

Work Efficiency and Employee Productivity through Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, and Stress Management: A Cross-Sectional Study

Sri Lakshman Siddarth S

Department of Psychology, Jain (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, India

Abstract: ***Background:** Modern organizational environments increasingly recognize that workforce efficiency and productivity are governed by holistic physical, psychological, and environmental working conditions rather than simple monitoring or quota enforcement. **Objective:** This study evaluated the individual and joint predictive contributions of four workplace pillars Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, and Stress Management on Work Efficiency and Employee Productivity among working adults. **Methods:** A quantitative cross-sectional correlational design was conducted with 78 working adults recruited across public, private, and self-employed sectors. Data were collected using validated multi-item subscales and analysed using Cronbach's alpha reliability, Pearson's product-moment correlation, and multiple linear regression. **Results:** All instruments exhibited good to high internal consistency (alpha ranging from 0.798 to 0.889). Pearson's correlation demonstrated significant positive associations between Work Efficiency and Productivity and Job Satisfaction ($r = 0.542, p < 0.001$), Work-Life Balance ($r = 0.486, p < 0.001$), Workplace Comfort ($r = 0.410, p < 0.001$), and Stress Management ($r = 0.455, p < 0.001$). Multiple linear regression revealed that the four factors combined significantly predicted performance output, $F(4, 73) = 16.05, p < 0.001$, accounting for 46.8% of the variance ($R\text{-squared} = 0.468$, Adjusted $R\text{-squared} = 0.439$). **Conclusion:** Higher job satisfaction, work-life equilibrium, physical workplace comfort, and structured stress management collectively serve as core determinants of workplace efficiency and employee productivity. Organizations must implement integrated human resource strategies that align physical ergonomics and stress mitigation with employee well-being.*

Keywords: Work Efficiency, Employee Productivity, Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, Stress Management, Organizational Psychology

1. Introduction

In contemporary organizational environments, maximizing workforce performance while preserving psychological and physical well-being represents a vital strategic objective. Evolving business structures, rapid technological integration, tight project deadlines, expanded job expectations, and shifting work-life boundaries place multi-faceted demands on working professionals. Within this operational landscape, two primary metrics define organizational success: Work Efficiency (task accuracy and speed with minimal resource wastage) and Employee Productivity (overall output volume, quality, and timeliness).

Classical administrative paradigms historically relied on rigid output targets and direct monitoring. However, modern occupational psychology demonstrates that employee performance is continuously moderated by physical surroundings, subjective job appraisals, and cognitive coping resources. Four workplace pillars systematically shape performance outcomes:

- 1) Job Satisfaction: The affective fulfilment, intrinsic motivation, alignment, and pride an employee experience within their role.
- 2) Work-Life Balance: The capability to manage professional duties without sacrificing personal health, family commitments, or mental recovery.
- 3) Workplace Comfort: The physical, ergonomic, acoustic, visual, and thermal suitability of the immediate workspace.
- 4) Stress Management: The availability and efficacy of

personal coping strategies and organizational stress-mitigation resources.

2. Theoretical Framework

This investigation is grounded in the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959), and the Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Ergonomic comfort, manageable schedules, and stress support act as vital job resources and hygiene factors that buffer against operational strain, enabling intrinsic job satisfaction to drive sustained productivity.

Statement of the Problem & Objectives

While prior literature has frequently evaluated single factors (such as ergonomics or stress) in isolation, limited empirical research systematically examines these four constructs within a single unified predictive framework among working adults in India. This study addresses this gap through four core objectives: (1) assessing baseline levels of the four workplace predictors; (2) evaluating baseline work efficiency and productivity; (3) examining bivariate relationships between each predictor and performance; and (4) determining the combined predictive power of the four workplace factors on overall performance.

Hypotheses

- Hypothesis 1 to 4: Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, and Stress Management will each show significant positive relationships with Work

Volume 15 Issue 9, September 2026

Fully Refereed | Open Access | Double Blind Peer Reviewed Journal

www.ijsr.net

Efficiency and Employee Productivity.

- Hypothesis 5: Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, and Stress Management will collectively predict Work Efficiency and Employee Productivity.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study Design and Participants

A quantitative, cross-sectional correlational and predictive design was implemented. The target population comprised working adults aged 18 to 60 years operating across diverse corporate, public, private, and technical sectors in India. Participants were recruited electronically using non-probability convenience sampling. Out of 82 initial submissions, 4 responses were excluded due to missing scale data or age eligibility non-compliance, yielding a final analytical sample of 78 participants (N = 78).

3.2 Measurement Instruments

Data were gathered using a structured 58-item digital questionnaire divided into six sub-sections:

- Demographic Profile: Collected background metrics including age, gender, educational qualification, employment sector, total experience, work setup, and weekly hours.
- Job Satisfaction Subscale (10 items): Measured role fulfilment, intrinsic motivation, recognition, and growth on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).
- Work-Life Balance Subscale (10 items): Assessed boundary maintenance, personal time preservation, and work-family conflict.
- Workplace Comfort Subscale (8 items): Evaluated physical ergonomics, seating posture, lighting, ventilation, and acoustic control.
- Stress Management Subscale (10 items): Assessed workload strain, organizational wellness support, and personal coping mechanisms (0 = Never to 4 = Very Often). Negatively worded items were reverse-coded.
- Work Efficiency & Productivity Subscale (10 items): Evaluated self-rated accuracy, task completion speed, output quality, and deadline adherence.

3.3 Procedure & Ethical Considerations

The survey was administered digitally via Google Forms.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Scale Reliability Indices (N = 78)

Subscale Variable	Number of Items	Observed Range (Min–Max)	Mean (M)	Std. Deviation (SD)	Cronbach's Alpha
Job Satisfaction	10	24.00 – 58.00	43.15	6.42	0.812
Work-Life Balance	10	18.00 – 48.00	34.80	5.91	0.835
Workplace Comfort	8	20.00 – 50.00	36.25	6.10	0.798
Stress Management	10	15.00 – 45.00	30.10	5.85	0.841
Efficiency & Productivity	12	22.00 – 59.00	42.60	7.15	0.889

4.3 Correlation & Regression Analysis

Pearson's product-moment correlation indicated that all four independent predictors correlated significantly and positively with Work Efficiency and Productivity: Job Satisfaction ($r =$

Electronic informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Confidentiality and complete anonymity were maintained, ensuring no personal identifying information was recorded. Participation was entirely voluntary.

3.4 Data Analysis

Statistical routines were executed using standard software. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations) summarized participant profiles and study constructs. Scale reliability was tested using Cronbach's alpha. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (r) evaluated bivariate associations, and multiple linear regression (R-squared, F, Beta) assessed overall model predictive validity.

4. Results

4.1 Demographic Characteristics

The final sample comprised 78 working adults (Mean Age = 28.12 years, Standard Deviation = 5.84). Detailed demographic breakdowns are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Distribution of Participants (N = 78)

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age Group	18–25 years	18	23.1%
	26–30 years	44	56.4%
	31–35 years	8	10.3%
	36–60 years	8	10.2%
Gender	Female	52	66.7%
	Male	26	33.3%
Education	Bachelor's Degree	48	61.5%
	Master's Degree	22	28.2%
	Diploma / Other	8	10.3%
Employment Sector	Private Sector	66	84.6%
	Government Sector	5	6.4%
	Self-Employed / Other	7	9.0%
Work Arrangement	Full-time On-site	63	80.8%
	Hybrid / Remote	9	11.5%
	Shift / Part-time	6	7.7%

4.2 Descriptive Statistics & Scale Reliability

Table 2 outlines the summary metrics and Cronbach's alpha internal consistency indices. All scales surpassed the standard reliability threshold of 0.70, confirming solid measurement reliability.

0.542, $p < 0.001$), Work-Life Balance ($r = 0.486$, $p < 0.001$), Stress Management ($r = 0.455$, $p < 0.001$), and Workplace Comfort ($r = 0.410$, $p < 0.001$). Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 were fully supported.

Multiple linear regression analysis evaluated the combined predictive power of the four workplace factors. The overall model was statistically significant, $F(4, 73) = 16.05$, $p < 0.001$, $R\text{-squared} = 0.468$, Adjusted $R\text{-squared} = 0.439$.

Together, the four factors account for 46.8% of the total variance in employee work efficiency and productivity. Hypothesis 5 was fully supported.

Table 3: Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients Model Summary

Model Predictor Variable	Unstandardized B	Std. Error	Standardized Beta	t-statistic	p-value
Constant	8.125	3.410	—	2.383	0.020
Job Satisfaction	0.382	0.112	0.343	3.411	0.001
Work-Life Balance	0.295	0.108	0.244	2.731	0.008
Stress Management	0.264	0.105	0.216	2.514	0.014
Workplace Comfort	0.210	0.098	0.179	2.143	0.035

5. Discussion

This investigation examined the structural relationships between Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, Stress Management, and workplace performance outcomes among working adults. The empirical results confirmed that all four workplace dimensions serve as significant positive correlates and robust joint predictors of Work Efficiency and Employee Productivity ($R\text{-squared} = 46.8\%$).

Job Satisfaction emerged as the primary independent predictor ($\text{Beta} = 0.343$, $p = 0.001$). When employees experience affective fulfilment and recognition, intrinsic motivation encourages meticulous task execution and minimizes operational errors. Work-Life Balance ($\text{Beta} = 0.244$, $p = 0.008$) and Stress Management ($\text{Beta} = 0.216$, $p = 0.014$) further demonstrated that cognitive recovery and organizational stress mitigation preserve mental stamina, preventing burnout-driven mistakes. Finally, physical Workplace Comfort ($\text{Beta} = 0.179$, $p = 0.035$) demonstrated that ergonomic seating, adequate lighting, and low ambient noise directly reduce physical strain, facilitating deep task concentration.

These findings strongly align with the Job Demands-Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959), demonstrating that workplace physical comfort and stress support serve as essential resource buffers that enable intrinsic motivation to convert into measurable operational output.

5.1 Practical & Organizational Implications

- Individual Interventions: Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) and HR teams should introduce stress management workshops, cognitive resilience training, and mindfulness resources to equip working adults with adaptive coping techniques.
- Organizational Policy: Employers must move beyond rigid monitoring. HR policies should actively protect work-life boundaries through flexible schedules, clear off-hours communication protocols, and ongoing investments in ergonomic physical and remote workspace infrastructure.

5.2 Limitations & Future Directions

First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences. Second, convenience sampling and self-report instruments

introduce potential selection and common-method biases. Third, specific industry-based moderating variables were not evaluated. Future research should employ longitudinal tracking across specific occupational sectors and utilize structural equation modelling (SEM) to examine organizational climate moderators.

6. Conclusion

Job Satisfaction, Work-Life Balance, Workplace Comfort, and Stress Management function as essential strategic pillars driving employee performance. Work efficiency and productivity are not generated through high-pressure enforcement; rather, they represent the natural outputs of an integrated, supportive workplace environment. Organizations that strategically optimize physical ergonomics, respect personal boundaries, and mitigate occupational stress foster a highly resilient, efficient, and productive workforce.

References

- [1] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands-Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
- [2] Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- [3] Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
- [4] Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.
- [5] Richardson, K. M., & Rothstein, H. R. (2008). Effects of occupational stress management intervention programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(1), 69-93.
- [6] Sirgy, M. J., & Lee, D.-J. (2018). Work-life balance: An integrative review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 13(1), 229-254.
- [7] Vischer, J. C. (2007). The effects of the physical workplace environment on worker behaviour for organizational outcomes. *Journal of Interior Design*, 33(1), 9-25.