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**Abstract**

*Globally, firms’ top priorities now include improving workplace cultures and putting a strong emphasis on employee well-being. Previous research suggests that improving workplace cultures can impact employee well-being. However, little research is known whether work-life balance mediates the relationship between workplace culture (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support) and employee well-being. Drawing on the importance, the main objective of the study was to investigate the mediating effects of WLB on the relationship between workplace culture and employee well-being. The study is quantitative and a survey was used to collect data from middle-level staff at private banks, and the sample includes 130 employees of private banks in the Puttalam District. Linear regression was used to measure the direct effects of the hypothesized relationships. The Sobel test and Baron & Kenny mediation analysis were used to measure the indirect effects of the hypothesized relationship. The results show that WLB partially mediates the relationship between temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and employees' well-being. While WLB fully mediates the relationship between supervisor support and employees' well-being. So, it is recommended for managers to build a culture in line with the WLB of employees', especially by providing WLB policies that will ultimately enhance the general welfare.*
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**Introduction**

The contemporary world has created many economic, social, and political issues which cause new challenges to organizations. Organizations have to be quick in responding to these challenges to ensure their long-term stability and competitiveness. They have to adopt new things in their performance and the way they use to manage their workforce.   In this context, the ‘work culture’ is extremely important to any organization. When organizational work culture is more concerned regarding employee needs, employees feel more comfortable and love to work more especially in difficult times and with the business climate changes. In addition, organizational outcomes such as performance, contentment, and employee well-being at work are all predicted by organizational culture (Lok & Crawford, 2004).

Employee well-being is one of the most essential factors that generate a good organizational culture. It enhances an organization's long-term efficiency, as a source of improving employee performance and loyalty of employees (Goodman, Disabato, Kashdan, & Kauff, 2018).  Previous research has explored various factors that determine employee well-being and among them, Work-Life Balance (WLB) has been identified as more crucial. WLB allows one to handle multiple responsibilities more effectively with less effort in work and family life as it provides positive physical and mental satisfaction (Ru Hsu, 2011). People who have a positive WLB can enhance their career life and can find enough time to spend with their family (MacEachen, Polzer, & Clarke, 2008).

Rife and Hall (2015) have found that work culture positively impacts employees’ well-being and further they have identified that a supportive organizational culture can create WLB. Organizations that care about their employees have found that investing in strategies to advance WLB is profitable and aids in the achievement of organizational objectives because it can enhance and stabilize employees' personal and professional lives and ensure their well-being (Ollier-Mallaterre & Foucreault, 2017). Similarly, some researchers have identified that employees' degree of stress at work, intention to leave, self-productivity, and job satisfaction all are impacted by the work culture (Ismail, Baki, & Omar, 2018).  Thus, past research reveals that there are some relationships between WLB, Work culture, and well-being. But there is few research conducted by researchers to identify the mediating impact of WLB on the relationship between culture and employees' well-being.

The study was conducted using employees from private commercial banks in Puttalam District. It has been found that the private commercial banking sector has recently gained a bad reputation as they have declined state for WLB and employee well-being due to different factors including lengthy working hours, weekend work, and stressful work conditions (Dharmawansa & Madhuwanthi, 2017). Weerasinghe, Senewirathne, and Dedunu (2017) found that due to the unfavorable working conditions, private-sector bankers in Sri Lanka experience lower levels of job satisfaction than public-sector bankers. Further employees who work long hours under pressure from arbitrary deadlines and unpredictable workflow have reported feeling stressed at jobs and having lower WLB (Adikaram & Jayatilake, 2016). Senanayake and Weerasinghe (2021) discovered a gap between the ideal state and the actual degree of workplace well-being among private bank employees in the body of existing literature. Although research has revealed that workplace culture may be linked to how employees view work-life balance, thereby affecting employee happiness, there may be specific circumstances that cause the specific relationship to disappear or even reverse (Santsa, Goncalves & Gomes, 2013). Ter Hoeven and Van Zoonen (2015) found that flexible work arrangements have a negative relationship with employee well-being. In the meantime, a few studies have highlighted some inconsistencies in the relationships between these variables too.

However, some researchers have looked into various components of work culture (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support) and their association with employee well-being and WLB separately. The mediating role of WLB in the relationship between work culture and employee well-being has yet to be investigated, particularly in the Sri Lankan context and concerning private banks. Since there is a knowledge gap regarding the mediating function of WLB on the relationship between work culture and employee well-being, the current study seeks to close that gap. With the increasing importance of the concepts, well-being, and WLB it is crucial to bridge the remaining knowledge gap and understand the connections between these spheres. Therefore, the research was conducted to investigate the below-mentioned problem.

***Whether WLB mediates the relationship between work culture (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support) and employees’ well-being?***

The primary objective of this research study is to examine the mediating effect of WLB on the relationship between work culture and employee well-being.

**Literature Review and Hypothesis Development**

**Theories Relating to the Construct**

The study is based on two theories: perceived organizational support theory (POS) and social exchange theory. The POS theory models the link between work culture and employee well-being. According to the theory, employees get a general perception of how the company values their contributions and cares about their wellness (Casper & Harris, 2008). It can be argued that a family-friendly supervisory environment (a crucial component of a work-family-friendly culture) will reduce conflicts between work life and family life and promote high emotional well-being (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2006).

The social exchange theory elaborates that when one party serves another well, the reciprocity standard requires the receiving party to return the favor (Kurtessis, Eisenberger, & Adis, 2015). When individuals feel their organization is more supportive, they are inclined to feel obligated to "payback" the organization through affective commitment and behavior related to work. It can be argued that a positive workplace culture and its psychosocial effects lead employees to have positive perceptions of their employers, which may be consistently linked to higher employee motivation, reduced work-family conflict, and improved well-being of employees.

**Work Culture and Employee Well-Being**

Ogbu, Zirra, and Oaya (2020) defined culture as a set of crucial factors used to measure employees' mission regarding their occupation, norms, rules, and regulation that enhance their performance. Belias and Koustelios (2014), defined culture as the way of managers and employees interacts with, a specific institution, and organization they work in. The workplace is responsible for preparing a better surrounding for the employees that ensure their wellness. Qi and Wu (2018) defined well-being as the supply of both financial and spiritual resources.  Studies have found that organizational culture is the main platform for facilitating employees’ well-being. Bailyn (1997), identified three dimensions; temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support as more crucial components of culture that directly impact employees' well-being. Employees have the choice of altering the time at which they begin and finish their shifts through flexible working hours. This makes it easier to choose when to take a day off and when to work overtime. Research indicates that this is beneficial for both companies and employees.  When a firm uses temporal flexibility, it demonstrates that it supports meeting the expectations of its employees. This promotes the well-being of the workforce. Bailyn (1997), identified when workers are permitted to choose their working hours, they are better able to control their workload and avoid being overly preoccupied with their work, both of which improve employee well-being.

According to Deci's and Ryan's (2000) study, autonomy at work is a fundamental human need as well as a source of inspiration and factor in the improvement of employee well-being. Making people more accountable for their work, encourages a higher degree of satisfaction (Nabawanuka & Ekmekcioglu, 2022). Schwalbe (1985), found that operational flexibility significantly influences staff performance, engagement, and job satisfaction. It has been discovered that giving employees greater autonomy results in higher levels of job satisfaction, increased psychological needs, higher levels of workplace engagement, and a favorable impact on overall wellness. In the meantime, it is important to have a work culture that is supportive of both the work and family life of workers to uplift the well-being of the employees (Mauno, Kinnunen, & Ruokolainen, 2006). Lapierre and Allen (2006) confirmed the importance of supportive guidance by supervisors in achieving relatively low conflicts in families and good emotional well-being. Thompson, Jahn, Kopelman, and Prottas (2004), noted that investigations have shown a potential relationship between employee well-being and supportive work culture aspects.

Based on these findings, the research hypotheses proposed as follows:

**H1a:** Temporal flexibility significantly impacts employees' well-being

**H1b:** Operational flexibility significantly impacts employees' well-being

**H1c**: Supervisor support significantly impacts employees' well-being

**Work Culture and Work-Life Balance**

Bharathi and Mala (2016) identified WLB as the capacity to preserve control, to be efficient and effective at employment, while still leading a pleasant, healthy, and leisurely home life. People tend to spend more time at work and less time with their families when they invest more in their careers. Numerous studies have revealed that although people have a requirement to have a strong WLB, they are unable to do so since work priorities take up more of their time and energy (Rife & Hall, 2015). But a lot of people think that their job advancement will be hampered if they do not give their tasks their all ( Groner, 2018). Those who maintain a positive WLB can handle the job perfectly while still making enough time to move with society. If someone spends more time in employment and too little in their favorite pastimes, unnecessary tension rises and overall life satisfaction falls (Golder & Wiens-Tuers, 2006). This has negative effects on performance, productivity, and health of the organization as well as employees.

Schmoll and Süß (2019), discovered that organizations that allow for temporal flexibility are seen as more attractive than those that do not. Flextime regulations are likely to increase workers' perception of control and job security (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Work-life balance may be enhanced by allowing employees to change their schedules following their particular demands (Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006). Time flexibility enhances the work-life balance and makes employees feel more independent and respected ( MacEachen, Polzer, & Clarke, 2008), which has a good impact on work engagement, productivity (Baltes, Briggs, Huff, Wright, & Neuman, 1999), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.  However, temporal flexibility has been identified as a concept that allows workers to better manage their other work and personal lives, thus having a positive relationship with work-life balance.

The positive effects of job autonomy on work-life balance have been shown in numerous studies when conducted in work environments where employees have access to a variety of flexible policies, such as those that allow for time and space flexibility, they feel more comfortable handling the work life and family life obligations, which depicts a positive relationship with WLB (Mas-Machuca, Berbegal-Mirabent, & Alegre, 2016). Similarly, research also revealed that a robust support system in an organization that emerges from the culture of the workplace can help employees achieve work-life balance (Rife & Hall, 2015). The success of the company depends greatly on its culture, which affects everyone who works there. Schein (2010), identified that the work-life balance of individuals is influenced by the policies, leadership behaviors, and actions of top management, which are determined by the culture. Every company has its own benefits and employee policies, that can be used to convey the entire organizational culture. Policies and supervisor assistance help to reduce workplace stress (Lapierre et al., 2008). Businesses must create a culture that motivates employees to grow and prosper and gives them a sense of belonging since the determinants of culture have an impact on WLB. As per past studies, supervisor support in minimizing work-related stress, transformational leadership, safe work surrounding, flexible schedules, and capacity to adjust work time, and assistance from partners enhance the WLB (Bell, Rajendran, & Theiler, 2012); Munir, Nielsen, Garde, & Albertsen, 2012; Nordenmark, Vinberg, & Strandh, 2012; Hayman, 2010; Emre & Spiegeleare, 2019; Abendroth & Den Dulk, 2011).

Based on these findings, the research hypotheses proposed as follows:

**H2a:** Temporal Flexibility significantly impacts WLB

**H2b:** Operational flexibility significantly impacts WLB

**H2c:** Supervisor support significantly impacts WLB

**Work-Life Balance and Employees’ Well-Being**

An organization's overall success and the functioning of society depend on maintaining a better work-life balance (Grady et al., 2008). There are many strategies for keeping people content in their current jobs, but work-life balance is one that consistently improves the level of individual happiness.  Clark (2000) identified family and employment as the most significant components of everyone's lives. Thus, employee well-being suffers whenever there is a conflict between work and family obligations (Clark, 2000; Frone, 2000). Previous research has identified that WLB and wellness can be won with less role conflict and individuals are happy with their jobs and individual responsibilities (Clark,2000). Further, poor WLB commonly causes despondency and unhappiness, which decreases productivity, lowers the quality of work, increases absenteeism, and increases employee turnover (Seligman, 2011).

Collins (2008) stated that success cannot be attributed to a workaholic who detests spending time with his or her family. The balance and harmony of life vanish when there is such an imbalance, and it also harms one's career. If one wants to stay out of a scenario like that, one should always make an effort to avoid this imbalance in life. Hence a business and its employees, moving from a work-life imbalance to a WLB can enjoy a variety of benefits (Collins, 2008). Greenhaus and Powell (2006), identified a significant effect of WLB on society and dramatically alters an individual's life. A work-life balance schedule is beneficial to an employee's health. When there is a proper balance between work and family life, stress levels significantly decline to normal levels facilitating the well-being of the individuals. People experience higher happiness and self-actualization when they gain more value from their employment and daily life.

Based on these findings, the research hypothesis proposed as follows:

**H3:** WLB significantly impacts employees' well-being

**Mediating Role of Work-Life Balance between Work Culture and Employee Well-Being**

Temporal flexibility is the capacity for both independent thought and flexible scheduling. Flexible scheduling increases output by decreasing employee stress and unavailability while concurrently uplifting WLB and employee well-being (Ter Hoeven & Van Zoonen, 2015). The amount of time that have for their personal life is crucial in conducting a better WLB. The working arrangements of the personnel determine this time. Working hours and time rules can help to explain the work-life balance to some extent. The argument goes that if employees can their working schedule; flexibility is much more readily available to them. Enough personal time helps people maintain a healthy work-life balance, which in turn enhances employee well-being (Matthews & Barnes, 2010).

Meanwhile, some showed a positive effect of flexible timing with WLB  (Njip, Beckers, Geurts, Tucker, & Kompie, 2012). According to some researchers, flexibility in hours worked that is organization-focused, that mandates that staff members adapt their schedules to meet employer needs, may have an impact on not only the variability of working time (such as the need to be available on short notice). These aspects of the workday have an impact on employees' daily lives. Therefore, it is asserted that under these conditions, temporal flexibility has a detrimental impact on employees' ability to balance their work and personal lives, which has a negative influence on their well-being. Chung and van der Horst (2018), said that there is a clear impact of the flexible working time to employees’ WLB.

It has been argued that employees with autonomy are always happy about their job and likely to engage (Park, Wall, & Jackson, 1997). However, other academics contend that this condition depends on the individual's attitude, which is influenced by things like family circumstances (Schneider, Reichers, & Mitchell, 1982). According to the majority of academics, operational flexibility is beneficial for family life and overall well-being. According to Bailyn (1993), for instance, businesses that permit operational flexibility led to more enjoyable workers at work and it increases the output of the employees. Operational flexibility allows the workers to handle their family and work goals effectively (Bailyn, 1997). Worker’s satisfaction is based on open and transparent communication among the managers and the employees, and assistance from both parties. Supervisory support minimizes tension and disagreements in roles, improves loyalty, and improves employee wellness (Matthews, Mills, Trout, & English, 2014).

The negative psychological impacts that employees may experience, such as a lack of employee well-being and a poor work-life balance, can be lessened by using certain resources, such as supervisor assistance. Workers are better at having a balance between commitments and family demands when their managers show concern for their needs. Employees' general well-being would improve as a result of having a balance existence with fewer conflicts in personal obligations. Daily supervisor assistance reduces the negative effects on employee well-being and guards against work-family conflicts (Chang, McDonald & Burton, 2010).  Recent studies have started to show the benefits of Supervisor support interventions that emphasize the adoption of supportive behaviors on worker health and well-being (e.g., Kossek, Lautsch, & Eaton, 2006).

Based on these findings, the research hypotheses proposed as follows:

**H4a:** WLB significantly mediates the relationship between temporal flexibility and employees’ well-being

**H4b:** WLB significantly mediates the relationship between operational flexibility and employees’ well-being

**H4c:** WLB significantly mediates the relationship between supervisor support and employees’ well-being

The conceptual framework of the research is illustrated in Figure 1.

***Figure 1: Conceptual Framework***

**Research Methods**

The study utilized a deductive approach as it used to develop a hypothesis on the existing theories and then develop a research plan to evaluate the hypothesis. The nature of the constructs offered in the theoretical model made the survey approach suitable for this investigation. Similarly, it is cross-sectional since the data was collected during a specific period. The unit of analysis was an individual private banker. The primary data was collected by using a well-structured questionnaire.

***Study Population***

The population of the study represents all the middle-level employees who work in selected licensed commercial private banks in Puttalam District in Sri Lanka. Puttalam district was selected since it is considered a rural area where most of the workers have to come from their residing places to Puttalam and stay to work which addresses the concepts; work-life balance and well-being of the employees very well. 250 middle-level employees were selected as the total population since they are more common in banks than other levels of employees at private banks.

***Sample and Sampling Technique***

The current study used a random sampling technique to choose a representative sample. The random sampling technique provides equal opportunity for all population members to be chosen for the sample. According to the Krejcie & Morgan table, 152 responders were selected for the sample size to be considered adequate. Only 130 out of 152 responses were received, representing an 85.5% response rate.

**Measurement Scales of Study**

***Work Culture:***

Using Clark's (2001) survey, workplace culture was evaluated. The survey consisted of 13 items including the measurement scales for the three sub-scales: temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supportive supervision. The alpha coefficient for temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support were 0.82, 0.70, and 0.91 respectively. Every response was evaluated using a Five-Point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree."

***Well-being:***

The dependent variable was evaluated by employing Smith & Smith's (2017) survey. Ten measurement scales, all of which highlighted the positive qualities of well-being, measured the degree of well-being. The coefficient alpha for the original measurement scale was 0.86. The assessment was done on a Five-Point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree.

***Work-Life Balance:***

To measure the mediating variable the 8 measurement scales from Taşdelen-Karckay and Bakalim's (2017) study were appraised. Private bankers were requested to rate their level of agreement with the assertions on a five-point Likert scale, with 1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree. The coefficient alpha for the original measurement scale was 0.91.

***Control Variable:***

Socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, educational level, name of the bank, and experience level were included as control variables.

**Data Analysis and Presentation**

The primary data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.0. The sample composition and individual behavior of the supplied concept were elaborated using frequency tables and descriptive statistics. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to establish the consistency of the variables. To examine the hypotheses and get a conclusion, correlation analysis, linear regression, and the Sobel test were used.

**Findings and Discussion**

**Demographic Analysis**

Out of 130 total respondents, 56 (43.1%) and 74 (56.9%) were female and male respectively. When considering the age limit majority of the sample was represented by the age limit in-between 31-40 years and it is 61 (46.9%). More respondents of the sample had only a secondary level education and it is 59 (45.4%). Five banks were taken for the study including Commercial Bank of Ceylon, Seylan Bank PLC, DFCC Bank PLC, Nations Trust Bank PLC, and Nations Development Bank PLC and the majority represent Commercial Bank of Ceylon. Further, more respondents had 4-6-year experience in the banking field.

***Table 1: Demographic Results***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristics** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **Gender** | Female | 56 | 43.1% |
|  | Male | 74 | 56.9% |
| **Age** | Below 30 | 39 | 30% |
|  | 31-40 | 61 | 46.9% |
|  | 41-50 | 22 | 16.9% |
|  | Above 50 | 8 | 6.2% |
| **Educational Level** | Secondary level | 59 | 45.4% |
|  | Bachelor Degree | 55 | 42.3% |
|  | Master Degree | 16 | 12.3% |
| **Name of the Bank** | DFCC bank PLC | 26 | 20% |
|  | Commercial Bank of Ceylon | 31 | 23.8% |
|  | National Development Bank PLC | 19 | 14.6% |
|  | Nations Trust Bank PLC | 24 | 18.5% |
|  | Seylan Bank PlC | 30 | 23.1% |
| **Experience** | 1-3 Years | 33 | 25.4% |
|  | 4-6 Years | 42 | 32.3% |
|  | 7-9 Years | 17 | 13.1% |
|  | Above 10 Years | 38 | 29.2% |

(Source: Survey Data)

**Reliability Analysis**

Cronbach alpha scores were calculated for each construct to show how various items consistently measure the construct to validate the variables. According to Gliem and Gliem (2003) rule, “Cronbach’s α-value greater than .70 falls in acceptable range and Reliability >.90 = excellent; >.80 = good; >.70 = acceptable; >.60 = questionable; and >0.5 = poor" (Butt & Yazdani, 2021). Test results showed that values of coefficient α were greater than acceptable values in all factors. The scales utilized in this research can therefore be regarded as reliable and therefore valid.

***Table 2: Cronbach Alpha Reliability Statistics***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Cronbach’s Alpha Value** | **No of Questions** |  | **Cronbach’s Alpha Value** | **No of Questions** |
| Temporal Flexibility | .687 | 5 | Work Culture | .883 | 13 |
| Operational Flexibility | .761 | 5 | WLB | .859 | 8 |
| Supervisor Support | .906 | 3 | Well-Being | .917 | 10 |

(Source: Survey Data)

**Hypothesis Testing**

**Test for Linearity**

Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to test the linearity assumption (Williams, Grajales, & Kurkiewicz, 2013; Abu-Bader & Jones, 2021) to examine the relationship between each dimension for conducting regression analysis. The intercorrelations among the variables are shown in Table 2. Temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support were all significantly and positively related to the well-being of the employees (r = 0.622, 0.637, and 0.348 respectively; all p < 0.01). Similarly, there was a significant positive relationship between temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, supervisor support, and WLB (r = 0.612, 0.667, and 0.448 respectively; all p < 0.01). Moreover, the Pearson correlation coefficient (r=0.833) between well-being and WLB was positive and the relationship was significant (p<0.001). Therefore, the overall result above implies that the linearity assumption in the analysis was achieved to run regression analysis.

***Table 3: Pearson’s Correlation Analysis for Linearity Test***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **1** | Temporal Flexibility | *r* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | *p* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** | Operational Flexibility  | *r* | .932\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  | *p* | .000 |  |  |  |  |
| **3** | Supervisor Support | *r* | .596\*\* | .649\*\* | 1 |  |  |
|  |  | *p* | .000 | .000 |  |  |  |
| **4** | WLB | *r* | .612\*\* | .667\*\* | .448\*\* | 1 |  |
|  |  | *p* | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |  |
| **5** | Well-Being | *r* | .622\*\* | .637\*\* | .348\*\* | .833\*\* | 1 |
|  |  | *p* | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |

(Source: Survey Data)

**Hypothesis Testing**

Conceptually, the four-step mediation analysis proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) and the SEM approach for assessing mediation are identical. However, researchers have lately drawn attention to potential weaknesses in Baron and Kenny's (1986) method for testing mediation effects since it fails to directly convey the numerical value of the significance of the indirect (mediated) effects (Preacher and Hayes, 2004; Shrout and Bolger, 2002). Therefore, to investigate the mediation effects, this study used the Baron and Kenny (1986) method and the Sobel test.

***Table 4: Results of Linear Regression***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **B** | **Standard Error** | **Beta (b)** | **T** | **Significant (p)** |
| **Step1** |
| Model I: Multiple regression analysis for the effect of Cultural dimensions on employees’ well-being |
| Constant | 2.078 | .190 |  | 10.944 | .000 |
| Temporal Flexibility | .146 | .127 | .217 | 1.149 | .000 |
| Operational Flexibility | .306 | .132 | .461 | 2.315 | .022 |
| Supervisor Support | .031 | .067 | .041 | 1.458 | .000 |
| *F value= 29.501; R2 = 0.413; Adj. R2 = 0.399* |
|  |
| **Ste1p 2** |
| Model II: Multiple regression analysis for the effect of Cultural dimensions on WLB |
| Constant | 1.832 | 0.216 |  | 8.479 | .000 |
| Temporal Flexibility | .540 | .145 | .776 | 2.416 | .000 |
| Operational Flexibility | .561 | .150 | .722 | 2.734 | .000 |
| Supervisor Support | .321 | .061 | .125 | 2.282 | 0.010 |
| *F value= 33.848; R2 = 0.446; Adj. R2 = 0.433* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Step 3** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model III: Simple regression analysis for the effect of WLB on Employees’ well-being |
| Constant | 1.075 | .134 |  | 8.010 | .000 |
| WLB | .629 | .053 | .845 | 17.885 | .000 |
| *F value= 289.898; R2 = 0.694; Adj. R2 = 0.691* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Step 4** |
| Model IV: Multiple regression analysis for the effect of Temporal flexibility and WLB on Employees’ well-being |
| Constant | .860 | .147 |  | 5.857 | .000 |
| Temporal flexibility | .122 | .040 | .180 | 3.004 | .003 |
| WLB | .617 | .051 | .723 | 12.048 | .000 |
| *F value= 158.550; R2 = 0.714; Adj. R2 = 0.710* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model V:  Multiple regression analysis for the effect of Operational flexibility and WLB on Employees’ well-being |
| Constant | .895 | .148 |  | 6.041 | .000 |
| Operational flexibility | .097 | .043 | .146 | 2.257 | .026 |
| WLB | .628 | .055 | .736 | 11.379 | .000 |
| *F value= 152.129; R2 = 0.706; Adj. R2 = 0.701* |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model VI: Multiple regression analysis for the effect of Supervisor Support and WLB on Employees’ well-being |
| Constant | .894 | .166 |  | 5.379 | .000 |
| Supervisor Support | .013 | .041 | .018 | .326 | .745 |
| WLB | .704 | .047 | .825 | 15.022 | .000 |
| *F value= 149.990; R2 = 0.694; Adj. R2 = 0.689* |

(Source: Survey Data)

H1a, H1b, and H1c suggested that cultural dimensions: temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support will significantly impact employees' well-being. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify whether the three independent variables as a set will have a significant impact on well-being. The result of the overall analysis was significant (F = 29.501, p = 0.00). The variables together explained about 41% of the total variance of well-being. The standardized beta coefficient showed that all three variables had significant and positive effects on well-being. Operational flexibility (b = 0.306, p < 0.001) is the highest predictor of well-being in the model. Thus, H1a, H1b, and H1c were accepted. The study findings support the findings of Broccoli, Sestino, Gastaldi, and Corso (2022) who found a positive significant impact of temporal flexibility and operational flexibility on the well-being of the remote workers. Irak and Mantler (2018), have also obtained similar results. Their findings support the idea that giving employees more choice over their schedule enhances autonomy, which helps to improve their well-being. Nabawanuka and Ekmekcioglu (2022) explored that perceived supervisor support positively influences employee well-being.

H2a, H2b, and H2c proposed that cultural dimensions: temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support will significantly impact WLB. To test these hypotheses, multiple regression analysis was conducted. The result of the overall analysis was significant (F = 33.848, p = 0.00). The variables together explained about 46% of the total variance. The standardized beta coefficient showed that all three variables had significant and positive effects on well-being. Operational flexibility (b = 0.561, p < 0.001) is the highest predictor of WLB in the model. Thus, H2a, H2b, and H2c were accepted. The study findings support the findings of Broccoli, Sestino, Gastaldi, and Corso (2022) who found a positive significant impact of temporal flexibility and operational flexibility on the WLB of the remote workers. Nabawanuka and Ekmekcioglu (2022) explored that perceived supervisor support positively influences WLB.

According to Table 4, 69% of the variability in employees' well-being is explained by WLB and the chosen regression model has a strong model fit (F = 289.898*,* p< 0.01) for the data. The results revealed that WLB significantly impact on well-being (p<0.05; β=0.629). Thus, H3 was accepted. Iverson (2012) confirmed that work-family conflict in terms of poor WLB robustly predicted poor physical and mental health, leading to employee stress which reduces employees' well-being. Thus, recording a positive relationship between the WLB and well-being. Haar & Bardoel (2008); Casey & Mathews (2011); Hosie & Sevastos, 2010; and Warr (2007) has obtained similar results.

According to the steps of Baron and Kenny for mediation analysis, WLB partially mediates the relationship between temporal flexibility with employees’ well-being and operational flexibility with employees' well-being since when the independent variable and the mediator are entered together in the regression, with the effect of the independent variable on the dependent being less than that of the previous. However, WLB shows a full mediation on the relationship between supervisor support and employees’ well-being as the independent variable is insignificant when the mediator is controlled. To test the statistical significance of the indirect impact of the mediations Sobel test was used.

***Table 5: Results of the Indirect Effect***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Test statistics** | **Standard Error** | **P value** |
| Temporal flexibility -> Balance -> Well-being | 3.553 | 0.095 | 0.000 |
| Operational flexibility -> Balance -> Wellbeing | 3.567 | 0.098 | 0.000 |
| Support -> Balance -> Well-being | 4.810 | 0.041 | 0.000 |

(Source: Survey Data)

As the p-value for the indirect effect between work culture dimensions (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support) and well-being through WLB is less than 0.05, it can conclude that the indirect relationship between work culture dimensions (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support) and well-being via WLB is statistically significant. Hence H4a, H4b, and H4c are accepted. The findings support the findings of the study conducted by Stankevicien, Tamasevicius, Diskiene, Grakauskas, & Rudinskaja (2021).

**Conclusion**

The researcher's main aim was to determine how work culture and employees' well-being were related, with work-life balance acting as a mediating factor. By using 130 middle-level employees as the sample, the study was carried out concerning private banks. This is because there is sufficient information to conclude that the current situation is less favorable for the well-being of employees of private banks. To examine how WLB mediates the link between work culture (temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, supervisor support) and employees' well-being, this study combines the (POS) and social exchange theories. Linear regression was used to identify the direct impacts and the Sobel test was applied to identify the indirect impacts. The outcomes of linear regression demonstrate that temporal flexibility, operational flexibility, and supervisor support was a statistically significant predictor of well-being. Even after the mediator, WLB was included in the regression analysis, temporal and operational flexibility remained a significant predictor of well-being. As a result, the findings indicate a partial mediation. However, after the mediator, WLB was included, supervisor support was found to be an insignificant predictor of well-being, indicating full mediation.  Therefore, it can be concluded that firms must create a culture that promotes WLB to improve employee well-being.

**Recommendation**

WLB programs can be established to advise employees on how to balance family and work obligations. To achieve WLB, both the organization and the individual have a responsibility, so all staff members must be trained on how they can do so personally. The organization can raise employee motivation to work and increase employee satisfaction by teaching the staff how to implement WLB in their own life. Management must take the appropriate actions, such as refraining from being overly harsh with the employees and standing by them in good faith. Having a prepared work plan can help the working organization address employee difficulties, assist them in time-sensitive situations, and offer complete support to the workers. If such a practice is not followed, job stress will exist, which causes an imbalance in how hard employees work and causes mental disturbances in the workers. At present, the majority of banks do have a busy schedule and a stressful work environment. This needs to be changed in a way that satisfaction can be achieved successfully. The management must thus be aware of the workload assigned to each employee as well as the number of hours they put in each day. Further, managers should manage by objectives to allow for greater structural flexibility, which is an addition to the availability of WLB. It should give certain services or fringe benefits and permit training programs to assist all employees in striking a balance between work and life. To ensure WLB's success, it is crucial that the organization as a whole from its culture to its staff works toward obtaining or supplying it.

**Limitations**

Despite a sufficient sample size, the data were cross-sectional and only included informants from one district, which limited the generalizability of the findings. Moreover, the present study was limited to the work culture variable and its dimensions, WLB, and well-being variables.

**Implications for Managers**

WLB is a result of the organization's empathic nature, and this aspect of the culture can foster a "friendly" and loyal relationship between the employer and the employee, inspiring them to put in their best effort for the company when necessary. Therefore, WLB must be in line with an organization's culture and goals to ensure that it is adequately provided and that the organization's internal focus does not come at the expense of its exterior focus. WLB can be a beneficial tool for managers to inspire their staff, foster more corporate citizenship, and demonstrate their concern. Since employees play a crucial role in the organization and their well-being directly affects the organization's well-being, this might in turn boost employee well-being. As a result, the organization must foster an empathetic culture, have an internal focus, and have a flexible organizational structure to accomplish WLB. Managers and executives are more likely to suggest or provide WLB policies that will ultimately enhance the general welfare of the firm when there is a flexible and empathic organizational culture. So that they may understand the benefits of implementing such policies, managers, and executives need to be taught the advantages of WLB. Additionally, this is significant because the foundation of an organization's culture is its workforce.

**Theoretical Implication**

Previous research has focused less on identifying the necessary steps to enhance employee well-being by raising WLB through an examination of organizational culture in the private banking industry. The study has identified methods to improve the WLB of private bank employees by emphasizing the value of flexible scheduling, supervisor assistance, and decision-making flexibility. The majority of early studies focused on the influence of culture on WLB, well-being, and other factors like job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover. The study is noteworthy because it examines the effects of three cultural factors on WLB and then employee wellbeing.

**Direction for Future Research**

Future research can carry out to identify the impact of work culture on employees' well-being through WLB predicting by demographic characteristics as a moderate variable. Further, future research can be carried out using a qualitative approach and obtain more details using both questionnaires and interviews and it is worth employing larger samples to enable generalizability.
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