ABSTRACT

Work role stress is one of the major problems that influence family role conflict of information technology (IT) professionals. The purpose of the paper is to examine the relationship between work role stress and family role conflict among married employees in the IT sector. The data is collected from 227 married IT professionals employed in different IT companies across India. The data is analysed with the help of descriptive statistics, correlation, factor analysis, and multiple regression through SPSS 21.0 software, AMOS for structural equation model (SEM) analysis. The results of the study revealed that all the determinants of work role stress do not affect family role conflict of married IT professionals. Determinants such as workload and work schedules influence family role conflict. In addition, the study findings bring out the relation between the determinants of work role stress and family role conflict. This study is important to IT companies as it helps to provide useful insights in managing family role conflict of married IT professionals.
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INTRODUCTION

IT (Information Technology) industry had spread across India creating extensive employment opportunities (Pattanaik & Nayak, 2011). It is observed that IT industry is one of the fast growing service sectors in India that contributes growth variable of Indian Economy (Shruthi, Pranak & Jha, 2017). IT division has developed in terms of revenue, business and as well as seen the increased participation of professional employees. Very soon Indian IT companies have earned a reputation for being cost-competitive (Dhar, 2016) with a very strong focus on client satisfaction (Sankalpa & Debkumar, 2015). In order to fasten their progress IT sector have been working 24/7 (Kossek, Ruderman, Braddy, & Hannum, 2012) and also many departments are based on IT sector which requires continuous work for many firms (Caliser, & Iskin, 2011). As a result the demand of work in IT professionals created pressure on their work domains (Ruppanner & Huffman, 2014) and increased the participation of employees to focus on IT workforce (Rustagi, 2010). Accordingly, there is an increase of work role stress (WRS) which is now customary in corporate India that has given rise to family role conflict (FRC) in IT sector (Mesmer & Viswesvaran, 2005).

Previously consequences of work role stress were not a significant issue. But, with the increased pressure in labor force elevated disagreement between the work and family roles, showed a considerable
impact on FRC (Powell & Mainiero, 1992). There are many competing demands that give rise of stress due to work role involvement into family role which leads to increase in FRC. Moreover married employees (Landau & Arthur, 1992) do have more FRC when compared with unmarried employees (Becker, 1985). Married professionals generally look for convenient and flexible jobs in order not to juggle with their role duties (Mc Ginn, 2015). With this reason WRS has kept more attention (Lu, Lu, Du & Brough, 2016) on FRC (Lior, 2017) among married professionals in India.

Hence in view of specific issue, the main object of the study is to explain about the relationship between the determinants of WRS and FRC and their significant effect on FRC among married IT professionals in India. Therefore the study would give a meaningful understanding to this relationship.

REVIEW LITERATURE

IT (Information Technology) sector is one of the fastest growing sectors in India. According to NASSCOM, (2017) identified that IT sector is the largest export which produce 10 crores of employment in India. With the provision of advantages in term of cost, services and skill IT companies have established their standards global wide. In order to maintain these standards, IT companies have to comprehend about their personnel since the growth and existence of IT organizations depend upon their personnel contribution (Singh, 2019). In the current years the concept of WRS and FRC has been examined extensively in the management literature.

Greenhaus and Beutell’s (1985) seminal work conceptualised and cogently presented the outcome scenarios due to a failure in balancing work and family domains. With increase in workforce (Ling & Poweli, 2001), there is an increase in FRC (Zacher, Jimmieson, & Winter, 2012). The word FRC is described as, “When family roles are mutually incompatible, conflicting and opposing one role to another role, there is a raise of conflict among the roles. It is occurred due to the work pressures raised from work roles. These pressures are formed by inner role conflict and make the family life roles more burdensome due to the responsibility of another task.” (Greenhausas & Beutall, 1985).

With increase of research on inter domain attributes (Oren & Levin, 2016) it is identified that there is an increase of possible factors in the organisations (Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, & Semmer, 2011). Work demand on family form a conflict which the study looks into a specific attributes that effect FRC.

Identified Determinants

Many studies showed that for many employees determinants of WRS are the primary attributes that effect on FRC which spawned a great need of study on them (Eby, Casper, Lockwood, Bordequx & Brinlay, 2005; Allen, Herst, Bruck & Sutton, 2000; Frone, 2003). WRS determinants might rise the degree of pressure that might lead to FRC (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2009). The lack of control over WRS determinants would results in a heightened tension with the family roles leading to conflict (Parasuraman & Simmers, 2009). The literature posits five WRS attributes that affect on FRC. They are job ambiguity (Tang & Chang, 2010), work load (Michel, Kotrba, Mitchelson, Clark, & Baltes, 2011), organisational policies (Ronda, Legaz & Lopez, 2016), work schedules (Nizam & Kahn, 2018) and nature of work (Diane, 2002). This paper presents a finer-grained conceptualisation and presents arguments for each attribute in subsequent sections.

Job Ambiguity

Job ambiguity raise when there is an unclear job responsibilities and obscure information about their job. Employees who undergo with job ambiguity would encounter with stress in their work role that might lead to FRC (Khan, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964). Job ambiguity influence on work role demands that affects on meeting with family role demands (Tang & Chang, 2010). Therefore it is understood that employees who have job ambiguity might have increased level of FRC.
H1: Job ambiguity positively influence on FRC.

**Work load**

Work load is reported to be a common issue among IT employees (Altaf & Awan, 2011). Work role stress arises with work load when the employees have more work to do than the allowed time to adequately finish it. Given the competitive pressures, the employees will have little choice to spend with their family members (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). It has been reported that employees with heavy work load are unable to reduce their WRS (Karatepe, 2013). Therefore, higher in demand of time of an employee with work role, higher the chance of degree of FRC. As a result, there is a conflict among the family domains due to limited time and extensive workload.

H2: Work load positively influence on FRC.

**Work Schedule**

Generally FRC are caused due to work schedules (Burley, Milburn & Kemmer, 2006). Most of the employees are exposed to stress and conflict when their work schedule interferes with family role demands (Lucie, Francious, Olga & Martine, 2009). Few studies analysed that work schedules increases conflicts between family relationships (Liu, Wang, Kessler & Schneider, 2011; Maume & Sabastian, 2012). Working conditions especially long working hours play a major role for raise in FRC (Tammelin, Malinen, Ronka & Verhoef, 2015). As per the study done by Presser, Gornick and Parashar, (2008), identified that affect of work schedules on FRC is not only based on family status but they look to be common among all the families either with children or without children. Therefore influence of working schedules on FRC would depend upon the raise of employee’s family needs or demands (Joanna, Christina & Mark, 2010).

H3: Work schedule negatively influence on FRC.

**Nature of work**

Work nature or nature of work is one the important dimension of WRS that affects on FRC. Nature of work includes work hours, work ambiguity, work overload and work systems (Nizam & Kahn, 2018). Working policies such as flexible work, part time work (Tomlinson & Durbin, 2010) might help the IT professionals to reduce their FRC. Employees having such working conditions have less FRC when compared with the employees who have full time work system. Therefore many organizations need to support their employees with good working culture to reduce their FRC.

H4: Nature of work negatively influence with FRC.

**Organisational Policies**

The best determinant that helps to reduce FRC is organisational policies (Beehr & MC Grath, 2003). If the organisation is favourable in providing supportive policies to techies then, there would be reduced FRC. Organisational policies such as flexible working timings, part time work options, emergencies time permissions to meet family role demands might decrease the conflict (Doble & Supriya, 2010).

H5: Organisational policies negatively influence with FRC.

Therefore the present study would examine the relationship between the determinants of WRS and their influence on FRC. Figure.1 represents the conceptual framework of the study
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used snowball-sampling method as a means of obtaining data from the respondents from various IT firms in India. IT professionals working in different IT companies (including both Multi National Companies and private) were the targeted population of the study. Descriptive research method is used to explain the study. A structured questionnaire was designed based on an extensive literature review and data was collected with the help of the questionnaire designed for the purpose of the study.

Data Collection

The data was collected from 227 married employees working in IT companies across India. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed in the selected areas of the study. Out these 372 questionnaires were received. Among them, 145 were with uncompleted data and with errors. So, finally, a totally of 227 (45%) respondents were included in the study. Out of the sample, 29.8% were from Bangalore, 28% are from Hyderabad, 13.1% are from Chennai, 8.1% from Vijayawada and 12% and 9% taken from Pune and Kolkata. From the sample, 47.3% of the respondents belong to private IT companies operating in India, and 52.7% of the respondents are from MNC’s companies.

Sample Characteristics

The characteristics of the sample included for the study are age, income, education, experience, gender, managerial level and number of children. Out of all the respondents, majority of them belong to the age between 30-40 years (42.6%). Regarding income majority of them get salary between Rs.61,000 to 90,000 (39.7%) per month. Most of the respondents are with master’s degree as highest education qualification (55%) and most of them have 6 to 10 years of experience (39%). Of all the respondents many of them belongs to lower level management (53.33%). In the study most of the respondents are males (59%) and out of the respondents 54% (123) of them are having children and among them majority of them are having single child.

MEASURES

Two variables (i.e) independent variables (WRS), dependent variable (FRC) were taken as measurable variables of the survey. Items from selected references were used for framing the questionnaire. Likert five point scaling techniques were used to measure each variable ranging from strongly agree [5] to strongly disagree [1].

WRS (independent variable):

Five WRS determinants were taken as independent variables that were tested using pre-tested questionnaire form previous studies. A total of 15 items were taken to measure the relationship.
• **Workload:** Five items were chosen from the study of Carlson, Kacmear & Williams, (2000) to measure the existing variable. The sample item is “My workload is not allowing me to fulfil my domestic responsibilities.”

• **Work Schedule:** Three items were taken from the study of Spector, (1985) to know the opinion of the employees. The sample item is “I am often occupied with my work schedules.”

• **Job Ambiguity:** Two items that were developed by Carlson et al., (2000) were taken to measure the variable. Sample item is “My job responsibilities are clear.”

• **Organisation Policies:** It is measured with two items developed by Spector, (1985). Sample item is “I am not happy with the benefits I get in my office.”

• **Nature of work:** The variable is measured with three items developed by Carlson et al., (2000). The sample item is “My company support and understand our family needs.”

**FRS (Dependent Variable):**

With study done by Carlson et al., (2000), seven items were considered to measure family role conflict. The sample item of is study is “I feel stress at home after I come from work.”

**Statistical tools**

Statistical tools applied for the study to analyse the data are descriptive analysis that explains mean and standard deviation; factor analysis; multiple regression and correlation with the application of SPSS 21.0. AMOS is applied for extracting SEM analysis (CFA-common factor analysis).

**Reliability**

In order to know the reliability of the scales, Cronbach alpha values are calculated. The alpha values ranged between .606 and .829. All the alpha values met the minimum criterion α>0.060 as it is exploratory research (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). The following are the reliability values (table 1) of the variables in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>α Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Work load</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Work schedule</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Job ambiguity</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Organisational Policies</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>FRC</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data analysed on the primary data collected)

**RESULTS**

Table 2 includes descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) and correlation of the determinants of WRS and FRC. As expected the determinants of WRS that is workload, work schedule, job ambiguity, organisational policies and nature of work are significantly correlated with FRC.
Before proceeding with hypothesis testing factor analysis was conducted to examine the distinctiveness of Job Ambiguity (JA), Work Overload (WO), Work Schedule (WS), Organisational Policies (OP), and Nature of Work (NW) (Zhang, Rasheed & Luqman, 2019). The study showed the loadings that are more than 0.50 for giving the clarity to factor definitions. The KMO and Barlett’s test shows the sampling adequacy is 0.744 which is relatively good, approximate chi-square is 1576.613 and all the factor loadings are statistically significant \((p<0.001)\). The names of these factors with the related Eigen values are shown in the following

### Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FRC</th>
<th>WL</th>
<th>WS</th>
<th>JA</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>-.579**</td>
<td>.596**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>.070*</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>-.129*</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.149**</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>-.277**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.352**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** P<0.01; * p<0.05 FRC-FRC; WL- work load; WS- work schedule; JA- job ambiguity; OP- organisational policies; NW- nature of work (Source: Data analysed with primary data collected)

Table 3 continued on next page

### Table 3. Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>“My job keeps me away from my family roles.”</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.888</td>
<td>25.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>“The time I spend for my work avoid me to participate in family programs.”</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>“I am unable to be the same way I do at work home”</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>“My work load is not allowing me to fulfil my domestic responsibilities.”</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>“Sometimes I need to be away from my family members to complete my work tasks on time.”</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>“Effective things I do at job do not make me good spouse or parent.”</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>14.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>“My work demand makes me difficult to maintain healthy relationship with my family members.”</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>“I am often occupied with my work schedule.”</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>“My job responsibilities are clear.”</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>10.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>“I understand easily about what others expect from me at work.”</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Factor 4: Organisational Policies **

Table 3 continued on next page
Standardised factor loading for JA ranging from 0.907 to 0.872, for WO ranging from 0.88 to 0.599, for WS ranging from 0.934 to 0.505, for OP ranging from 0.719 to 0.613 and for NW ranging from 0.655 to 0.613. Furthermore, the findings depicted above describe that the standardized regression weight (SRW) values for all statements under the factor that are more than 0.50. It means that no statements differ significantly across the factor. Hence statements are highly considered to be in the same factor. Hence the results indicate that our measures capture approximately reliable standard. And also a series of Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is conducted to examine the hypothesized factor model fits the data satisfactorily which can be observed in figure 2. The result of CFA (CMIN/DF=4.185, RMR=0.937, GFI=0.738, AGFI=0.828, NFI=0.996, CFI=0.947, RMSEA=0.045) for the construct were found to be exceptionally fit (Hair et al., 1998, Chau and Hu, 2001, Calisir et al., 2011).

Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Eigen Value</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>“My work schedule is fair”</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>9.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>“I am not happy with the benefits I get in my office”</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5: Nature of work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“My company support and understand our family responsibilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“I always feel that I am worried to get my work done on time.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>“Occasionally I feel overwhelmed with my job responsibilities”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Data analysed on the primary data collected)

Figure 2.

(Source: Data analysed with primary data collected)
Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression Analysis was used to understand the relationship between WRS determinants and FRC with the help of SPSS 21 software. Multiple Regression Analysis is used to test from Hypotheses 1 to Hypotheses 7. Table 4 shows the output of multi regression models and their effect on FRC.

Table 4. Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.653a</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>46.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), NW, OP, JA, WS, WL
b. Dependent Variable: FRC

(Source: Data analysed with primary data collected)

Table 4 shows the model summary of outcome variable/dependent variable and their predictors are. The R value in the table is recorded as 0.653 which is the multiple correlation coefficients between the predictors and outcome. The R² value in the table is recorded as 0.426 which shows the range of variability in the outcome of the predictors. This means the predictor’s variation in FRC is 42.6% which is moderate variation.

Table 5. ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>46.096</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.219</td>
<td>46.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>62.079</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108.175</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | a. Predictors: (Constant), NW, OP, JA, WS, WL
|       | b. Dependent Variable: FRC |

(Source: Data analysed with primary data collected)

For identifying whether the model is significant with better outcome results, ANOVA is used which is shown in table 5. The F-ratio in the table represents the ratio that constitute the ratio of upgrading the predicted results from fitting the model that is comparative to inaccuracy that still exists in the model. In the above table, F-ratio is 48.483 and significant at p<0.001. Therefore the initial model significantly predicts the outcome variable that is FRC.
Hypotheses 1 state that job ambiguity positively influence on FRC. As given in table 6, there is a positive relationship between job ambiguity and FRC ($b=0.02$). Therefore higher the ambiguity, higher will be FRC. But it is not significant at $p<0.05$ thereby rejecting $H_1$.

Hypotheses 2 specified that work load positively influence on FRC. Results showed that there is a positive relationship between work load and FRC ($b=0.317$, table 6). Hence higher the work load, higher will be the FRC. And also it is observed from the table 6 that it significantly predicts at $p<0.001$ thereby supporting $H_2$.

Hypotheses 3 state that work schedule negatively influence on FRC. Given in the results that there is a negative relationship between work schedule and FRC ($b=-0.289$, table 6) which identifies that change in work schedules would effect on FRC. Moreover work schedule is significant at $p<0.001$ which accepts $H_3$.

Hypotheses 4 expects that nature of work negatively influence with FRC. Identified that there is a negative relationship between nature of work and FRC ($b=-0.005$, table 6). It means good working conditions and employee friendly policies would reduce FRC. But it is observed that nature of work is not significant at $p<0.05$ which means $H_4$ is rejected and not supported in the study.

Hypotheses 5 proposed that organisation policies negatively influence on FRC. According to the results in the study showed that organisational policies negatively related with FRC ($b=-0.063$, table 6). It means good organisational policies such as work permissions, flexible work hours, and part time facilities would certainly reduce FRC. But given in the study organisational policies is not significant with FRC at $p<0.05$ leading to rejection of $H_5$.

**DISCUSSIONS**

The present study has taken up to have a better knowledge on effect of WRS determinants on FRC of highly competitive IT professional in India. Since there is variation in the characteristics and nature of IT professional’s job when compared with other professional workers, they are selected as a sample of the study (Armstrong, Riemenschneider, Allen & Reid, 2007). Due to their dynamic nature of work, the IT professionals have to go for ongoing updating of their knowledge and skills (Lee, 2000). As a result they over come with stress due to long stretched work hours and sequentially available though online (Messersmith, 2007). In addition most of their companies work with international standard timings in spite of Indian standard timings which vary their day schedules (Allen, Armstrong, Reid & Riemenschneider, 2008). This would obviously tighten their family roles. Due to this the employees are not able to overcome the demands of their family roles which are leading to FRC. Through work
stress and family conflict is a common problem in most of the industries; it seems to be rather higher with IT professionals.

In regard the study identifies various factors of WRS that influence on FRC using factor analysis on the considered sample of IT professionals. The results of the study brought out a five noticeable factors that affect FRC. They are work load, work schedule, nature of work, job ambiguity and organisational policies. The output has established that all the policies do not have same influence on different forms of dispute. Each factor is found to have a unique relationship with FRC (Fu & Shaff, 2001).

Job ambiguity is one of the important WRS factor that influence on FRC. The results of the study showed that job ambiguity has positive effect but does not influence on FRC among IT professionals (Dinger, Tatcher & Stepina, 2010). By this it is understood that $H_1$ is not supported in the study. And also it is understood that ambiguity is linked to source based conflict or type of organisation. This is in line with intuitive thought on the expectation for job ambiguity leading to FRC. But job ambiguity usually integrate work and family roles as per their role demands (Batt & Valcour, 2003).

Another important WRS factor that influence on FRC is work load. It is said that IT employees are required to be on call as and when required which might affect their family roles. This could results in high level of disputes and thereby decreasing the time to be spent with family members (Marin & Phyllis, 2001). Here in the study the results showed that there is a positive and significant influence of WRS on FRC. Based on these results it is understood that $H_2$ is supported in the study.

Similarly another factor of WRS, work schedule is also found to be significant with FRC. Generally IT sector have different work schedules and many organisations were designed with MNC’s culture. The companies work on regularly with different shifts system. So it is understood that if the employees are given the choice of scheduling their work time it might reduce their disputes among their roles for IT professionals (Albertsen, Garde, Nabe, Hansen, Lund & Hvid, 2014). As a result $H_3$ is accepted in the study.

Another interesting finding of the study is nature of work. The result of the study showed that nature of work is not significant with FRC which identifies that $H_4$ is rejected in the study. One of the reasons might be that in IT profession it is often imagined that hard-driving or successful employees are susceptible to the dispute between work stress roles and family roles. But according to Peters, Waltez, Demerouti & Deregt, (2009), nature of work is necessary to motivate employees towards their work.

And then describing about organisational policies, it is identified to be one of important factor that could reduce FRS. In the study, the results identified that there is no significant affect of organisational policies on FRC. It means $H_5$ is rejected is rejected in the study. But organisational policies help to reduce the role disputes among the IT employees (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). And moreover making workplace with supportive policies is beneficial to employees and employers (Baxter, Janeen, Chesters, Jenny, 2011).

Therefore based on the results and discussion of the study it is understood that even though all the factors are having relationship with FRC, their relationship does not have significant effect on FRC.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Work and family are the two important domains for both employer and employees. There is a need to be identified for managing both the domains. IT companies have to create flexible, accommodated and promised paths that encourage the IT professionals to build loyalty with organization (Ballout, 2009) and simultaneously meet their family needs and responsibilities. Moreover IT industry can focus on to implement new conceptual frame work that is work family management (WFM). This frame work is advantageous to every professional employee’s especially married and parental employees. WFM conceptual work helps us to understand the importance of family role needs and responsibilities and thereby support to manage their roles (Kathleen, Janet & Agatha, 2008).
The attributes that are considered in the study depends upon the employee relationship with the company. The relationship of the attributes on the work and family depends upon the availability of sources. Hence there is a need for IT companies to focus on the use of various channels in order to bring positive attitude among IT employees and thereby limit FRC. Moreover organizations should maintain a healthy environment by encouraging a fair relationship between management and employee’s which would help them to decrease their FRC.

IT managers should also find the ways to increase their support with better organizational policies or employee friendly policies in order to decrease their FRC. In addition to these, employees are required to allocate bonafide duties, work schedules, leaves, etc. to reduce their work overload.

LIMITATIONS

Currently, the study is covered with limited attributes, which is needed to be expanded. Moreover, the study can be extended with a more substantial number of representative samples for exposing more validated results. Also, the study is required to be focussed on many different sectors by not restricting to IT industry itself. Also, the review can be extend with a more substantial number of representative samples for exposing more validated results. Another limitation in the study is due to time limitation, the area and sample were restricted. The study can be expanded to cross-cultured too for having more generalized conclusions.

CONCLUSION

The present study effect of WRS on FRC is a serious issue that every employee is facing in their job especially married professionals. By a sample of 227 married respondents working in IT industry from India were considered to make a meaningful study. With the application of factor analysis, multiple regression, the sample was tested to analyze the output of research. Variables of WRS such as job ambiguity, work load, work schedule, organisational policies and nature of work were considered in the study. Among these only work load and work schedule effect on FRS. But in general all the variables were considered to be essential factors of WRS that influence on FRC. Therefore the study gives a notable suggestion for IT industry that the factors considered for this study might be under the control of employee relationship. In regard to this it can be said to IT companies that they must use various channels to bring out factorable/positive attitude among the employees and thereby to limit their FRC. The employer is required to allocate bonafide duties and work schedules that help married employees to reduce their FRC. Therefore to conclude, any organisation which have supportive organisation culture for employees would be successful and help their employees to manage their WRS and FRC.
REFERENCES


K. Thriveni Kumari is Associate Professor in School of Management at Presidency University. She has 18 years of teaching experience. Her research area is currently focused upon organization behaviour, work-family balance, work-family conflict, leader member exchange and career development. She had published one international book, 22 research papers in various journals of repute and presented 10 papers at national and international conferences in India and one paper at Philippines. She is working as editorial member for three international journals.