave: The effects of emotional intelligence and resilience. *Industrial marketing management*, *44*, 142-153.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, *52*(1), 1-26.

Beigi, M., & Shirmohammadi, M. (2011). Effects of an emotional intelligence training program on service quality of bank branches. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, *21*(5), 552-567.

Best, S., & Chinta, R. (2021). Work–life balance and life satisfaction among the self-employed. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *28*(7), 995-1011.

Boles, J. S., Johnston, M. W., & Hair Jr, J. F. (1997). Role stress, work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion: Inter-relationships and effects on some work-related consequences. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, *17*(1), 17-28.

Cain, L., Busser, J., & Kang, H. J. A. (2018). Executive chefs' calling: effect on engagement, work-life balance and life satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *30*(5), 2287-2307.

Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, *56*(2), 249-276.

Casper, W. J., Vaziri, H., Wayne, J. H., DeHauw, S., & Greenhaus, J. (2018). The jingle-jangle of work–nonwork balance: A comprehensive and meta-analytic review of its meaning and measurement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(2), 182.

Cutler, C. G. (2005). Self-efficacy and social adjustment of patients with mood disorder. *Journal of the american psychiatric nurses association*, *11*(5), 283-289.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, *95*(3), 542.

Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual review of psychology*, *54*(1), 403-425.

Di Fabio, A., Palazzeschi, L., & Bar-On, R. (2012). The role of personality traits, core self-evaluation, and emotional intelligence in career decision-making difficulties. *Journal of employment counseling*, *49*(3), 118-129.

Docampo, D. (2013). Reproducibility of the Shanghai academic ranking of world universities results. *Scientometrics*, *94*(2), 567-587.

Dora, S. (2003). The adaptation of social problem-solving inventory (revised form) into

Turkish: Validity and reliability studies. *Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.*

Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980–2002). *Journal of vocational behavior*, *66*(1), 124-197.

Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., & Mansfield, L. R. (2012). Whistle while you work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of management*, *38*(4), 1038-1083.

Extremera, N., Ruiz-Aranda, D., Pineda-Galán, C., & Salguero, J. M. (2011). Emotional intelligence and its relation with hedonic and eudaimonic well-being: A prospective study. *Personality and individual differences*, *51*(1), 11-16.

Garver, M. S., & Mentzer, J. T. (1999). Logistics research methods: employing structural equation modeling to test for construct validity. *Journal of business logistics*, *20*(1), 33.

Gayathri, N., & Karthikeyan, P. (2016). The role of self-efficacy and social support in improving life satisfaction. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*.

Golden, A. G., & Geisler, C. (2007). Work–life boundary management and the personal digital assistant. *human relations*, *60*(3), 519-551.

Goleman, D. (1995), Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ, Bloomsbury, London.

Gragnano, A., Simbula, S., & Miglioretti, M. (2020). Work–life balance: weighing the importance of work–family and work–health balance. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(3), 907.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Kossek, E. E. (2014). The contemporary career: A work–home perspective. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 361-388.

Gregory, A., & Milner, S. E. (2009). Work-life balance: a matter of choice?. *gender, Work and Organization*, *16*(1).

Guasp Coll, M., Navarro-Mateu, D., Giménez-Espert, M. D. C., & Prado-Gascó, V. J. (2020). Emotional intelligence, empathy, self-esteem, and life satisfaction in Spanish adolescents: regression vs. QCA models. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 1629.

Gu, H., Wen, Z., & Fan, X. (2020). Investigating the multidimensionality of the work-related flow inventory (WOLF): a bifactor exploratory structural equation modeling framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 740.

Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S.

(2021). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using R: A workbook* (p. 197).

Hac, R. (2019). Psychological aspects of the recruitment of administrative personnel and services in a regional airport. *Zeszyty Naukowe. Transport/Politechnika Śląska*.

Hadi, P. (2023). The influence of self-efficacy on employee performance mediated by work motivation and work engagement. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478)*, *12*(2), 653-661.

Hagqvist, E., Gådin, K. G., & Nordenmark, M. (2017). Work–family conflict and well-being across Europe: The role of gender context. *Social Indicators Research*, *132*, 785-797.

Hodzic, S., Scharfen, J., Ripoll, P., Holling, H., & Zenasni, F. (2018). How efficient are emotional intelligence trainings: A meta-analysis. *Emotion Review, 10*(2), 138–148.

Holinka, C. (2015). Stress, emotional intelligence, and life satisfaction in college students. *College Student Journal*, *49*(2), 300-311.

Hussain, M. S., Khan, S. A., & Bidar, M. C. (2022). Self-Efficacy of Teachers: A review of the literature. *Multi-Disciplinary Research Journal*, 2320-2750.

Ignat, A. A., & Clipa, O. (2012). Teachers' satisfaction with life, job satisfaction and their emotional intelligence. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *33*, 498-502.

Ismail, Y., & Yeo, L.K. Soon-Yew (2016). Occupational stress features, emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: an empirical study in private institutions of higher learning. *Scientific e-journal of Management Science, 16* (5), 5-33.

Jex, S. M., & Bliese, P. D. (1999). Efficacy beliefs as a moderator of the impact of work-related stressors: a multilevel study. *Journal of applied psychology*, *84*(3), 349.

Jorfi, H., Jorfi, S., &Moghadam, K. (2010). Impact of emotional intelligence on performance of employees. *Postmodern Openings*, *1*(4), 63-74.

Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of applied psychology*, *78*(6), 939.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Erez, A., & Locke, E. A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: the role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of applied psychology*, *90*(2), 257.

Junod, A. N., & Jacquet, J. B. (2023). Insights for the drop-off/pick-up method to improve data collection. *Society & Natural Resources*, *36*(1), 76-88.

Karabchuk, T., & Soboleva, N. (2020). Temporary employment, informal work and subjective well-being across Europe: Does labor legislation matter? *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *21*(5), 1879-1901.

Kar, S., & Misra, K. C. (2013). Nexus between work life balance practices and employee retention-The mediating effect of a supportive culture. *Asian social science*, *9*(11), 63.

Kalliath, T., & Brough, P. (2008). Work–life balance: A review of the meaning of the balance construct. *Journal of management & organization*, *14*(3), 323-327.

Kaufman-Scarborough, C. (2006). Time use and the impact of technology: Examining workspaces in the home. *Time & Society*, *15*(1), 57-80.

Khan, R., Naseem, A., & Masood, S. A. (2016). Effect of continuance commitment and organizational cynicism on employee satisfaction in engineering organizations. *International journal of innovation, management and technology*, *7*(4), 141.

Keeney, J., Boyd, E. M., Sinha, R., Westring, A. F., & Ryan, A. M. (2013). From "work–family" to "work–life": Broadening our conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *82*(3), 221-237.

Kelliher, C., Richardson, J., & Boiarintseva, G. (2019). All of work? All of life? Reconceptualising work-life balance for the 21st century. *Human resource management journal*, *29*(2), 97-112.

Kerksieck, P., Brauchli, R., de Bloom, J., Shimazu, A., Kujanpää, M., Lanz, M., & Bauer, G. F. (2022). Crafting work-nonwork balance involving life domain boundaries: Development and validation of a novel scale across five countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 892120.

Kong, E., Hassan, Z., & Bandar, N. F. A. (2020). The mediating role of leisure satisfaction between work and family domain and work-life balance. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*, *6*(1), 44-66.

Kuykendall, L., Tay, L., & Ng, V. (2015). Leisure engagement and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, *141*(2), 364.

Lakshmi, K. S., & Kumar, N. S. (2011). Work life balance of women employee-with reference to teaching faculty. In *E-Proceedings for 2011 International Research Conference and Colloquium* (pp. 22-58).

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Sheu, H. B., Schmidt, J., Brenner, B. R., Gloster, C. S., & Treistman, D. (2005). Social cognitive predictors of academic interests and goals in engineering: Utility for women and students at historically black universities. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *52*(1), 84.

Lexell, J. E., & Downham, D. Y. (2005). How to assess the reliability of measurements in

rehabilitation. *American journal of physical medicine & rehabilitation*, *84*(9), 719-723.

Lightsey, O. R., McGhee, R., Ervin, A., Gharibian Gharghani, G., Rarey, E. B., Daigle, R. P., & Powell, K. (2013). Self-efficacy for affect regulation as a predictor of future life satisfaction and moderator of the negative affect—Life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *14*, 1-18.

Liu, H., Song, G., & Wang, D. (2011). The influence of self-efficacy on flight dispatchers' stressor-strain relationships. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *39*(6), 839-850.

Liu, J., Li, Q., Sun, X., Zhu, Z., & Xu, Y. (2021). Factors influencing programming self-efficacy: an empirical study in the context of Mainland China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 1-15.

Lopez-Zafra, E., Ramos-Álvarez, M. M., El Ghoudani, K., Luque-Reca, O., Augusto-Landa, J. M., Zarhbouch, B., & Pulido-Martos, M. (2019). Social support and emotional intelligence as protective resources for well-being in Moroccan adolescents. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*, 1529.

Luque-Reca, O., García-Martínez, I., Pulido-Martos, M., Burguera, J. L., & Augusto-Landa, J. M. (2022). Teachers' life satisfaction: A structural equation model analyzing the role of trait emotion regulation, intrinsic job satisfaction and affect. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *113*, 103668.

Mayer, J. D., &Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional Intelligence,*17*(4), 433-442.

Medrano-Ureña, M. D. R., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Benítez-Sillero, J. D. D. (2020). Physical fitness, exercise self-efficacy, and quality of life in adulthood: a systematic review. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, *17*(17), 6343.

Michel, J. W., Tews, M. J., & Allen, D. G. (2019). Fun in the workplace: A review and expanded theoretical perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, *29*(1), 98-110.

Montag, C., & Panksepp, J. (2017). Primary emotional systems and personality: an evolutionary perspective. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 253148.

Na-Nan, K., & Wongwiwatthananukit, S. (2020). Development and validation of a life satisfaction instrument in human resource practitioners of Thailand. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *6*(3), 75.

Naseem, K. (2018). Job stress, happiness and life satisfaction: The moderating role of emotional intelligence empirical study in telecommunication sector Pakistan. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, *4*(1), 7-14.

Noda, H. (2020). Work–life balance and life satisfaction in OECD countries: A cross-sectional analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *21*(4), 1325-1348.

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.

Panda, N. K. (1963). Management of Time and Executive Behaviour. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, *9*(4), 691-698.

Pasupuleti, S., Allen, R. I., Lambert, E. G., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2009). The impact of work stressors on the life satisfaction of social service workers: A preliminary study. *Administration in social work*, *33*(3), 319-339.

Roberts, E. (2008). Time and work–life balance: the roles of 'temporal customization'and 'life temporality'. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *15*(5), 430-453.

Rode, J. C., Mooney, C. H., Arthaud-Day, M. L., Near, J. P., Baldwin, T. T., Rubin, R. S., & Bommer, W. H. (2007). Emotional intelligence and individual performance: Evidence of direct and moderated effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, *28*(4), 399-421.

Ruppanner, L. (2013). Conflict between work and family: An investigation of four policy measures. *Social Indicators Research*, *110*, 327-347.

Schutte, N. (1998). Schutte self-report emotional intelligence test (sseit). *Preuzeto*, *8*, 2017.

Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D. J. (2018). Work-life balance: An integrative review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, *13*, 229-254.

Stone, R. W., & Bailey, J. J. (2007). Team conflict self-efficacy and outcome expectancy of business students. *Journal of Education for Business*, *82*(5), 258-266.

Sturges, J. (2012). Crafting a balance between work and home. *Human relations*, *65*(12), 1539-1559.

Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Is extremely high life satisfaction during adolescence advantageous?. *Social indicators research*, *78*, 179-203.

Sun, P., Wang, S., & Kong, F. (2014). Core self-evaluations as mediator and moderator of the relationship between emotional intelligence and life satisfaction. *Social Indicators Research*, *118*, 173-180.

Tian, H., Zhou, W., Qiu, Y., & Zou, Z. (2022). The role of recreation specialization and self-efficacy on life satisfaction: the mediating effect of flow experience. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(6), 3243.

Toker, B. (2012). Life satisfaction among academicians: an empirical study on the universities of Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*, 190-195.

Urquijo, I., Extremera, N., & Villa, A. (2016). Emotional intelligence, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being in graduates: The mediating effect of perceived stress. *Applied research in quality of life*, *11*, 1241-1252.

Valery, M. B., Santati, P., & Hadjri, M. I. (2023). The Influence of Work-Life Balance on Employee Performance:(Empirical Study at Telkomsel Regional Sumbagsel Office). *JPIM (Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Manajemen)*, *8*(2), 208-217.

Waite, L., & Gallagher, M. (2001). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier and better off financially*.

Wayne, J. H., Butts, M. M., Casper, W. J., & Allen, T. D. (2017). In search of balance: A conceptual and empirical integration of multiple meanings of work–family balance. *Personnel Psychology*, *70*(1), 167-210.

Wayne, J. H., Grzywacz, J. G., Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2007). Work–family facilitation: A theoretical explanation and model of primary antecedents and consequences. *Human resource management review*, *17*(1), 63-76.

Wright, S. L., Firsick, D. M., Kacmarski, J. A., & Jenkins-Guarnieri, M. A. (2017). Effects of attachment on coping efficacy, career decision self-efficacy, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *95*(4), 445-456.

Wu, Y. C. (2011). Job stress and job performance among employees in the Taiwanese finance sector: The role of emotional intelligence. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *39*(1), 21-31.

Yadav, N. (2011). Emotional intelligence and its effects on job performance: A Comparative study on life insurance sales professionals. *International Journal of MultidisciplinaryResearch*, *1*(8), 248-260.

Zhang, F., & Parker, S. K. (2019). Reorienting job crafting research: A hierarchical structure of job crafting concepts and integrative review. *Journal of organizational behavior*, *40*(2), 126-146.

Zheng, C., Molineux, J., Mirshekary, S., & Scarparo, S. (2015). Developing individual and organisational work-life balance strategies to improve employee health and wellbeing. *Employee Relations*, *37*(3), 354-379.

Zhou, M. (2016). A revisit of general self-efficacy scale: Uni-or multi-dimensional?. *Current Psychology*, *35*, 427-436.

Zhou, C., Yue, X. D., Zhang, X., Shangguan, F., & Zhang, X. Y. (2021). Self-efficacy and mental health problems during COVID-19 pandemic: A multiple mediation model based on the Health Belief Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *179*, 110893.