The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)

Volume 12, Issue 2, April- June, 2024

DIP: 18.01.248.20241202, DOI: 10.25215/1202.248

https://www.ijip.in

Comparative Study



Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction, Employee Motivation and Work-Life Balance among Public and Private Sector Employees

Tanya Prasad¹*

ABSTRACT

This study aims to do a comparative analysis of job satisfaction, employee motivation, and work-life balance among public and private sector employees. Data was collected from 140 employees of which 70 were from the public sector (both male and female) and 70 from the private sector (both male and female) aged between 25-55 years of age. Data was collected using the survey method. Job satisfaction scale, work motivation questionnaire and work-life balance scale was used to collect the responses. As per the findings, there exists very little difference in Job satisfaction, employee motivation and work-life balance among public and private sector employees.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Employee Motivation, Work-Life Balance

he discussion on work-life balance, employee motivation, and job satisfaction has gained a lot of attention in the changing face of modern employment from academics to legislators to practitioners. (Adams & Tran, 2020; Nita & Stamati, 2019). It is critical for organizations to comprehend the subtle distinctions between the public and private sectors as they work to maximize employee performance and well-being (Perry & Wise, 1990). This study does a comparative analysis which aims to reveal the nuances of job satisfaction, employee motivation and work-life balance in the public an private sector employees.

According to Lundberg et al. (2009), the public and private sectors are two distinct occupational domains with different objectives, organizational structures, and operational frameworks. The public sector is tasked with serving the interests of society at large, whereas the private sector functions under a paradigm that is motivated by profit (Rainey, 2014). These innate differences invariably impact the dynamics of work-life balance, employee motivation, and job satisfaction within each industry.

Job satisfaction is key to the overall happiness of an employee. It is important that the employees feel connected to their jobs and feel that they are able to maintain a good work-life balance in their current role.

*Corresponding Author

Received: May 21, 2024; Revision Received: May 27, 2024; Accepted: May 31, 2024

¹Student

According to Deci and Ryan (1985), employee motivation is a crucial factor in determining how employees behave and view activities linked to their jobs. It is frequently recognized as the engine behind both individual performance and firm productivity. Employees in the private sector may require a different set of motivational strategies centered around performance incentives and career advancement opportunities due to the pursuit of profit maximization, while employees in the public sector may be intrinsically motivated due to the emphasis on public service and societal impact (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Analyzing how the two industries' motivational dynamics differ might help to promote employee commitment and engagement.

Work-life balance has become a crucial factor in determining an employee's general well-being and job satisfaction in a time of globalization and technological breakthroughs (Shockley & Singla, 2011). According to Greenhaus and Allen (2011), striking a balance between work and personal obligations is becoming more and more important to workers in all industries. However, according to Kosek and Lautsch (2018), organizational cultures, legislation, and societal expectations can have a significant impact on the methods and support systems used to achieve work-life balance in the public and private sectors.

There has always been debates on which one out of the public or private sector jobs are better. Both have its pros and cons which directly affect overall job satisfaction, employee motivation and work-life balance. Studies have been conducted over decades to test which sector has an edge over the other. Some key factors in the studies include overall job satisfaction, employee motivation, pay and rewards as well as work-life balance.

Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction is defined as "an emotional state" which is a pleasurable or positive state resulting from one's Job experience. (Locke,1976). Job satisfaction isn't just about how much you like your job; It's also attributed to a state of mind that defines how happy you feel in life, not only professionally but also in your personal life that includes your relationships, family, and health.

Individuals who are satisfied with their occupations typically put in more effort at work and miss fewer days of work. While on the other hand, employees who are not happy with their job situation, might leave their jobs more often and are more prone to feeling stressed out (Penn,1998; Tsiligis, 2004; Liter,2013; Erdogan, 2017; Lee, 2018 Work-related fulfilment, joy, or self-satisfaction are not the only things that matter. It is important that the employee connects with their work and develops a healthy bond bond with his/her work.

Definition of Job Satisfaction:

Different well-known creators have defined the idea of job satisfaction in different ways. Some of them are

- 1. Smith et al. (1969) define Job Satisfaction as "the inclination a person has about their work.
- 2. Abraham Maslow (1954): According to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory, a person's ability to fulfill their needs—from fundamental physiological needs to more advanced needs related to self-actualization—is correlated with their level of job satisfaction. As people go closer to meeting their higher-order requirements, Maslow contends, their level of satisfaction rises (Maslow, 1954).

- **3.** According to **Edwin A. Locke** (1976), "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" is what he describes as job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2017).
- **4. Vroom** (1982) explained Job Satisfaction as "employees' passionate direction toward their present place of employment jobs" (Vroom et.al, 1982).

Although the meaning of job satisfaction has evolved over time, still most of the definitions have the same idea that job satisfaction is a positive sense of fulfillment at work.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction theories are classified into two types:

- 1. Content theories
- 2. Process theories.

Content theories mainly focus on individual requirements and self-objectives. They fundamentally apprehend what rouses employees in an organization. Some of the famous theories that come under this are-

- 1. Maslow's Theory of Motivation/Satisfaction (1943): This theory of Maslow is "the most widely mentioned theory of motivation and satisfaction" (Weihrich & Koontz, 1999). He said that an individual's motivational needs can be classified hierarchically. As one level is satisfied, it is no longer needed and then one moves to another level Therefore, to motivate and ultimately satisfy the individual, the next higher level of need must be engaged. (Luthans, 2005). Maslow (1943) classified needs into five levels, which were as follows: Physical needs (clothing, food, shelter, and sex); Safety needs: (physical protection); Social needs: (chances to form intimate relationships with others); Esteem/Achievement needs: (recognition from others); and Self-Actualization needs: (chances to achieve self-fulfillment and personal growth) (Maslow, 1943).
- 2. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959): According to Frederick Herzberg, job happiness and discontent are not only at opposite ends of the same spectrum. Rather, they are entirely different entities. While elements like the work atmosphere, communication, and job stability may contribute to unhappiness, elements like rewards, salary, recognition, and achievement lead to satisfaction. Both types of factors are seen as independent because an employee can feel neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. According to the theory, dissatisfaction arises when hygiene factors are low, but if these factors are high, there's no dissatisfaction. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction mainly depends on motivators. Sometimes, employees might feel both satisfied and unsatisfied at the same time, or they might not feel either.

On the other hand, Process theories investigate how inspiration might strike. They oversee "how" inspiration occurs as well as the "process" of inspiration. Among the popular process theories are:

Equity Theory (J. Stacy Adams) (1963)

Equity theory suggests that employees look at what they contribute to their job (input) and what they receive from it (outcome). They then compare their input and outcome with those of other people who are relevant to them. If they feel that their input and outcome are fair compared to those others, they feel like things are balanced and fair, which is called equity. (Robbins, 2015).

Goal-Setting Theory (Edwin Locke, 1968)

Goal setting theory is the most researched and dominant theory of employee motivation field(Perry et al., 2006). According to goal theory, achieving challenging goals necessitates maintaining focus on the issue, elevating the significance of the goal, and motivating persistence and increased effort. Goal theory and cognitive theories can be merged to comprehend the occurrences better.

Employee motivation

Employee motivation is defined by the natural urge from within the employee to work hard and take action on tasks related to their job. According to Jones et al. (2008), it is essentially described as "psychological forces" that dictate an individual's behaviour inside an organization, their amount of effort, and their persistence. Motivation is also described as "the willingness to invest one's energy in order to accomplish a goal." One can also define motivation as "a readiness to spend their energy to achieve a goal. According to Work, motivation is defined as 'the sum of the processes that influence the arousal, direction, and maintenance of behaviours relevant to work settings" (Moran and Barbara, 2013).

Employee Motivation is considered one of the most important parts of the success of any organization as it promotes employees' effective performance. For an organization's objective to be achieved, the employers depend upon the performance of their employees (Wiley, 1997). Motivation levels at the workplace directly affect how productive employees are. When employees are enthusiastic and driven about their work, they perform to the best of their abilities, which boosts productivity. However, even when they are skilled, employees who lack motivation perform poorly (Wiley, 2007; Germann, 2004). Employee Motivation remains an important part of organizational psychology as it helps to describe individual conduct in organizations (Donovan, 2001).

Definition of Employee Motivation

Several definitions given by famous personalities are

- 1. Robins and Coulter (2005) defined motivation as "the desire and willingness to exert a high level of inspiration to reach organisational goals, conditioned by the effort's ability to satisfy some individual need" (Robins and Coulter, 2005).
- **2.** Luthan (2011) defines employee motivation as a combination of internal and external factors that regulate enthusiasm in employees to achieve their organisational goals. (Luthan, 2011).
- 3. Steers et. al (2004) says "Employee motivation encompasses the psychological forces that drive individuals to perform optimally in their work roles, including their desires, needs, and aspirations." (Steers et. al, 2004).
- **4.** Colquitt et al (2019) explain employee motivation as the forces within an individual that explain the amount, direction, and persistence of effort put forth at work are represented by employee motivation.

Theories of Employee Motivation

1. Vroom's expectancy theory: Victor Vroom founded the expectation theory of motivation, which holds that expectations of desirable results serve as the foundation for motivation. Expectancy, instrumentality, force, and valence form the foundation of the theory (Skemp et. al, 2007). Valence refers to an attractiveness towards rewards, incentives, or outcomes. Expectancy refers to a person's belief in whether he will be able to achieve a goal or not. Instrumentality is the thinking that good

performance will be rewarded and Force is the ability of the person to perform (Skemp et. al, 2007). Vroom believed that people will work hard to reach a goal if they think the goal is important and if they believe their work will help achieve it (Moran and Barbara, 2013).

2. McClelland's Need Theory: McClelland's need achievement theory says that some people are motivated by wanting to achieve personal success, not just by getting rewards (Saif et al., 2012). This theory helps explain why some teachers keep striving for success, even when they face challenges: they set high goals for themselves and reaching those goals is what keeps them going. Alderfer's ERG theory is like Maslow's hierarchy of needs but simplifies it. Instead of Maslow's five categories of needs, Alderfer's theory has three: relatedness (like feeling respected or having friends), growth (like learning new things), and existence (like feeling safe and having basic needs met).

WORK-LIFE BALANCE

The relationship between work and other pursuits such as leisure, social obligations, family, community, health, and personal growth is known as work-life balance. Work-life balance is about finding a delicate equilibrium by giving this first priority. It is unique to each person and is always evolving. In today's time, organisations have realised the importance of work-life balance in respect to the productivity and creativity of employees. In order to encourage their staff to work effectively, employers are now providing flexible work schedules, team outings to healthcare facilities, and daycare centres. Employee motivation increases as a result, and they grow devoted to the company and put in extra effort to maintain a good work-life balance.

Definition of Work-Life Balance

Several definitions given by some famous personalities are:

- 1. Clark (2000) says that Finding a healthy balance between one's personal and professional obligations allows people to manage their time and energy wisely and preserve their general well-being. This is known as work-life balance.\
- 2. Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) define work-life balance as to the methods and approaches people use to successfully integrate their personal and professional lives, with the goal of maximising positive spillover effects and achieving fulfillment in both.
- **3. Frone** (2003) says Achieving the ideal balance between the various roles people play—such as employee, partner, parent, and self—allows people to be satisfied and content in both their personal and professional lives. This is known as work-life balance.

Theories of Work-Life Balance

1. Segmentation Theory

According to this idea, life and work are unaffected by one another because they are distinct entities with separate identities (Edwards & Rothband, 2000; Kanter, 1977; Staines, 1980; Young & Kleiner, 1992; Zedeck, 1992). Since the industrial revolution, "life and work have been inherently divided by space, function, and time" (Gragnano et al., 2020). Employees can establish boundaries between their personal and professional lives by keeping work-related thoughts, actions, and feelings separate when at home and vice versa. This is a tactic used by some to firmly hold themselves back. (Piotrkowski, 1979). This allows employees to skillfully sort their lives.

2. Enrichment Theory

It's also known as Enhancement Theory. According to this hypothesis, having experience in one area of life enhances the quality of other areas of life, and vice versa. Morris and Madsen (2005) state that this hypothesis indicates the extent to which experiences derived from instrumental sources such as abilities, skills, and values, or from emotive sources like satisfaction and mood, improve the quality of the other domain. Employees have reportedly noted that experiences in one role improve the quality of life in other roles, enhancing both life and work roles (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). The general explanation provided by the hypothesis is that there are beneficial interactions between job and family life.

3. Congruence theory

According to this hypothesis, factors that aren't directly related to family or job duties might nonetheless affect how stable various positions are. Variables including genetic pressures, behavioural patterns, psychological traits, and sociocultural influences are used to achieve this (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Zedeck, 1992). For instance, this theory takes intelligence or educational attainment into account as a third component. Variables like these have a favourable impact on responsibilities in the home and workplace (Rincy & Panchanatham, 2014).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Caoagdan et. al (2023) conducted a study to compare Job satisfaction among employees of Public and Private administration using metrics of Job satisfaction and work motivation. A total of 90 employees were chosen for this study (45 male and 45 female). The result showed that both public and private sector employees had high levels of job satisfaction, which was impacted by supportive teams, compensation, and interactions with coworkers. Fair compensation and motivation lead to increased satisfaction in private administration. Employees in the private sector place a higher value on large pay than do those in the public sector.

Yusuf (2018) conducted a study "A Comparative Study of Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction of the Employees Working in the Business Process Outsourcing Sector". This study sheds light on the work-life balance and job satisfaction of those employees in Business process outsourcing. A total of 200 employees were selected out of which 120 were males and 80 were females. All of the analysis was done using SPSS software. The result showed an insignificant difference in job satisfaction as well as work-life balance among male and female employees of the BPO sector.

Rathi and Islam (2024) We out a study to determine the relationship between public and private bankers' job performance, job happiness, and work-life balance. A total of 100 participants—50 men and 50 women—were selected from a number of Dhaka-area public, private, and public banks. According to the study's findings, job happiness, work-life balance, and job performance were all strongly correlated. The results also indicated that job satisfaction and work-life balance independently and together predict job performance, with job happiness being the strongest predictor of job success.

Oktosatrio and Suhendro (2018) in "Investigating the Relationship between Work-Life-Balance and Motivation of the Employees: Evidence from the Local Government of Jakarta" investigate the connection between employees' motivation and work-life balance in Jakarta, Indonesia's public sector. A conceptual framework was developed using motivational and

work-life balance theories to explore the variables. Data of 8 people were collected who were working in who were working in local government of Jakarta. This was descriptive research following the qualitative inductive method. Results showed that job is greatly impacted by personal life. The majority of respondents said they would rather work from home and have flexible hours. It's interesting to note that women are more willing than men to work from home. Additionally, the results showed that women are far more organized than men when it comes to juggling personal and professional obligations. Furthermore, all workers choose to take vacation time over additional pay or bonuses. Last but not least, the most demotivating aspect of a job is working longer hours.

Singh and Singh (2020) conducted a study on "Employee Job Satisfaction in the Private and Public Sector Banks". This study aimed to look at the features that influence job satisfaction among employees working at the operational level in both banks. Data of 200 employees were collected (80 male) (120 female). The result revealed that Determining the elements influencing job satisfaction and the significant role that they play in the service industry—particularly in banks—is crucial. In banks, employee performance is very important. Employee satisfaction raises the standard and effectiveness of banking operations. It becomes imperative that administrators, academics, and policymakers take into account the various factors influencing job happiness.

Singha (2018) study on "Impact of work-life balance on Job Satisfaction" talks about the impact of work-life balance on Job satisfaction in the context of teachers who teach at school. The result showed that Although they used to be satisfied with their careers, the results indicate that work-life balance has a major impact on job satisfaction.

Chaterjee (2017) A study on "Job Satisfaction, Occupational Stress and Work Motivation: A Comparative Analysis among the Banking and Academic Sector Professionals" was carried out by Chaterjee (2017). Assessing occupational stress, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment among professionals in two distinct fields—academics and bankers, which include both the public and private sectors—was the study's main objective. The total size of the sample was 240 in which 120 were bank employees (60 public and 60 private) and 120 were academic professionals (60 public and 60 private). The findings showed that workers in government schools are more satisfied with their jobs than those in private schools. When comparing the private bank industry to other professions and their corresponding sectors, it is also evident that the private bank industry rates highest on all occupational stress characteristics. And at last, the result also revealed work motivation is higher in public schools than in government bank.

Hasan et al. (2021) conducted a study on "The Influence of Person–Job Fit, Work–Life Balance, and Work Conditions on Organizational Commitment: Investigating the Mediation of Job Satisfaction in the Private Sector of the Emerging Market". In the evaluation of work-life balance, person-job fit, working conditions, and the mediation of job satisfaction, the study aids in optimizing organisational commitment. Additionally, it looks into how various demographic factors affect organisational commitment. The population is made up of workers from Pakistani private sector companies. The study found that job satisfaction, person-job fit, and work-life balance all positively impact organisational commitment. While 100% mediation of job satisfaction was discovered for work conditions, job satisfaction intervenes complementarily with the link of work-life balance and person-job fit with organisational commitment.

Frimpong et. al (2021) study examines the relationship between employee motivation and team performance within the banks of Ghana and China. The result revealed that Individual motivation differs from individual motivation within a team. Even if a team is made up of individuals, no two people have the same requirements or goals as one another. On the other hand, team performance after an evaluation is positively impacted by overall team motivation or employee motivation, such as recognition. Ghanaian respondents gave the highest rating to recognition, whereas Chinese respondents gave the top rating to an attractive wage (Strongly agree). Nonetheless, when it comes to elements that influence team performance, Ghanaian respondents gave Members Understanding the highest rating for strongly agreeing. But commitment scored highest under "strongly agree" among those who were Chinese.

Sinha and Ahmad (2020) conducted a study that aimed to to investigate the work motivation of both teaching and non-teaching staff members in Government and Missionary Schools during the COVID-19 epidemic, with a focus on North Bihar. Data was collected of 180 employees aged between 30-58 (45 government school teacher,45 government school non-teachers 45 missionary school teachers, and 45 missionary school non-teachers). The result of the study showed that there were notable distinctions between the Government School and Missionary School groups regarding the work motivation of their teaching staff. the levels of work motivation among Government school teaching employees have been found little high as compared to missionary school teaching employees.

Saikia and Shome (2023) conducted a study on "EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT OF WORKERS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LIMITED TEA GARDEN OF ASSAM: A COMPARATIVE STUDY". This study's primary goal is to identify any notable distinctions between tea garden employees employed by public and private companies. Data was collected from 238 respondents out of which 100 were from public limited tea garden workers (46 male, 54 female) and 138 were from private limited tea garden workers of Assam (62 men, 7 women). The results indicate that tea garden workers who work in public and private settings, as well as between male and female employees in the former and female employees in the latter, differ significantly in terms of employee motivation and organisational commitment. It demonstrates that male tea garden workers are more motivated and dedicated than their female counterparts.

Mhammad and Salameh (2014) conducted a study on "Teacher motivation: A study of work motivation of the primary stage teachers in Jordan". Examining primary school teachers' job motivation in connection to age, school type, educational background, and gender was the primary goal of the research. Data from 312 individuals was gathered. The findings showed that Jordanian primary school teachers have a comparatively high degree of motivation. The findings also indicated that compared to male instructors, female teachers had higher levels of work motivation. Additionally, it was discovered that teachers with bachelor's degrees were more driven to work than those with advanced diplomas.

Amjid and Zamir (2020) study aims to compare the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of instructors working at public and Cadet colleges. The results of the study, which examined the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of teachers in public and Cadet institutions, indicated that there was no discernible difference between the teachers' motivation.

Ahluwalia and Preet (2018) study examines differences among the teachers working in university of Punjab related to commitment, motivation, and locus of control according to

their experience. Sample size was 460 teachers (250 state university respondents & 210 private university respondents). The results show that intrinsic motivation rises as work experience does. It is discovered that teachers who have less work experience are more intrinsically motivated. Teachers with more job experience are shown to be more dedicated to the organisation than teachers with less work experience. Teachers with more experience tend to have higher levels of devotion to their work. With respect to locus of control, the tendency of a teacher to lean more towards external locus of control and less towards internal locus of control increases with experience.

Sabir and Kura (2021) conducted a study on "The Effects of Work-Life Balance on the Academic employees' Performance, Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Private and Public Universities of Kurdistan Region". This study looks into how academic staff members' job happiness, motivation, and performance in public and private institutions in the Kurdistan Region are affected by work-life balance. The findings suggest that academic staff members have difficulty striking a work-life balance during the course of their employment. Even though the work-life balance culture at public universities is not at an acceptable level, employees at public universities nevertheless enjoy a relatively larger degree of work-life balance than their counterparts at private institutions. Employees at private universities confront more difficult obstacles than those at public universities.

Dousin et.all (2019) Examine the relationship between work-life balance practices and employee job performance among doctors and nurses in East Malaysia, as well as the mediating role that job satisfaction plays in this relationship. In the East Malaysian states of Sarawak and Sabah, 491 physicians and nurses are surveyed for the study. It may be concluded from the findings that job performance is significantly improved by flexible work schedules and supportive supervision. Positive mediation between accommodating work schedules and encouraging oversight of job performance occurs when job satisfaction is high. Employee job satisfaction will rise as a result of good work-life balance (WLB) practices, which will also boost output and performance.

Pandey (2020) conducted a study on "A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of Private and Public Sector Managers". In this study, managers in the public and private sectors will have their job satisfaction levels compared. We used a total of 120 managers for our study, dividing them into two groups: 60 managers from the private and 60 managers from the public sectors. The findings showed a substantial gap between managers in the public and private sectors. Compared to managers in the private sector, those in the public sector expressed greater satisfaction with regard to senior/junior relationships, nature of work, and salary/pay. Conversely, public sector managers expressed greater satisfaction with unions than their private sector counterparts.

Maureen Snow Andrade & Jonathan H. Westover (2023) conducted a study on the topic "Job Satisfaction – An International Comparison of Public and Private Sector Employees". With data from the International Social Survey Programme, The study examines the effects of work-life balance, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and work relationships on job satisfaction for employees in the public and private sectors using a worldwide sample from 37 countries. The study's primary factors revealed a considerable difference between these professions, with public workers scoring higher in key areas.

METHODOLOGY

Aim

To compare differences in variables such as job satisfaction, employee motivation and work-life balance between employees in the public and private sectors.

Objective

- a. To study the difference in Job satisfaction between public and private sector employees.
- b. To study the difference in employee motivation between public and private sector employees.
- c. To study the difference in work-life balance between public and private sector employees.
- d. To evaluate the potential reasons behind the lower difference of variables among both the public and private sectors.

Hypothesis

- H0: There is no significant difference between Job satisfaction, employee motivation, and work-life balance among public and private sector employees.
- H1: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction among public and private sector employees.
- H2: There is a significant difference in employee motivation among public and private sector employees.
- H3: There is a significant difference in work-life balance among public and private sector employees.

Sample and its selection

The total sample collected was of 140 people working in Delhi NCR of which 70 were from the public sector (35 male and 35 female) and 70 were from the private sector (35 male and 35 female). The age limit was between 25-55 years of age. The data was collected using questionnaires and the sample technique used was snowball sampling.

Description of the Tools employed:

- 1. Generic Job Satisfaction scale (GJS): this scale was developed by Scott MacDonald and Peter Macintyre in 1997. It was use to measure Job satisfaction among various occupational settings. The scale consists of 10 items which related to different aspects of work environment.
- 2. Work Motivation Questionnaire (WMQ): Dr. K.G. Agarwal (1990) provided this scale. This survey is intended to gauge employees' motivation for their jobs. There are five options for each of the 26 items on a Likert scale. Dependency, organizational orientation, workgroup interactions, psychological work incentives, material incentives, and working circumstances are the six characteristics that are covered in this questionnaire.
- 3. Work-life balance Scale: This scale was given by Judy Hayman (2005). This scale contains 15 items that measure work-life balance among three areas-: work interference in personal life (WIP), personal life interference with work (PLIW), and work-personal life enhancement (WPLE). As you read the following statements, tick the one that resonates with you the most (from 1= Strongly disagree to 3= Strongly disagree).

Procedure

The three questionnaires were distributed to the targeted participants, this questionnaire was distributed online through Google Forms and the responses also came online according to their perspective. The responses were then saved in an Excel sheet. Once the data was collected, the T-test was to compare the data of the three variables among public and private sector employees.

Statistical Analysis

T-test and SPSS software will be used to analyze the data collected.

RESULTS

This study's primary goal was to compare work-life balance, employee motivation, and job satisfaction between employees in the public and private sectors. The participants selected were asked to fill out the questionnaire according to their work experience, how satisfied and motivated they were with their jobs, and whether they are able to manage work and life equally. The results are as follows.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of study variables

		Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Total work motivation	64.35	16.73
2	Dependence_WM	17.43	3.46
3	Organisational orientation_WM	14.31	4.54
4	Work group relation_WM	9.83	3.38
5	Psychological work incentives_WM	8.78	3.22
6	Material incentive_WM	6.86	2.63
7	Job situation_WM	7.10	2.32
8	Job satisfaction	37.38	7.18
9	Work interfering personal lifeWLB	9.56	3.03
10	Personal life interference with work_WLB	10.90	2.43
11	Work/personal life enhancement_WLB	6.60	2.15

Table one represents the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) of all the study variables - Total work motivation (Dependence, Organisational orientation, Work group relation, Psychological work incentives, Material incentive, Job situation), Job satisfaction, work life balance (Work interfering personal life, Personal life interference with work, Work/personal life enhancement).

Normality testing

Table 2 Normality test among private (1) and public (2) participants for study variables

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a					Shapiro
	Working Sector	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	
Total Work motivation	1	.091	68	.200	.928	
	2	.117	73	.015	.954	
Dependence	1	.113	68	.031	.961	
	2	.097	73	.085	.960	
Organizational orientation	1	.113	68	.031	.944	
	2	.096	73	.091	.956	
Work group relation	1	.114	68	.028	.952	
	2	.170	73	.000	.936	
Psychological work	1	.107	68	.052	.943	
incentives	2	.129	73	.004	.954	
Material incentive	1	.118	68	.021	.940	
	2	.128	73	.005	.944	
Job situation	1	.175	68	.000	.896	
	2	.139	73	.001	.947	
Job satisfaction	1	.099	68	.094	.972	
	2	.092	73	.200	.977	
Work interfering personal	1	.172	68	.000	.917	
life	2	.121	73	.010	.937	
Personal life interference	1	.160	68	.000	.942	
with work	2	.113	73	.021	.962	
Work/personal life	1	.170	68	.000	.886	
enhancement	2	.180	73	.000	.901	

^{*.} This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table two represents the normality test statistics among private (1) and public (2) participants for the study variables. The Shapiro-Wilk Sig. index indicates that the data for the study sample was normally distributed only for job satisfaction suggesting a parametric condition. For all other variables, samples were not normally distributed suggesting a nonparametric condition.

T test Table 3 T test between private (1) and public (2) across study variables

	Mean	SD	T	Sig. (2 tailed)	Result
Job satisfaction					
Private	37.19	7.19	.30	.76	NS
Public	37.56	7.22			

NS-Not significant, S-Significant

Table three represents the t statistics between private (1) and public (2) on job satisfaction. There is no significant difference in job satisfaction between the two sample groups.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Mann Whitney U test
Table 4 Mann Whitney U test between private (1) and public (2) participants across study variables

Total work motivation		Mean	U	Sig. (2	Result
Private Public 68.52		Rank		tailed)	
Public 73.31 2429 82 NS Private Private Private Public 70.22 71.73 2429 .82 NS Organisational orientation_WM Private Public 68.62 2320 .50 NS Work group relation_WM Private Public 69.08 2351.50 .58 NS Public Public 72.79 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM Private Public 71.40 2454.50 90 .90 NS Material incentive_WM Private Fivate Public 67.53 74.23 2246 .32 NS .32 NS Job situation_WM Private Fivate Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS .82 NS Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB Fivate Public 73.78 73.78 2293 .43 NS .43 NS					
Dependence_WM			2313.50	.48	NS
Private Public 70.22 71.73 2429 82 NS Organisational orientation_WM Private Public 68.62 73.22 2320 .50 NS Work group relation_WM Private Public 69.08 72.79 2351.50 .58 NS Public 72.79 NS NS Public 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 NS Material incentive_WM Private Public 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 NS Job situation_WM Private Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB Private Public 73.78 2293 .43 NS Personal life interference With Work_WLB Private Public 68.41 NS		73.31			
Public 71.73	_				
Organisational orientation_WM 68.62 2320 .50 NS Public 73.22 .50 NS Work group relation_WM 69.08 2351.50 .58 NS Private 69.08 2351.50 .58 NS Public 72.79 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 .50 .58 NS Material incentive_WM .70.62 .70.21	Private	70.22	2429	.82	NS
Private Public 68.62 73.22 2320 .50 NS Work group relation_WM 73.22 .50 NS Work group relation_WM 69.08 72.79 2351.50 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM 72.79 .50 NS Psychological work incentives_WM 71.40 2454.50 .90 .90 NS Public 70.62 .50 .50 NS Material incentive_WM .50 .50 .50 NS Public 74.23 .50 .50 .50 NS Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 .82 NS Public 71.73 .50 <t< td=""><td></td><td>71.73</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		71.73			
Public 73.22 Second Private Public Public	Organisational orientation_WM				
Work group relation_WM 69.08 2351.50 .58 NS Private 72.79 2351.50 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 .90 NS Material incentive_WM 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 .90 NS NS Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 .82 NS Work interfering personal lifeWLB 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 .78 .43 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41 .90 .43 NS	Private	68.62	2320	.50	NS
Private Public 69.08 72.79 2351.50 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM Private 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 NS NS Material incentive_WM Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 NS NS Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 NS NS Private Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41 NS NS NS	Public	73.22			
Private Public 69.08 72.79 2351.50 .58 NS Psychological work incentives_WM Private 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 NS NS Material incentive_WM Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 NS NS Public 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 NS NS Private Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41 NS NS NS	Work group relation_WM				
Psychological work incentives_WM 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Public 70.62 .90 NS Material incentive_WM .90 NS Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 .90 NS Public 74.23 .90 NS Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 .90 NS Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 .90 NS Private 68.41 .43 NS Private 68.41 .90 .43 NS		69.08	2351.50	.58	NS
Private Public 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Material incentive_WM 70.62 .90 NS Material incentive_WM 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 .90 NS NS Public 74.23 .32 NS NS Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 .82 NS NS Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41 .84 .43 NS	Public	72.79			
Private Public 71.40 2454.50 .90 NS Material incentive_WM 70.62 .90 NS Material incentive_WM 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 .90 NS NS Public 74.23 .32 NS NS Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 .82 NS NS Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41 .84 .43 NS	Psychological work incentives_WM				
Material incentive_WM Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 Job situation_WM Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public		71.40	2454.50	.90	NS
Private 67.53 2246 .32 NS Public 74.23 Job situation_WM Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB Private 68.41 Public 68.41	Public	70.62			
Public 74.23	Material incentive_WM				
Job situation_WM Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public	Private	67.53	2246	.32	NS
Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public 68.41	Public	74.23			
Private 70.21 2428.50 .82 NS Public 71.73 Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public 68.41	Job situation WM				
Work interfering personal lifeWLB Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public	Private	70.21	2428.50	.82	NS
Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS NS	Public	71.73			
Private 65.04 2077 .09 NS Public 76.55 Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public 65.04 2077 .09 NS NS	Work interfering personal lifeWLB				
Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41		65.04	2077	.09	NS
Personal life interference with work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private Public 68.41	Public	76.55			
work_WLB 73.78 2293 .43 NS Private 68.41 Public .43 NS					
Private 68.41 Public		73.78	2293	.43	NS
Public					
	Work/personal life enhancement_WLB				
Private 66.11 2149.50 .16 NS	<u> </u>	66.11	2149.50	.16	NS
Public 75.55			21 17.50	1.10	1,0

NS-Not significant, S-Significant

Table four represents the Mann Whitney U test statistics private (1) and public (2) participants on Total work motivation (Dependence, Organizational orientation, Work group relation, Psychological work incentives, Material incentive, Job situation), work life balance (Work interfering personal life, Personal life interference with work, Work/personal life enhancement). There is no significant difference in all the variables between the two sample groups.

DISCUSSION

This study did a comparative analysis between job satisfaction, employee motivation and work-life balance among public and private sector employees including both male and

female. The sample size taken for this was 140 in which 70 were from the public sector and 70 were from the private sector aged between 25-55 years of age. For collecting responses, three questionnaires were used which were Job satisfaction, work motivation questionnaire and work-life balance scale. All the data collected was arranged in Excel sheet. Interpretation of the result was done using T-test and Mann Whitney U test in SPSS software.

The data for the study sample was normally distributed only for job satisfaction suggesting a parametric condition. For this, T-test was used. For the other two, Mann Whitney U test was used as samples were not normally distributed suggesting a nonparametric condition. The studies were conducted based on three different hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction among public and private sector employees. In table 3, The statistical T test between public and private sector on Job satisfaction shows that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction among public sector and private sector employee as p value stand at .76. One of the reasons for this result could be that the task and responsibilities performed by both sector employees may be similar. When the nature of the work itself is comparable, employees may experience similar levels of satisfaction regardless of the sector they work in. This could also be due to a combination of shared work environments, organizational cultures, leadership quality, compensation and benefits, and global trends towards prioritizing employee well-being. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected.

H2: There is a significant difference in employee motivation among public and private sector employees. Mann Whitney U test statistics was done on private and public participants on Total work motivation (Dependence, Organizational orientation, Work group relation, Psychological work incentives, Material incentive, Job situation). According to table 4, p value of dependence was .48, organizational orientation was .50, work group relation was .58, psychological work incentives was .90, material leave was .32 and job situation was .82. This means there is no significant difference in employee motivation (across various dimensions) between private and public sector as all dimensions p value is more than 0.05. This could be due to striking similarities in employee motivation among both sector employees. Both sectors offer comparable job characteristics, compensation packages, and opportunities for career advancement, fostering similar levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation among employees. This parity crosses the traditional lines between public and private employment and emphasises the universal human goals for fulfilling work, just compensation, and encouraging environments. Thus, this hypothesis is also not true.

H3: There is a significant difference in work- life balance among public and private sector employees. Mann Whitney U test statistics was done on private and public participants work life balance (Work interfering personal life, Personal life interference with work, Work/personal life enhancement). According to table 4, For all three WLB variables, the p-values are above 0.05 (work interfering personally life .09, personal life interference with work .43 and work/personal life enhancement .16), indicating that there are no significant differences between private and public sector employees in terms of work-life balance. The reason could be Both sectors increasingly recognize the importance of promoting employees' well-being and accommodating their personal lives alongside professional responsibilities. Flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting and flexible hours, are becoming more

prevalent across sectors, enabling employees to better balance work and personal commitments. Thus, this hypothesis is also rejected.

CONCLUSION

Public sector has always been looked upon as superior in terms of job security, employee motivation and balancing work life, however, the private sector has always had an upper hand in pay structure. Based on the study conducted both the public and private sector seem to have similar levels of job satisfaction, employee motivation and work life balance. Over the years studies have shown the bias towards one or the other. However, my analysis indicates that both the public and private sectors have evolved over the years to offer similar levels of overall job satisfaction in terms of work-life balance, feeling connected to work and being motivated, and pay structure and reward. There are multiple reasons for this. First of all, the creation of encouraging work conditions, competitive pay packages, and the adoption of well-being-promoting regulations are becoming priorities for both industries. Second, comparable strategies are being used by organizations in the public and commercial sectors as a result of societal changes that place a high value on work-life balance and comprehensive employee development. What's more, the convergence of leadership approaches, organizational cultures, and job characteristics across sectors adds to the observed similarities in these important workplace variables. This indicates the progress made over the years in both the public and private sectors to improve the overall employee experience for both men and women. With minimal significant differences found between private and public sector, H1, H2 and H3 are not accepted. The overall culture of an organization as well as the quality of the leadership that is motivated towards the well-being of its employees, is very important for providing the employees a positive work environment. Irrespective of being a government or private organization, a positive work climate with effective leadership leads to higher levels of work satisfaction, and higher motivation among employees. The employees value there work life balance, their over all well being as well as their personal and professional growth.

Limitations

- The researcher was unable to obtain a sample with uniform features because it was obtained through snowball sampling.
- Some people might have thought the employee motivation scale was too long. Thus, from time to time, the participants gave neutral responses.
- Due to scheduling restrictions, we were unable to accept a large number of government and private sector entities.

Implication

The study conducted will help policy makers to create a supportive culture and benchmark practices as well as give policymakers insight into how to best implement policies, enable workers to speak up for change, and give both sector employers a competitive advantage in retaining talent. Furthermore, boosting worker well-being across industries boosts organisational performance and facilitates the delivery of public services more effectively, both of which are ultimately advantageous to society at large.

Future Scope

Longitudinal studies could be used in future study to monitor changes over time and investigate the effects of outside variables, such as the state of the economy or developments in technology, on various aspects of the workplace. Furthermore, performing cross-cultural

research in various nations or areas may shed light on the ways in which cultural variations affect the dynamics of work-life balance, motivation, and job satisfaction. Furthermore, by capturing the complex viewpoints and experiences of employees, qualitative research techniques like focus groups and interviews could supplement quantitative findings. Such initiatives would contribute to our knowledge of the variables influencing worker well-being and help create customised interventions and policies that improve job satisfaction and productivity in a variety of industries and situations.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(5), 422–436.
- Aggarwal, K. G. (1990). Manual for Work Motivation Questionnaire. National Psychological Corporation
- Al-Salameh, E. M. (2014). Teacher motivation: A study of work motivation of the primary stage teachers in Jordan. American Journal of Applied Psychology, 3(3), 57. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajap.20140303.12
- Ali, M. A. (2020). Comparison of motivation attributes among teachers at Cadet and public sectors colleges. *Pakistan Journal of Education*, *37*(2). https://doi.org/10.30971/pje.v37i2.500
- Ahluwalia, A. K., & Preet, K. (2018). Work Motivation, Organizational Commitment and Locus of Control vis-a-vis Work Experience amongst University Teachers. Ahluwalia | SAMVAD. https://doi.org/10.53739/samvad/2017/v14/118113
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. Human Relations, 53(6), 747–770.
- Caoagdan, Angeli and Milallos, Jovelyn and Grino, Rhea Hope and Vigonte, Florinda and Abante, Marmelo V., Job Satisfaction and Motivation: A Comparative Analysis Within the Sphere of Public and Private Administrative Domains (November 9, 2023). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4628371 or http://dx.doi.org/10. 2139/ssrn.4628371
- Donovan J.J. Work motivation. In: Anderson N., Ones D.S., Sinangil H.K., Viswesvaran C., editors. *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*. SAGE; London, UK: 2001. pp. 53–76.
- Dousin, O., Collins, N., & Kler, B. K. (2019). Work-Life balance, employee job performance and satisfaction among doctors and nurses in Malaysia. International Journal of Human Resource Studies, 9(4), 306. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijhrs.v9i4.15
- Erdogan V., Yildirim A. Healthcare professionals' exposure to mobbing behaviors and relation of mobbing with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Procedia Comput. Sci. 2017; 120:931–938. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.328.
- Frone, M. R. (2003). Work-family balance. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), Handbook of occupational health psychology (pp. 143–162). American Psychological Association.
- Frimpong, S. K., Luo, F., & School of Management, Wuhan University of Technology. (2021). Comparative study on the relationship between employee motivation and team performance of the banks in Ghana and China. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Innovation & Management* (p. 1216). http://www4.pucsp.br/icim/ingles/downloads/papers_2010/part_5/111_Comparative%20Study%2 0on%20the%20Relationship.pdf

- Germann M. Influence of project managers on the motivational factors of a project team; Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Management of Technology IAMOT; Washington, DC, USA. 3–7 April 2004.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Carlson, D. S. (2007). Conceptualizing work-family balance: Implications for practice and research. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9(4), 455–471.
- Governance Era: The Performance Paradigm Revisited. Public Administration Review. Volume 66 | Number 4.
- Hayman J (2005), "Psychometric Assessment of an Instrument Designed to Measure Work-Life Balance", Research and Practice in Human Resource Management, Vol. 13, No. 1.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). The motivation to work. New York: Wiley.
- Hasan, Tania, Mehwish Jawaad, and Irfan Butt. 2021. "The Influence of Person–Job Fit, Work–Life Balance, and Work Conditions on Organizational Commitment: Investigating the Mediation of Job Satisfaction in the Private Sector of the Emerging Market" *Sustainability* 13, no. 12: 6622. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126622.
- Jones, Gareth R.; George, Jennifer M. (2008). Contemporary Management.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2017). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 143(4), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000103
- Kuranchie-Mensah, E. B., & Amponsah-Tawiah, K. (2016). Employee motivation and work performance: A comparative study of mining companies in Ghana. *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management*, 9(2), 255. https://doi.org/10.3926/jiem.15 30
- Locke E.A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. *Chic. RandMc Narlly.* 1976; 2:360–580.
- Luthans, F. (2011). Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Leiter M.P., Hakanen J.J., Ahola K., Toppinen-Tanner S., Koskinen A., Väänänen A. Organizational predictors and health consequences of changes in burnout: A 12-year cohort study. *J. Organ. Behav.* 2013; 34:959–973. doi: 10.1002/job.1830.
- Lee H.J. How emotional intelligence relates to job satisfaction and burnout in public service jobs. *Int. Rev. Adm. Sci.* 2018; 84:729–745. doi: 10.1177/0020852316670489.
- Macdonald, S., & MacIntyre, P. (1997). The Generic Job Satisfaction Scale: Scale development and its correlates. Employee Assistance Quarterly, 13(2), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1300/J022v13n02_01.
- Maslow, A. H (1943). A theory of human motivation. Psychological Review, July, 370-396. Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. Harper & Row.
- Moran, Barbara B. (2013). *Library and Information Center Management*. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.
- Mehta, A., & Srivastava, A. (2014). Motivation of academic staff A comparative study of selected Government and private Management Institutes of Delhi/NCR. In University of Rajasthan, Jaipur & Sriram Business School, Gr. Noida, *International Research Journal of Management Sociology & Humanity* (Vol. 5, Issue 8, p. 309). https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/36010389/2057-libre.pdf?1419279204=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DMotivation_of_Academic_Staff_A_Comparati.pdf

- Mehak Singla (2018): "Impact of worklife balance on Job Satisfaction". Aayushi International Interdisciplinary Research Journal (AIIRJ), Vol V Issue-III MARCH 2018 ISSN 2349-638x Impact Factor 4.574
- Oktosatrio, Suhendro (2018): *Investigating the Relationship between Work-Life-Balance and Motivation of the Employees: Evidences from the Local Government of Jakarta*. Published in: International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 8, No. 2 (25 February 2018): pp. 205-221.
- Penn M., Romano J.L., Foat D. The relationship between job satisfaction and burnout: A study of human service professionals. *Adm. Ment. Health.* 1988; 15:157–165. doi: 10.1007/BF00869249.
- Pooja Chatterjee (2017): Job Satisfaction, Occupational Stress and Work Motivation: A Comparative Analysis among the Banking and Academic Sector Professionals, IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM) e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 19, Issue 3. Ver. IV (Mar. 2017), PP 30-43
- Pandey, Sandeep. (2020). A Comparative Study of Job Satisfaction of Private and Public Sector Managers. 10.13140/RG.2.2.33506.71362/1.
- Priyankar Singha1 *, Dr. Souvik Raychaudhuri., Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Analysis of Private and Public Sector Teachers of District West Bengal, India. The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (e) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (p) Volume 3, Issue 3, No. 4, DIP: 18.01.070/20160303 ISBN: 978-1-365-03420-6 http://www.ijip.in
- Robins SP, Coulter M (2005) Management, 7th edn. A Pearson Education Company.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally
- Skemp-Arlt, K.M; Toupence, R. (2007). "The administrator's role in employee motivation". Coach & Athletic Director. pp. 28–34.
- Saif, K.F., Nawaz, A., Jan, A. & Khan, M.I. Synthesizing the theories of job-satisfaction across the cultural/attitudinal dimensions. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2012,3 (9): 1382-1396.
- Sinha, C., & Ahmad, A. S. (2020). Employees' Work Motivation during COVID–19 Outbreaks: A Comparative Study of Missionary and Govt. Schools. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *5*(10), 547–554. https://doi.org/10.36348/sjhss.2020 .v05i10.006
- Sayema Rahman Rathi, Afrin Islam. Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Job Performance among Bankers: A Cross-Sectional Study. The International Journal of Indian Psychology ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print) Volume 12, Issue 1, January- March, 2024.
- SABIR, R. A., & CURA, D. F. (2021). The Effects of Work Life Balance on the Academic employees' Performance, Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Private and Public Universities of Kurdistan Region. *The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(2), 674–678. Retrieved from https://cibgp.com/au/index.php/1 323-6903/article/view/975
- Saikia, M., Shome, M. K., Hyde and Roy, Srivastava, SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), Alkalha, A., Tella, T., Mohsen, M., Denton, D., Angle, A., Perry, P., Shahid, S., Azhar, A., Chughtai, C., & Zafar, Z. (2023). Employee Motivation and Organizational Commitment of Workers in Public And Private Limited Tea Garden Of Assam: A Comparative Study. In *Vol. 18 Issue-3*. https://seyboldreport.net/pdf/2023/03/171.pdf

- Tsigilis N., Koustelios A., Togia A. Multivariate relationship and discriminant validity between job satisfaction and burnout. J. Manag. Psychol. 2004; 19:666-675. doi: 10.1108/02683940410559365.
- VeenaLatha. (2019). A Study on Work Life Balance of The Employees in the Field of Education. JETIR, 6(2). https://www.jetir.org/papers/JETIRY006057.pdf
- View of a Comparative Study of Employee job Satisfaction in the private and Public Sector Banks | International Journal of Information Technology and Management. (n.d.). https://ignited.in/ijitm/article/view/871/1583
- Wiley C. What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys. *Int.* J. Manpow. 1997; 18:263–280. doi: 10.1108/01437729710169373.
- Yusuf, Subooh. (2018). A Comparative Study of Work-Life Balance and Job Satisfaction of the Employees Working in Business Process Outsourcing Sector. IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences (ISSN 2455-2267). 2. 87-93. 10.21013/ jmss.v10.n2.p3.

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Prasad, T. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Job Satisfaction, Employee Motivation and Work-Life Balance among Public and Private Sector Employees. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 12(2), 2852-2870. DIP:18.01.248.20241202, DOI:10.25215/1202.248