

Impact of Work-family Spillover on Burnout

Dr. Luxmi^[1]

ABSTRACT

The main objectives of this paper were to study work family spillover and burnout of employees, to find the impact of work family spillover on burnout, to see the association of work family spillover and burnout vis-a-vis demographic factors and to find the relationship between sub-scales of work family spillover and burnout of employees in a few selected public and private sector banks. The scope of the study was public and private sector banks in and around Chandigarh. The sample comprised of 120 respondents drawn from four public and private sector banks. The results revealed a very significant positive correlation between work family spillover and burnout. Almost all the hypotheses concerning work-family spillover and burnout and their sub-scales vis-à-vis failed to be rejected.

Key Words: Work-Family Spillover, Burnout and Banking Sector Organizations

INTRODUCTION

Work family spillover is when factors at the workplace affect family functioning and vice-versa. Positive spillover refers to situations in which the satisfaction, energy, and sense of accomplishment derived from one domain transfers to another. On the contrary, negative spillover is the derived problems being carried over from one domain to another. Work family spillover creates a conflicting situation at home as well as work. Conflict between work and family is important for organizations and individuals because it is linked to negative consequences. For example, conflict between work and family is associated with increased absenteeism, increased turnover, decreased performance, and poorer physical and mental health.

Conceptually conflict between work and family is bi-directional. Most researchers make the distinction between what is termed work-family conflict, and what is termed family-work conflict. Work-to-family conflict occurs when experiences at work interfere with family life like extensive, irregular, or inflexible work hours, work overload and other forms of job stress, interpersonal conflict at work, extensive travel, career transitions, unsupportive supervisor or organization. Family-to-work conflict occurs when experiences in the family interfere with work life like presence of young children, primary responsibility for children, elder care responsibilities, interpersonal conflict within the family unit and unsupportive family members. Although these two forms of conflict-work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW) are strongly correlated with each other, more attention has been directed at WIF more than FIW. This may be because work demands are easier to quantify; that is, the boundaries and responsibilities of the family role is more elastic than the boundaries and responsibilities of the work role. Also, research has found that work roles are more likely to interfere with family roles than family roles are likely to interfere with work roles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cook & Minnotte (2008) suggested that gender interacts with the percentage of women in an industry predicting coworker support and supportive work-family culture. Gender also interacts with the percentage of women in an occupation predicting family-to-work conflict. Premeaux et al., (2007) found that a positive work-family culture may be perceived by employees to not only support the integration of their work and family lives, but also to value work-family integration. Studies have found that the age and number of children in a family affects work-family conflict. Family friendly policies availability will be positively related to job satisfaction, affective commitment, and continuance commitment. Frone, M.R. (2003) suggested that a mapping of behavioral and psychological involvement to specific dimensions of external and internal work family interference appears to be important when examining the general relation of role involvement to work-family interference.

Hammer et al., (2003) demonstrated that work-to-family conflict is primarily caused by work-related stressors and characteristics and that it predicts family-related affective and behavioral outcomes, while family-to-work conflict is caused by family related stressors and characteristics and predict work-related outcomes. Carlson & Frone (2003) suggested that both psychological and behavioral involvement factors influenced work interference with family. To reduce both internal work interference with family and internal family interference with work, individuals may need to be taught how to moderate their level of psychological investment in work and family. Marchese et al., (2002) found that companies and managers are confronted with work and family issues every day. Failure to resolve these conflicts has negative consequences for employees, their families, and organizations.

Grzywacz, et al., (2002) studied alternative conceptualizations and operationalizations of work-

^[1]Senior Assistant Professor, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh E-Mail: luxmimalodia@yahoo.com

family spillover that attenuate different types of measurement error. Although also reliant on self-report data, researchers have used co occurring stresses or the transmission of stress across life domains as more objective indicators of negative spillover. Negative spillover between work and family and the prevalence of work and family stress would increase across adulthood through midlife and then decline in the later stages of workforce participation as children are launched and parents die.

Yang et. al. (2000) argued that role-related self-conceptions not only moderate the relationship between demand and conflict but also have a direct impact on demand within a domain. Edwards & Rothbard (2000) emphasized that there can be a number of spillovers. Mood, values, behavior from one domain may affect the other domain, both positively as well as negatively. Resources such as time, attention, and energy are finite and those expended in one domain are unavailable for other. This constraint yields a negative direct relationship between work and family resources. Thompson C.A. (1999) examined that both work-family benefit availability and supportive work-family culture were positively related to affective commitment and negatively related to work-family conflict and intentions to leave the organization. In addition, the three culture dimensions were found to have unique relationships with these behaviors and attitudes. Scandura & Lankau (1997) found that conflict between work and family roles diminish employees' perceptions of quality of work life and the quality of family life which, in turn, can impact organizational outcomes such as productivity, absenteeism and turnover.

Burnout is a psychological term for the experience of long-term exhaustion and diminished interest. Research indicates general practitioners have the highest proportion of burnout cases. Maslach and Jackson (1981) conceptualised employee burnout as having three components:

1. Emotional exhaustion - feelings of being over extended and unable to cope;
2. Depersonalisation - the tendency to treat human beings as things; and
3. Reduced personal accomplishment - declining one's feelings of achievement in work.

Employee burnout can be thought of as a psychological process - a series of attitudinal and emotional reactions - that an employee goes through as a result of job related and personal experiences. Often the first sign of burnout is a feeling of being, emotionally exhausted from one's work. When asked to describe how she or he feels such an employee might mention feeling drained or used up, at the end of the rope, and physically fatigued. Waking up in the morning may be accompanied by a feeling of dread at the thought of having to put in another day on the job. Halbesleben and Buckley (2004) say that burnout is a psychological response to work stress that is

characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced feelings of personal accomplishment. Burnout has significant costs in terms of health and organizational consequences (International Labour Office, 1993). The increasing proportion of long-term disability-claims filed by workers as a result of burnout, have led to significant burdens for employees, employers and insurers worldwide (Maslach et al., 2001). In their paper, they review the burnout literature from 1993 to present, identifying important trends that have characterized the literature. They focus attention on theoretical models that explain the process of burnout, the measurement of burnout, means of reducing burnout, and directions for the future of burnout research.

Lee and Ashforth (1990) talked about the meaning of Maslach's three dimensions of Burnout. They examined the dimensionality of Maslach's (1982) 3 aspects of job burnout—emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, among a sample of supervisors and managers in the human services. The 3 aspects were found to be differentially related to other variables reflecting aspects of strain, stress coping, and self-efficacy in predictable and meaningful ways. The variables most strongly associated with the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization dimensions were generally negatively worded, whereas those most strongly associated with the Personal Accomplishment dimension were generally positively worded. Because depersonalization represents a defensive means of coping with the erosion of emotional energy, they predicted that depersonalization would be associated with a second defensive means of coping, escape. Escape, however, was not significantly associated with any of the burnout dimensions. The two means of coping may function as substitutes or complements, thus leading to an unstable set of associations

Cordes and Dougherty (1993) say that burnout is a unique type of stress syndrome, characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and diminished personal accomplishment. The article 'Prevention of burnout: New perspectives' by Maslach and Goldberg (1998), proposes two new approaches to the prevention of burnout that focus on the interaction between personal and situational factors. The first approach, based on the Maslach multidimensional model, focuses on the exact opposite of burnout: increasing engagement with work by creating a better "fit" between the individual and the job. The second approach draws from the decision-making literature and reframes burnout in terms of how perceptions of the risk of burnout may lead to suboptimal choices that actually increase the likelihood of burning out. These new approaches provide a more direct strategy for preventing burnout than typical uni-dimensional "stress" models because these new approaches (1) specify criteria for evaluating outcomes and (2) focus attention on the relationship between the person and the situation rather. Veerle (2001), explored that the depression was significantly related to

superiority, whereas no link was observed between the core symptom of burnout (i.e., emotional exhaustion) and superiority.

Jackson and Schuler (1983) believe that employee burnout has some extremely serious consequences for employees and employers. Fortunately there are a number of things that the personnel department can do—such as implementing participatory management programs like quality circles or conducting organizational surveys—to prevent employee burnout. *Maslach and Leiter (2005)* suggest that to fix burnout individuals first need to identify the areas in which their mismatches lie and then tailor solutions to improve the fit within each area. There are two paths to banishing burnout: the individual path and the organizational path. A good understanding of burnout is essential to keep the flame of compassion and dedication burning brightly. The authors believe that burnout is not a problem of individuals but of social environment in which they work. Workplaces shape how people interact with each other and how they carry out their jobs. *Schaible & Gecas (2010)* found that that value dissonance only exhibited independent effects on burn out rooted in depersonalization, whereas effects of emotional dissonance varied depending on the type of burn out under consideration.

Madhavi and Vimala (2011) examined that the work family issues significantly influenced all the dimensions of role stress except RE (Role Erison), PI (Personal Inadequacy), SRD (Self role distance), and RIN (Role inadequacy). *Lambert et al., (2009)* examined that strain-based conflict, behavior-based conflict, and family on work conflict all had positive associations with job burnout. Time-based conflict had a non-significant relationship with job burnout. *Ramasundaram and Ramasundaram (2011)* attempted to study the relationship between the work-thought interference as an antecedent, job stress as a consequence, and work life conflict as a mediator. Statistical analytical tools were administered to study the direct relationship and the indirect relationship through the work life conflict. It was found that all the variables were significant except work-thought interference and job stress and work family conflict behavior and job stress. The covariance matrix among the standard errors was significant between the variables. The model that produces an estimated covariance matrix that is within sampling variation of the observed covariance matrix is generally thought of as a good model and would be said to be fit. Then, the covariance among three dimensions of work life conflict was found to be significant.

Westman et al., (2001) investigated that sense of control was found to have a negative impact on burnout and on the spouse's undermining behavior and a positive impact on the spouse's sense of control. *Perrewe and Hochwarter (2001)* found that work interference with family frustrates the attainment of values in the family domain, and family interference with work frustrates the attainment of values in the work domain. Reducing

conflict in the workplace and at home is key in attaining one's personal and work values. *Deckard et al., (1994)* established that organizational measures, specifically, evaluative ratings of Workload/Scheduling and Input/Influence were the strongest predictors of emotional exhaustion. *Bacharach et al., (1991)* found that work-specific role stressors, such as work-based role conflict, ambiguity, overload, serve as predictors of job burnout and satisfaction. *Maslach and Jackson (1981)* examined public sector professionals inherently view their work environment, and, in turn, the relationship between work and family life, differently than their peers in the private sector, thus resulting in the possibility of a substantial self-selection effect. *Malik et al., (2010)* found that there was no significant effect of burnout at work, work life balance and work life conflict on doctors' turnover intentions. There was no significant affect of burnout at work on doctors' work life balance whereas it had a significant effect on the work life conflict and job satisfaction of doctors.

METHODOLOGY

Present Study

The above mentioned and other similar studies made the plot for the present study. This study is exploratory in nature. The present study is confined to cover two dimensions i.e. work family spillover and burnout. In order to conduct the study, top four banks were selected namely State Bank of India, Punjab National Bank, ICICI bank and HDFC Bank. A total of 120 respondents were taken (30 from each bank).

Research Objectives

- i) To study the level of work family spillover and burnout of employees in a few selected public and private sector banks.
- ii) To see the association of work family spillover and burnout of the employees with demographic factors i.e. age and total work experience in a few selected public and private sector banks.
- iii) To investigate the impact of work-family spillover on burnout of employees in a few selected public and private sector banks.
- iv) To find the relationship between sub-scales of work family spillover and burnout of employees in a few selected public and private sector banks.

Hypotheses

- H_{1a}** There is high level of work family spillover and burnout in few selected public and private sector banks.
- H_{2a}** There is an association of work family spillover and burnout with age of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.
- H_{3a}** There is an association of work family spillover and burnout with total work experience of employees.

H_{4a} Work-family spillover has negative and significant impact on the level of burnout of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

H_{5a} There is significant correlation between sub-scales of work-family spillover and burnout of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The research conducted at initial stages is exploratory in nature. This was done through secondary data collection through reviewing the previous research done relating to work family spillover and burnout. The purpose of the exploratory research is to progressively narrow down the scope of the research topic and to transform discovered problems into defined ones, incorporating specific research objectives. Since it is a correlational research, hence the scope of the research is to find out the extent of relationship between work family spillover and burnout of employees. The present examination was conducted on the data collected from few selected public and private sector banks.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Primary data was collected through preliminary interviews and questionnaires. The first part of the questionnaire focused on the work family spillover. The Questionnaire developed and validated by Netemeyer (2005) was used to undertake the study. This scale is covering two dimensions i.e. work family conflict and family work conflict. The second part of the questionnaire focused on burnout of the employees. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson was used to undertake the study. The scale is multidimensional, suggesting three subscales as follows:

- i) **Emotional Exhaustion** subscale describes feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work. An example is: "I feel burned out from my work"
- ii) **Depersonalization** subscale describes an unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipients of one's care and service. For example: "I worry that my job is hardening me emotionally"
- iii) **Personal Accomplishment** contains eight items that describe feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people. In contrast to the other two subscales, lower mean scores on this subscale correspond to higher degrees of experienced burnout.

The cronbach alpha coefficient of the scales was found to be 0.897 and .703 (Work Family Spillover and Burnout respectively).

DATA ANALYSIS

Preliminary Analysis: Data were examined for outliers and possible errors prior analysis, and none were detected.

The data also were screened for possible violations to assumptions of normality and linearity. No violations were found.

Table 1: Tests of Normality

		Burnout	Work Family Spillover
N		120	120
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	3.8407	3.4508
	Std. Deviation	.79468	1.08186
	Absolute	.118	.075
Most Extreme Differences	Positive	.118	.075
	Negative	-.095	-.036
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.293	.822
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.071	.509

The p value for both the variables was found to be p (Burnout) = .071 and P (Work Family Spillover) = .509. These results indicated that the data was normally distributed. Based on these results it was decided that the data was suitable for parametric tests.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

To arrive at pertinent analysis, the collected data was put to statistical analysis using SPSS package. The tools, which were employed to test the drafted hypothesis for analysis included: Descriptive Statistics, Independent t-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Correlation and regression. After scoring the questionnaire the data was tabulated for each variable being studied separately.

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

H_{1a} There is high level of work family spillover and burnout in few selected public and private sector banks.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Dimensions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
WF Spillover	120	1.20	6.10	3.4508	1.08186
WFC	120	1.00	7.00	3.8383	1.28215
FWC	120	1.00	6.40	3.0633	1.40515
BURNOUT	120	1.09	6.41	3.8407	.79468
EMOEXH	120	1.00	9.33	3.2250	1.42950
PERACCOM	117	1.00	3.50	2.0994	.68200
DEPRSON	120	1.00	6.40	2.8067	1.36362
Valid N (listwise)	117				

The table-1 represents the means scores of work-family spillover and burnout as well as all their sub-dimensions i.e. work-family spillover – work-family conflict and family-work conflict; burnout - emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. The means scores of work-family spillover and burnout as well as their sub-dimensions i.e. work-family spillover – work-

family conflict and family-work conflict; burnout - emotional exhaustion are above the scale mean (3). The level of Work-family spillover among employees is high with a mean of 3.45. The level of sub-dimension i.e. work-family conflict is highest with mean 3.83, followed closely by family-work conflict (3.06). This shows that the employees exhibit high work-family spillover. The overall level of burnout is 3.84. With regards sub-scales of burnout; the level of emotional exhaustion is the highest with a mean of 3.22, followed by depersonalization (2.80) and the lowest is personal accomplishment with a mean of 2.09. This shows that the first hypothesis is partially accepted.

H_{2a} There is an association of work family spillover and Burnout with age of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

Table 3: ANOVA

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
WFC	Between Groups	34.828	3	11.609	8.375	.000
	Within Groups	160.795	116	1.386		
	Total	195.624	119			
FWC	Between Groups	6.773	3	2.258	1.148	.333
	Within Groups	228.185	116	1.967		
	Total	234.959	119			
WF Spillover	Between Groups	18.018	3	6.006	5.745	.001
	Within Groups	121.262	116	1.045		
	Total	139.280	119			
BURNOUT	Between Groups	3.858	3	1.286	1.794	.152
	Within Groups	83.173	116	.717		
	Total	87.031	119			

The results of ANOVA (table 3) suggested a significant difference in the work family spillover and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. work family conflict, among different age levels (below 18, 18-25, 25-30, 30-35, above 35), getting p- value less than .05 (p equals to .001 and .000 respectively). Therefore the second hypothesis (H2a), that there is an association of work family spillover and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. work family conflict, among different age levels, is rejected. The results further suggested no significant difference in the burnout and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict, among different age levels (below 18, 18-25, 25-30, 30-35, above 35), getting p- value more than .05 (p equals to .152 and .333 and .000 respectively). Therefore the second hypothesis (H4a), that there is an association of burnout and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict, among different age levels, is not rejected or may be accepted.

H_{3a} There is an association of work family spillover and Burnout with total work experience of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

Table 4: ANOVA

Dimensions		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
WFC	Between Groups	18.810	3	6.270	4.114	.008
	Within Groups	176.813	116	1.524		
	Total	195.624	119			
FWC	Between Groups	13.555	3	4.518	2.367	.074
	Within Groups	221.404	116	1.909		
	Total	234.959	119			
WF Spillover	Between Groups	14.162	3	4.721	4.377	.006
	Within Groups	125.118	116	1.079		
	Total	139.280	119			
BURNOUT	Between Groups	13.096	3	4.365	6.849	.000
	Within Groups	73.935	116	.637		
	Total	87.031	119			

The results of ANOVA (table 4) suggested a significant difference in the burnout, work family spillover and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. work family conflict, among different experience levels (0-1 yr, 1-3 yrs, 3-5 yrs, above 5 yrs), getting p- value less than .05 (p equals to .001 and .000 respectively). Therefore the third hypothesis (H3a), that there is an association of burnout, work family spillover and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. work family conflict, among different total experience levels, is rejected. The results further suggested no significant difference in the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict, among different experience levels (0-1 yr, 1-3 yrs, 3-5 yrs, above 5 yrs), getting p- value more than .05 (p equals to .074). Therefore the third hypothesis (H3a), that there is an association of the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict, among different experience levels, is not rejected or may be accepted.

H_{4a} Work-family spillover has negative and significant impact on the level of burnout of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

Table 5: Correlations

Dimensions		WF Spillover	Burnout
WF Spillover	Pearson Correlation	1	.296**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	120	120
BURNOUT	Pearson Correlation	.296**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	120	120

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

Pearson's Correlation coefficient was used to test the hypothesis, and the results show that there is significant positive correlation ($r = .296$, $p = .001$) between work-family spillover and burnout of employees. It implies that the employees with high level of work-family spillover exhibit high level of burnout towards the organisations they are employed in.

In order to examine the impact of work-family spillover on burnout linear regression technique was used. Table 6 reports the strength of the relationship between the model and the dependent variable. The table displays R, R squared (R^2) and adjusted R^2 . R, the multiple correlation coefficient, which is defined as the linear correlation between the observed and model-predicted values of the dependent variable. R square, the coefficient of determination which is the squared value of multiple correlation coefficient is also illustrated in Table 6. It can be seen that regression model explained 29% of the variance in the burnout.

Table 6: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.170 ^a	.029	.021	.78643

a. Predictors: (Constant), WFSpillover

Table 7 summarizes the results of Analysis of Variance. The objective of ANOVA table is to test the acceptability of the model from the statistical perspective. The sum of squares, degree of freedom and mean square are displayed for two sources of variation, regression and residual. The regression row displays information about the variation accounted for by the model. The residual row displays information about variation that is not accounted for by the model i.e. error term.

Table 7: ANOVA^b

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	2.170	1	2.170	3.509	.064a
Residual	72.980	118	.618		
Total	75.150	119			

a. Predictors: (Constant), WFSpillover

b. Dependent Variable: BURNOUT

It was found the regression sum of squares is less than the model explained residual sum of squares, which indicated that most of the variation, is not explained by the above work family spillover dimensions. The significance value of F statistic is more than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is due to chance.

From the above results it can be concluded that the hypothesis H4a is supported. Thus, the hypothesis (H_{4a}) that work-family spillover have negative and significant impact on the level of burnout of employees is not rejected or may be accepted.

H_{5a} There is a significant correlation of sub-scales of work-family spillover with burnout of employees in few selected public and private sector banks.

Table 8: Correlations

Dimensions		WFC	FWC	WFSpillover	BURNOUT
WFC	Pearson Correlation	1	.295**	.784**	.172
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.000	.061
	N	120	120	120	120
FWC	Pearson Correlation	.295**	1	.824**	.299**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000	.001
	N	120	120	120	120
BURNOUT	Pearson Correlation	.172	.299**	.296**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.061	.001	.001	
	N	120	120	120	120

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

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (table 8) suggested a correlation between the sub-scales of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict ($r = .299$, $p = .001$) and work family conflict ($r = .172$, $p = .061$) and the level of burnout. Therefore the fifth hypothesis (H_{5a}), that there is a significant correlation between the sub-scales of work family spillover and burnout of employees in few selected public and private sector banks is not rejected or may be accepted.

FINDINGS & CONCLUSION

With increasing work pressure from family as well as work, employees are finding it difficult to manage the family as well as their work life simultaneously. This ultimately leads to burnout of employees. This study measured the correlation between work family spillover and the level of burnout of employees and tried to find the factors which attribute to the relationship between work family spillover and burnout of employees.

One way ANOVA was applied to study the effect of age on work family spillover and level of burnout of employees. The results of ANOVA showed that work family spillover is different among different age groups. Age is related to work family conflict but does not have any significant effect on family work conflict. The study also showed that burnout is not related to different age groups meaning that all the age groups experience burnout irrespective of their age.

One way ANOVA was applied to study the effect of Total work experience on Work Family Spillover and level of Burnout of employees. The study showed that that there is a significant difference in the burnout, work family spillover and the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. work family conflict, among different total experience levels (0-1 yr, 1-3 yrs, 3-5 yrs, above 5 yrs). The results further suggested no significant difference in the sub-scale of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict, among different age levels (Below 18, 18-25, 25-30, 30-35, above 35).

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation suggested a significant correlation of burnout with work family spillover ($r = .296$, $p = .001$) and the sub-scales of work family spillover i.e. family work conflict ($r = .299$, $p = .001$) and work family conflict ($r = .172$, $p = .061$), which was expected as with increasing pressure from family as well as work, employees are finding it difficult to maintain a balance between the two. Hence it ultimately leads to burnout of the employees.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- i) Some respondents were quite unwilling to complete the questionnaire because of lack of time on their part.
- ii) This research was limited only to lower level employees working in banking sector. Employees of the top level were not included in the research.
- iii) Because of lack of time or other reasons, many respondents have a tendency to mark the answers randomly.

REFERENCES

- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P. and Conley, S. (1991). Work-Home Conflict Among Nurses and Engineers: Mediating the Impact of Role Stress on Burnout and Satisfaction at Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , Vol. 12, No. 1, January, pp. 39-53.
- Carlson, D.S. and Frone, M. R. (2003). Relation of Behavioral and Psychological Involvement to a New Four-Factor Conceptualization of work-family interference. *Journal of Business and Psychology* , Vol. 17, No. 4, June, pp. 515-535.
- Cook, A. and Minotte, K. L. (2008). Occupational and Industry Sex Segregation and the work-family interface. *Sex Roles* , Vol. 59, pp. 800-813. SpringerScience+ Business Media, LLC-2008, Published Online- 12 June-2008.
- Cordes, C. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A Review and an Integration of Research on Job Burnout. *The Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.: 621-656.
- Deckard, G., Materko, M. and Field, D. (1994). Physician Burnout: An Examination of Personal, Professional, and Organizational Relationships. *Medical Care* , Vol. 32, No. 7, July, pp. 745-754.
- Edwards, J.R. and Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms Linking Work and Family: Clarifying the Relationship between Work and Family constructs. *The Academy of Management Review* ,Vol. 25, No. 1, January, pp. 178-199.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Relation of Behavioral and Psychological Involvement to a New Four-Factor Conceptualization. *Journal of Business and Psychology* , Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 515-535.
- Grzywacz, J.G.; Almeida, D.M. and McDonald, D.A. (2002). Work-Family Spillover and Daily Reports of Work and Family Stress in the Adult Labor Force. *Family Relations* ,Vol. 51, No. 1, January, pp. 28-36.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*. Vol. 30, pp. 859-879.
- Hammer, K. B.; Bauer, T.N. and Grandey, A.A. (2003). Work family conflict and work related withdrawal behavior. *Journal of business and psychology*, Vol. 17, No. 3, Spring, pp. 419-436.
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1983). Preventing Employee Burnout. *Personne*. Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 58-68.
- Lambert, E., Hogen, N.L. and Altheimer, I. (2010). The Association Between Work-Family Conflict and Job Burnout among Correctional Staff: A Preliminary Study. *Southern Criminal Justice Association* , Vol. 35, October, pp. 37-55.
- Madhavi, C. and Vimala, B. (2011) A Study on Work Related Stress and Work Family Issues Experienced by Women Software Professionals in Chennai, *3rd International Conference on Information and Financial Engineering IPEDR*, (12), 264-268.
- Malik, M.I., Zaheer, A., and Khan, M.A., (2010) Developing and Testing a Model of Burnout at Work and Turnover Intentions among Doctors in Pakistan, *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(10), 234-247.
- Marchese, M. C.; Basshan, G. and Ryan, J. (2002). Work-Family Conflict: A Virtue Ethics Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics* Vol. 40, No. 2, October, pp. 145-154.
- Maslach, C. & Leiter, M.P. (2005). Reversing burnout: How to rekindle your passion for your work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, pp. 42-49.
- Maslach, C. and Goldberg, C. M. (1998). Prevention of burnout: New perspectives. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*. Vol. 7, pp. 63-74.
- Maslach, C. and Jackson, S.E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* , Vol. 2, No. 2, April, pp. 99-113.
- Maslach, C.; Schaufeli, W. B.; Leiter, M. P. (2001). S. T. Fiske, D. L. Schacter, & C. Zahn-Waxler. ed. "Job burnout". *Annual Review of Psychology*. Vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- Perrewe, P.L. and Hochwarter, W. A. (2001). Can We Really Have It All? The Attainment of Work and Family Values. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* , Vol. 10, No. 1, February, pp. 29-33.
- Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C.L. and Mossholder, K.W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of Multi-Dimensional, Multi-Role Work-Family Conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , Vol. 28, February, pp. 705-727.
- Ramasundaram, A. and Ramasundaram, G. (2011) The Role of Work Family Conflict as a Mediator between Work-thought Interference and Job Stress, *International Management Review* , 7 (2), 25-34.

- Scandura, T.A. and Lankau, M.J. (1997). Relationships of Gender, Family Responsibility and Flexible Work Hours to Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* ,Vol. 18, No. 4, July, pp. 377-391.
- Schaible, L.M. & Gecas, V., (2010). The impact of Emotional Labour and Value Dissonance on burn out Police Officers. *Police Quarterly*, 13(3), 316-341.
- Thompson, C. A. (1999). When Work–Family Benefits Are Not Enough: The Influence of Work–Family Culture on Benefit Utilization, Organizational Attachment, and Work–Family Conflict . *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* , Vol. 54, No. 3, 392-415.
- Veerle, B. N. W. (2001). Burnout and depression are not identical twins: is decline of superiority a distinguishing feature? *Personality and Individual Differences*, pp. 873-880.
- Westman, M., Etzion, D. and Danon, E. (2001). Job Insecurity and Crossover of Burnout in Married Couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* , Vol. 22, No. 5, August, pp. 467-481.
- Yang, Nini, Chen, C. C., Choi, J. and Zok Yamin (2000). Sources of Work-Family Conflict: A Sino-U.S. Comparison of the Effects of Work and Family Demands. *The Academy of Management Journal* ,Vol. 43, No. 1, February, pp. 113-123.