

Quality of Life in Enforced Work from Home: An Exploration of Gender Differences

Rajeev K Shukla & Ruchika Yadav

To work from home (WFH), employees had to alter their lifestyle. A pertinent question is whether the shift is fulfilling for working professionals in terms of quality of life (QoL) as WFH left no boundary between personal and professional lives. This study identifies the factors that constitute QoL while working from home, and examines if there are any gender wise differences in QoL in WFH. Data was collected from 148 working professionals. Findings of the study identified 4 factors of QoL - psychological well-being, social well-being, strenuous work, and freedom to work. Results also indicated that there is no significant difference between male and female professionals in factors of QoL for WFH.

Rajeev K Shukla is Director, Shri Vaishnav School of Management, SVVV, Indore. **Ruchika Yadav**, Research Associate, National Insurance Academy, Pune. E-mail: ruchikayadav@niapune.org.in

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic has unsettled the conventional style of business operations. It was a far-fetched thought for the mankind that a virus would lead to drastic shifts in the way organizations and employees used to function. Beyond anyone's imagination, in March 2020 the business processes turned to complete digitalization and virtualization. The organizations which never imagined to operate remotely were compelled to shift their operations to work from home (WFH) due to nationwide lockdown and social distancing norms adopted to control the spread of Covid-19.

Although previous studies have indicated that offering remote and flexible working to employees is beneficial to organizations as well as employees for various reasons like reduced commuting cost, increased efficiency, productivity and work output (Felstead & Henseke, 2017; Flores, 2019), however, WFH availed by choice and as an additional benefit given by the organization is different from WFH by force. Hence both the organizations and the employees had to face

the associated challenges during the 'enforced-WFH' (eWFH) due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Apart from the professional challenges associated with implementing remote working practices, employees had to face numerous challenges on the personal front too as the scenario was quite different in the eWFH. All the members of family were confined to home with no or minimum domestic help, increased work load as individuals had to 24/7 juggle between work commitments and taking care of the family, lack of IT infrastructure, sharing of equipment between parents and children, and internet connectivity issues were some of the factors which led to spur in stress levels while WFH during the pandemic. Moreover, there was no defined boundary left between the personal and professional life during the eWFH.

According to the boundary theory, employees create 'physical', 'temporal' and 'psychological' boundaries for themselves to demark the time, place and people associated with work and family roles (Allen et al., 2014). Creating these boundaries help them to minimize the intrusion of work with non-work life. Deducing from the boundary theory, it is postulated that while employees struggled to create the physical, temporal and psychological boundaries between work and family roles during the eWFH, their work-life balance and QoL might have suffered adversely, and there would have possibly been unfavorable interference of work-life in family-life and family-life in work-life (Bhumika, 2020). These changes and challenges therefore posed the following pertinent questions which

prompted the researchers to undertake this study.

1. Whether the shift is fulfilling for working professionals in terms of quality of life (QoL)?
2. Does the shift have any special bearing on the female working professionals as they are the ones who have major responsibility of the household chores, especially in India?

Although earlier studies have explored the relationship between WFH and QoL, but rarely any research study has explored the pandemic affected work scenario and QoL experienced during the eWFH. Moreover, gender based differences are a popular variable in WFH studies (Rohilla et al., 2021, Bhumika, 2020; Drummond et al., 2017; Delina & Raya, 2016; Shah, 2015) and it is considered as an important factor in determining the QoL during WFH. Since men and women prioritize work and family differently (Bhumika, 2020), gender becomes an important factor in exploring the QoL especially in eWFH. Literature has also suggested that whenever there is any change in the work-family setting, gender differences must be explored in both work-life as well as family-life realm (Drummond et al., 2017). The purpose of the study, therefore, is:

- (i) to understand and identify the factors that constitute QoL while eWFH,
- (ii) to ascertain if there is any gender wise difference in QoL especially during the eWFH.

Review of Literature

Traditionally, flexible working arrangements and giving employees an option to WFH have been considered as prominent indicators of offering work-life balance by the organizations, as they provide greater flexibility and autonomy to employees in terms of when and how to work. The managers, however, at times become skeptical of this arrangement as it could result in evading from allocated tasks while being at home (Bloom et al., 2015). The benefits and challenges of remote working have already been documented in literature. Felstead and Henseke (2017) established that WFH results in higher commitment towards the organization, increased job satisfaction and work-related well-being of the individuals. Flores (2019) stated that WFH results in increased efficiency, productivity and work output. On the contrary, evidence also suggests that remote working especially from home leads to increased stress (Moore, 2006), feeling of isolation due to limited face-to-face interaction with fellow colleagues (Busch, Nash & Bell, 2011), and the challenge of making the technology work (Flores, 2019).

Remote working especially from home leads to increased stress feeling of isolation due to limited face-to-face interaction with fellow colleagues and the challenge of making the technology work.

The eWFH home due to nationwide lockdown in March 2020 had its own

unique challenges and consequences. On one side, employees got a chance to spend more time with family, while on the other it challenged effectively managing the work and family responsibilities (Bhumika, 2020). Although organizations adapted and responded well to the sudden need of shifting operations to remote working to ensure business continuity, eWFH impacted the lives of the employees in some way or the other. Marsh and McLennan Companies (2020) reported negative psychological effects of WFH like loneliness and isolation, depression, anxiety, stress, and pressure. They stated that prolonged remote working can turn positive and optimistic employees into unmotivated and pessimistic individuals, thereby negatively impacting the well-being and QoL. Anderson and Kelliher (2020) argued that the benefits of greater flexibility, autonomy and gratitude as offered by WFH are relished because employees are able to exercise their ‘choice’ over the work arrangement. Moreover, willingness to WFH is dependent upon a number of factors like family support, presence of children at home, comfortable and quiet environment to support WFH, availability of IT infrastructure and good internet connectivity (Shareena & Shahid, 2020). However, these choices are not available in case of eWFH. Prolonged working hours, changes in work role, reduced productivity and increased stress, on one hand, and sparkling increase in creativity for self-nurturing on the other hand, have been the results of WFH during the pandemic (Jaiswal & Arun, 2020). As per a research report by National Insurance Academy (NIA), (2020) on ‘Work-From-Home in Insur-

ance Industry: Adapting to the 'New-Normal' WFH has both pros and cons. The perceived benefits as per the study were increased productivity, better identification of process, role and skill redundancies, more work flexibility, and cost reduction. On the flip side, negative aspects were increased stress especially in women due to increased work load and role conflict as they had to handle both home as well as office role at home, increased working hours, lesser scope for socializing, reduced performance level and delay in communication.

Although both men and women faced the challenges during eWFH, Banerjee and Pati (2020) in their thematic and chronological analysis identified that Indian women had certain unique experiences in WFH between March 2020 and September 2020.

- (i) WFH and work for home resulted in overlapping of office and home responsibilities. A major part of the household and childcare responsibility fell on women during the pandemic, which indicated that neither the organization nor the family is sensitive or considerate about women's work pressure.
- (ii) In order to cut down the company cost, women were the first to be laid off during the pandemic. This is a psychological bias which considers women employees as dispensable.
- (iii) The irritation and frustration caused by the pandemic, job loss, lack of recreational activities were all poured out on women and there has been a

sharp rise in domestic violence and harassment.

The emotional and physical well-being of women had gone for a toss during the eWFH (Banerjee & Pati, 2020; Gopal et al., 2020). Increased stress, anxiety and depression added on to the psychological burden on working women (Gopal et al., 2020). Similar findings were noted in a UK based study on 'Work, care and gender during the Covid-19 crisis' which documented that women were more likely to experience job losses, and they were more likely to have the additional burden and responsibility of childcare (Hupkau & Petrongolo, 2020). Results of a study by Raju and Kumar (2020) established that there has been a significant impact on the physical and psychological health, social relationships, and environmental factors in eWFH. Contrary to the results of some of the earlier researches, Raju and Kumar (2020) posited that women were more active, energetic, and they balanced their home and office work better than men during this period. Hence women experienced a better QoL in WFH. Irrespective of the gender, QoL is an important aspect which will have a direct impact on the overall well-being of an individual. Balance between work, family and personal life is important to achieve QoL. Being successful in one sphere at the cost of other is not the sign of positive QoL (Rao & Indla, 2010).

World Health Organization (WHO) defined QoL as 'an individual's percep-

tion of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns' (www.who.int). Ruževičius and Akranaviviute (2007) defined QoL as 'an individual's satisfaction with his or her life dimensions comparing with his or her ideal life'. The current study focuses of QoL of working professionals during the eWFH due to the pandemic. Hence for the purpose of this study, QoL has been defined as 'individual's perception in context of work, family and environment in which they live and in relation to their level of happiness and well-being associated with the purpose of living and standard of living'.

Objectives

- To identify constituent factors of Quality of Life for Work from Home.
- To identify gender effect on Quality of Life during enforced-Work from Home.

Hypotheses

Based on the above objectives, following hypotheses were formulated for the study and were tested at five per cent level of significance.

H_0 : WFH QoL is not significantly different for male and female professionals.

H_{01} : Gender wise there is no significant difference towards psychological well-being factor of WFH.

H_{02} : Gender wise there is no significant difference towards social well-being factor of WFH.

H_{03} : Gender wise there is no significant difference towards strenuous work factor of WFH.

H_{04} : Gender wise there is no significant difference towards freedom of work factor of WFH.

Type of Research

The purpose of the study was to identify the constituent factors which lead to QoL during eWFH, and also to understand if there is any gender wise difference in QoL as experienced during the eWFH during the pandemic. Hence, a deductive approach was followed, based on the survey design as the said approach helps in measuring the concepts quantitatively and also helps in explaining the causal relationship between the variables.

Sample

Purposive (judgmental) sampling method was used for the study. Purposive sampling is a non-probability random sampling method wherein the sampling units are based on judgment of the researcher, which focuses on people who will have the required information and will also be agreeable to share it (Etikan & Bala, 2017). Since the research was conducted during January 2021, when the countrywide lockdown restrictions were being lifted, and the organizations were partially getting back to working from office, purposive sampling method was

deemed most appropriate. Working professionals familiar to researchers were used as sampling frame. From within the sampling frame, those who had worked from home or were still working from home while the study was conducted, were the sampling unit. The inclusion criteria for the respondents was:

- (i) working professionals
- (ii) have worked from home during the pandemic and/or were still working from home when the study was conducted
- (iii) residing in India

Procedure

Data was collected through an online survey questionnaire developed on Google Forms which was shared with 292 working professionals through email and WhatsApp in January 2021. The sample was informed about the purpose of the survey, voluntary participation, and were assured of maintaining anonymity and confidentiality of responses. Researchers received completed anonymous responses from 148 individuals, resulting in a response rate of 50.68%. The respondents represented a heterogeneous sample of industries, which included, education, manufacturing, IT, BFSI. Other demographic details of the respondents are mentioned in Table 1.

Table 1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

		Frequency	Per cent
Gender	Male	85	57.4
	Female	63	42.6
Marital Status	Single	37	25
	Married	107	72.3
	Divorced	3	2
	Widowed	1	0.7
Work Status	Working from home	39	26.4
	Working from office	74	50
	Both (on rotation basis)	35	23.6
Staying with	Family	128	86.5
	Alone	15	10.1
	Others	5	3.4

Data Collection

A 31-item self-developed survey instrument was used for data collection, which included 13-items being adopted from the 26-item Quality of Life scale developed by World Health Organization (www.who.int), WHOQOL. Bearing in mind the changes in the work-family sce-

nario during eWFH, only those items were selected from WHOQOL scale that appeared applicable and pertinent to the changed scenario. The rest 18-items were developed based on the theoretical ground and the conceptual definition which the researchers arrived at for the study. All the items were measured on five-point Likert scale (one=strongly dis-

agree to five=strongly agree). Journals and online resources were used as sources of secondary data collection.

Data Analysis

Correlation, Factor Analysis, and t-test statistical tools were used and data was analyzed with the help of SPSS version 24. Analysis was conducted in two steps. Validity and Reliability of the survey instrument was assessed in the first step, while hypotheses were tested in the second step.

Reliability is referred to as the “stability of findings” whereas validity refers

to the “truthfulness of the findings” via the survey instrument (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). Validity of the instrument is therefore concerned with what the instrument measures and how well it measures that (Mohajan, 2017). Cronbach-Alpha, which is the most common method of Reliability Testing (Chaudhari, Yadav & Rai, 2021) was tested in SPSS Version 24. The commonly used threshold for Chronbach’s Alpha is 0.70 (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Overall Cronbach-Alpha for the survey instrument came out to be 0.957, indicating high internal consistency of the items. Reliability Statistics for each measure is given in Table 2.

Table 2 Reliability Statistics

Measure	Cronbach’s Alpha	No. of Items
Overall	.957	31
Psychological Well-being	.940	13
Social Well-being	.939	9
Strenuous Work	.827	5
Freedom of work	.859	4

Reliability statistics in Table 2 indicate that scales for all the measures have high internal consistency.

Since 18 of the 31-items of the survey instrument were self-developed, face validity of instrument was tested with the help of 4 experts in the field. Face validity is “the degree that respondents or users judge that the items of an assessment instrument are appropriate to the targeted construct and assessment objectives” (Hardesty & Bearden, 2004). A copy of the complete survey instrument was shared with the experts. The experts rated each of the item as “completely”,

“somewhat” or “not at all” representative of the variable under study (Hardesty & Bearden, 2004). An online meeting was scheduled with the experts wherein they shared the feedback and opinion about the appropriateness and representativeness of the items in the instrument. Based on the expert’s discussion, analysis and inputs, items rated as “completely” representative were retained as it is, items rated as “somewhat” representative were modified and items rated as “not at all” representative were dropped from the final instrument. Details of the final number of items in each measure are listed in Table 3.

Table 3 Expert’s Judgement on Face Validity: Details of Number of Items

Measure	Initial number of items	Number of items in the final instrument after expert review
Psychological Well-being	17	13
Social Well-being	13	9
Strenuous Work	6	5
Freedom of work	6	4

Assumption for applying factor analysis was checked with the help of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s test. The KMO test helps in measuring the sampling adequacy for each variable, and its value ranges between 0 and 1 (Chaudhari, Yadav & Rai, 2021). KMO value between 0.8 and 0.9 is considered great, and value above 0.9

is considered as superb (Field, 2009; Chaudhari, Yadav & Rai, 2021). KMO value for the data was 0.928. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity is significant when p value is less than 0.005. The Bartlett’s Test showed p=.000, supporting Factor Analysis. Hence the values of KMO and Bartlett’s test were found satisfactory as shown in Table 4.

Table 4 KMO and Bartlett’s Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.928
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3793.725
	Df	465
	Sig.	.000

Factor analysis with principal components and Varimax rotation was carried out. According to Williams et al. (2010), “factor analysis is an important tool that can be used in the development, refinement, and evaluation of tests, scales, and measures”. Hair et al. (1995) suggested that in order to run factor analysis, the sample size should be equal to or more than 100. The main aim of factor analysis is to convert large number of items into factors (Williams et al., 2010). The results of factor analysis corroborated that the items were grouped into four factors. Items in all four factors were examined and inductive process was followed to theoretically relate and define the factors (Williams, et al., 2010). The factors were identified as-

Psychological Well-being, Social Well-being, Strenuous Work, and Freedom of Work. Total 67.33 per cent of variance could be explained with the help of the four extracted factors.

Spending more time with family on one side, and working from the same place for long hours without socializing breaks on the other side, posed major challenges.

Psychological Well-being: Lock-down due to Covid-19 pandemic posed sudden WFH for populace at large and not many were prepared for such a scenario. Conflicting expectations from work and family roles created psychological

stress and employees from different sectors experienced a different level of psychological (dis)comfort during eWFH. Spending more time with family on one side, and working from the same place for long hours without socializing breaks on the other side, posed major challenges. Based on factor analysis, 13 items were identified under the said category to understand the difference and change in psychological well-being. The factor loading of items representing psychological well-being ranged between 0.513 and 0.759. Examples of item statements are: 'I am able to concentrate well on my work while WFH', 'I feel my life has become meaningful while WFH'.

Social Well-being: WFH saved lot of time on commutation, hence more time was available for social activities. A nine-item scale to check the impact of WFH on social well-being was identified via factor analysis. Factor loading of items representing social well-being ranged between 0.591 and 0.822. Examples of item statements are: 'WFH provides greater opportunity to interact with friends and relatives', 'WFH provides greater opportunity to share and care for the family members'.

Strenuous Work: The physical strain and psychological stress during WFH varied depending on various social and domestic factors. Disruption created by the eWFH inflicted havoc on the mental well-being of employees, thereby increasing the level of anxiety and stress. A five-item scale was used to understand the work strain. Factor loading of items representing strenuous work ranged be-

tween 0.610 and 0.856. Examples of item statements are: 'WFH increases mental stress', 'My number of working hours has increased in WFH'.

Freedom of Work: WFH provided flexibility in work schedule and opportunity to learn new skills and explore hobbies. Four items in the scale measured this aspect. Factor loading of items representing freedom of work ranged between 0.513 and 0.641. Examples of item statements are: 'WFH provides freedom to fulfill professional responsibilities', 'WFH provides opportunities for learning and skill development'.

Female professionals felt relatively higher degree of strenuous work than male professionals.

Gender wise mean, standard deviation and t-test were undertaken in SPSS version 24 to test the hypotheses. Results of the analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between male and female professionals towards psychological well-being, social well-being, strenuous work, and freedom of work factors of QoL during eWFH. Hence all hypotheses (H_0 , H_{01} , H_{02} , H_{03} , H_{04}) were accepted (Table 6). However, the study observed that female professionals felt relatively higher degree of strenuous work than male professionals during eWFH. The study further identified that male professionals have experienced relatively higher degree of social well-being and freedom of work than female profession-

als. Irrespective of gender of professionals, WFH has provided similar opportunity for psychological well-being (Table 5).

Table 5 Gender-wise Mean and Standard Deviation

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Psychological Well-being	Male	85	3.2063	.96867
	Female	63	3.2234	.91066
Social Well-being	Male	85	3.4523	1.08390
	Female	63	3.3616	.97397
Strenuous Work	Male	85	3.0988	.97425
	Female	63	3.1873	.95165
Freedom of Work	Male	85	3.2588	1.09276
	Female	63	3.1429	1.06039

Table 6 Gender-wise T-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Psychological Well-being	Equal variances assumed	.208	.649	-.109	146	.913
	Equal variances not assumed			-.110	137.972	.913
Social Well-being	Equal variances assumed	.386	.535	.525	146	.600
	Equal variances not assumed			.534	140.614	.594
Strenuous Work	Equal variances assumed	.143	.706	-.552	146	.582
	Equal variances not assumed			-.554	135.421	.581
Freedom of Work	Equal variances assumed	.000	.994	.646	146	.519
	Equal variances not assumed			.649	135.879	.517

Results & Discussion

In January 2020, for the first time in decades, the world noticed the word ‘Epidemic’ in headlines. A strain of Covid-19 virus forced the entire country to lock down in March 2020 for executing social distancing in order to prevent the spread of the infection. All businesses and services came to halt immediately and only those in essential services were allowed to operate. In response to the sudden shutdown, businesses shifted their operations to WFH and employees had to alter their lifestyle to meet the needs of WFH. This change posed a pertinent question on whether the new shift is fulfilling for working professionals in terms

of QoL, as it left the boundary between personal and professional life blurred.

Greenhaus et al. (2003) in their research studied the relationship between work-life balance and QoL with specific reference to three components viz. time, involvement, and satisfaction. The results revealed that work-family balance is linked with the QoL only when there is considerable time, involvement, or satisfaction to allocate across different roles. QoL is invariably high for the individuals who are more engaged and satisfied in family than work, and is low for those who are more engaged and satisfied in work rather than family. WFH practice, however, demands sup-

portive environment. In the absence of such environment neither QoL nor quality of work-life can be attained (Bhumika, 2020; Shareena & Shahid, 2020).

There have also been studies which established that WFH has negative impact on the QoL, especially for working women, as they have to undertake office as well as home responsibility simultaneously (Banerjee & Pati, 2020; Gopal et al., 2020; NIA, 2020). Rajadyaksha et al. (2015) postulated that family life and work life affect men and women differently. The theory, called as gender role theory, states that family responsibilities will affect work responsibilities more in case of women, and work responsibilities will affect family responsibilities more for men. Due to the prescribed gender specific roles, working women experience double pressure when both work as well as family are equally demanding as they struggle to create a balance between the two (Bhumika, 2020). Lippe and Lippenyi (2020) in their research stated that WFH has created blurred boundary between work and family especially due to the continuous connection through the use of smart phones. Such practices lead to increased work-family conflict, thereby deteriorating the QoL. The current study was therefore conducted to understand the factors that constitute QoL during eWFH, and to identify if there is any gender wise difference in QoL in eWFH.

The results of the study highlight the nature of QoL experienced in eWFH during the pandemic, and indicate that psychological well-being, social well-being,

strenuous work and freedom to work are the factors which affect and establish the QoL during eWFH. The results have been supported by prior researches. Moore (2006) studied personal well-being in relation to the QoL and recommended that in order to achieve well-being it is essential to have a positive relationship between 'self' and 'place'. They concluded that remote working, especially from home is a source of stress due to role conflict. Raju and Kumar (2020) established that there has been significant impact on the physical and psychological health, social relationships, and environmental factors in WFH during the pandemic. Conversely, Anderson et al. (2015) in their research compared well-being of employees in WFH and while working from office. They identified that employees experience more positive well-being on the days when they WFH.

Remote working, especially from home is a source of stress due to role conflict.

Findings of our study also indicate that WFH QoL is similar for male and female working professionals and there is no significant difference between psychological well-being, social well-being, strenuous work, and freedom of work on the basis of gender. The plausible reason could be that during difficult times of lockdown due to the pandemic, when there was minimum or no domestic help, men came forward to share some household responsibility and supported women by contributing in the daily chores. The emotional readiness was more and the individuals had

developed a coping mechanism among themselves. As has been established by Shareena and Shahid (2020), QoL in WFH cannot be attained without supportive environment and family.

WFH and other flexible options of working are neither inherently good nor bad, but their success or failure is driven by the ways in which they are made available and are used.

Interestingly, the results of our study also indicated that female professionals have felt relatively higher degree of strenuous work than male professionals and male professionals have experienced relatively higher degree of social well-being and freedom of work than female professionals. The plausible reason for this could be explained by the gender role theory which states that since men and women look at family life and work life differently, it affects them differently. Due to the prescribed gender specific roles, working women experience more pressure when both work and family are equally demanding, as they struggle to create a balance between the two (Rajadyaksha et al., 2015). Hence women feel more work strain and comparatively less freedom of work than men, due to additional responsibility of household chores apart from the work responsibilities. Similar findings have been reported by Banigan et al. (2016) who identified that working mothers with young children face greater challenges for maintaining a good mental health. Conversely, Raju and Kumar (2020) ac-

knowledged that women are more energetic and they experience a better QoL while WFH.

Despite the pros and cons of remote working, it is pertinent to note that WFH and other flexible options of working are 'neither inherently good nor bad, but their success or failure is driven by the ways in which they are made available and are used' (Perrigino et al., 2018:606). Moreover, much of the research on WFH was undertaken during the times when employees had a choice over where to work from, whereas WFH during the pandemic offered no such choice (Anderson & Kelliher, 2020).

Implications of the Study

Global pandemic forced the working professionals to WFH. They experienced WFH which they never imagined would happen for them. They adapted well to the emerging situation and worked from home to ensure business continuity. The present study contributes to the existing literature in terms of identifying the factors which constitute QoL for working professionals as they WFH during the pandemic. The findings based on limited sample size do not provide any evidence of significant difference of gender effect on QoL during eWFH.

Indisputably, it has been proven in the past few months that certain job roles can be efficiently performed from home without being physically present in the workplace (Anderson & Kelliher, 2020). Although many organizations have taken a call for hybrid model of

work, the findings of this study will help to persuade those organizations who were earlier (and are still) reluctant to offer WFH to their employees and be more open to flexible working arrangements. It will also help the organizations to formulate people-friendly and flexible policies to ensure overall well-being of the employees even if they are working remotely from their homes. Organizations can contribute to the overall well-being of the employees by organizing counselling and mentoring sessions to ensure that the employees don't feel exhausted and over-strained while working from home for long. Further, it will help the working professionals to identify the aspects which will influence their overall well-being and QoL while WFH.

Scope for Future Research

The current study is based on limited variables. Including certain related variables will give more insights about the QoL during eWFH. The data for the study was collected through online survey and in a limited time frame, which resulted in a sample size of 148 Indian respondents. Having a larger sample size along with geographical diversity will give a broader and generalizable perspective to the study. The pandemic had affected the entire nation. However, the current study does not consider individuals in rural areas. Further research can have a comparative analysis of impact on QoL in urban and rural areas. Our research has done a comparative analysis on the basis of gender. Further studies can do a comparative analysis on the basis of industry

or other demographics like marital status, status of living (i.e. whether the individuals are living alone or with family).

References

- Allen, T. D., Cho, E. & Meier, L.L. (2014), "Work-family Boundary Dynamics", *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1: 99-121.
- Altheide, D. L. & Johnson, J. M. (1994), "Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research" in N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Anderson, A.J., Kaplan, S.A. & Vega, R.P. (2015), "The Impact of Telework on Emotional Experience: When, and for Whom? Does Telework Improve Daily Affective Well-being?" *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(6): 882-97.
- Anderson, D. & Kelliher, C. (2020), "Enforced Remote Working and the Work-life Interface During Lockdown", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35(7/8): 677-83.
- Banerjee, G. & Pati, I. (2020), "Women Working from Home During COVID-19: An Analysis". *Parikalpana - KIIT Journal of Management*, 16: 173-91.
- Banigan, M.S., Bell, J.F., Basu, A., LaForce, C.B. & Harris, J.R. (2016), "Workplace Stress and Working from Home Influence Depressive Symptoms among Employed Women with Young Children", *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 23: 102-11.
- Bhumika (2020), "Challenges for Work-life Balance During COVID-19 Induced Nationwide Lockdown: Exploring Gender Difference in Emotional Exhaustion in the Indian Setting", *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 35(7/8): 705-18.
- Bloom, N., Liang, J., Roberts, J. & Ying, Z.J. (2015), "Does Working from Home Work?"

- Evidence from a Chinese Experiment”, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1): 165-218.
- Busch, E., Nash, J. & Bell, B. S. (2011), *Remote Work: An Examination of Current Trends and Emerging Issues*. Ithaca, NY: Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, Cornell University.
- Chaudhari, S., Yadav, R. & Rai, S. (2021), “Work Values & Job Attitudes: A Study of Gen Y in Public Sector”, *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 57(1) : 142-57.
- Delina, G. & Raya, R. P. (2016), “Dilemma of Work-life Balance in Dual-career Couples- a Study from the Indian Perspective”, *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*, 12(1): 1-27.
- Drummond, S., O’Driscoll, M. P., Brough, P., Kalliath, T., Siu, O.L., Timms, C., Riley, D., Sit, C. & Lo, D. (2017), “The Relationship of Social Support with Well-being Outcomes via Work–family Conflict: Moderating Effects of Gender, Dependents and Nationality”, *Human Relations*, 70(5): 544-65.
- Etikan, I. & Bala, K. (2017), “Sampling and Sampling Methods”, *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, 5(6): 00149. DOI: 10.15406/bbij.2017.05.00149
- Felstead, A. & Henseke, G. (2017), “Assessing the Growth of Remote Working and Its Consequences for Effort, Well-being and Work-life Balance”, *New Technology Work and Employment*, 32(3): 195-212.
- Field, A. (2009), *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, 3rd Edition*, Sage Publications, London.
- Flores, M. F. (2019), “Understanding The Challenges of Remote Working and Its Impact to Workers”, *International Journal of Business Marketing and Management*, 4(11): 40-44.
- Gopal, A., Sharma, A.J. & Subramanyam, M.A. (2020), “Dynamics of Psychological Responses to COVID-19 in India: A Longitudinal Study”, *PLoS ONE*, 15(10): e0240650. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0240650>
- Greenhaus, J.H., Collins, K.M. & Shaw, J.D. (2003), “The Relation Between Work-family Balance and Quality of Life”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63: 510-31, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00042-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00042-8).
- Hair, J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L & Black, W. C. (1995), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 4th ed, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hardesty, D. M. & Bearden, W. O. (2004), “The Use of Expert Judges in Scale Development Implications for Improving Face Validity of Measures of Unobservable Constructs”, *Journal of Business Research*, 57: 98-107.
- Hupkau, C. & Petrongolo, B. (2020), *Work, Care and Gender During the Covid-19 Crisis, A CEP Covid-19 Analysis*, *London School of Economics and Political Science*, Paper No. 002.
- Jaiswal, A. & Arun, C. J. (2020), “Unlocking the COVID- 19 Lockdown: Work from Home and Its Impact on Employees”, <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-34556/v1>
- Lippe, T. V. D. & Lippényi, Z. (2020), “Beyond Formal Access: Organizational Context, Working From Home, and Work–Family Conflict of Men and Women in European Workplaces”, *Social Indicators Research*, 151: 383-402.
- Marsh & McLennan Companies (2020), *When You Work from Home*. www.marsh.com .
- Mohajan, H. K. (2017), “Two Criteria for Good Measurements in Research: Validity and Reliability”, *Annals of Spiru Haret University*, 17(3): 58-82.
- Moore, J. (2006), “Homeworking and Work-life Balance: Does It Add to Quality of Life?” *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 56(1): 5-13.
- National Insurance Academy (2020), *Work-From-Home in Insurance Industry: Adapting to*

- the New-Normal, Pune, <https://niapune.org.in/research-and-publication/research-reports>
- Perrigino, M.B., Dunford, B.B. & Wilson, K.S. (2018), "Work-family Backlash: the 'Dark Side' of Work-life Balance (WLB) policies", *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2): 600-30.
- Rajadhyaksha, U., Korabik, K. & Aycan, Z. (2015), "Gender, Gender-role Ideology, and the Work-family Interface: A Cross-cultural Analysis" in Mills, M.J. (Ed.), *Gender and the Work-Family Experience: An Intersection of Two Domains*, Springer International Publishing, London
- Raju, S. & Kumar, V.K. (2020), "Quality of Life of Women Working from Home in COVID-19 Lockdown: A Questionnaire Survey", *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*, 7(10): 3947-51.
- Rao, T.S.S. & Indla, V. (2010), "Work, Family or Personal Life: Why Not All Three?" *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 52(4): 295-97.
- Rohilla, P., Garg, R. & Chandiramani, K. (2021), "Negative Effects of 'Work from Home' Culture During the Coronavirus Pandemic: a Gender-based Study", *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(1): 1232-46.
- Ruževičius, J. & Akranavičiute, D. (2007), "Quality of Life and Its Components Measurement", *Engineering Economics*, 2: 43-48.
- Shah, R. A. (2015), "Work-life Balance and Gender: A Study of Professionals in India", *Review of Management*, 5(1/2): 5-18.
- Shareena, P. & Shahid, M. (2020), "Work from Home During Covid 19: Employees Perception and Experiences", *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 9(15), DOI: 10.36106/gjra.
- Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R. (2011), "Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha", *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2: 53-55.
- Williams, B., Onsmann, A. & Brown, T. (2010), "Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Five-step Guide for Novices", *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care*, 8(3): 1-13.
- World Health Organization. (2012), WHOQOL: Measuring Quality of Life, <https://www.who.int/toolkits/whoqol>