How National Culture Influences Work-Life Balance: Insights from Hofstede's Dimensions

Anna Wieczorek-Szymańska[1]

Abstract:

Purpose: This study investigates the concept of work–life balance from a cross-cultural perspective. It reviews the current state of work–life balance across countries, analyses cultural differences, and evaluates the extent to which such differences shape national patterns of work–life balance.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The study draws on a literature review and an examination of the Global Life Work Balance Index alongside Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions. The empirical analysis employs correlation methods to explore the relationship between culture and work–life balance. The central research question is: How does national culture (NC) influence work–life balance (WLB)? In response, the study advances the hypothesis that national culture differentiates the level of WLB across countries.

Findings: The findings indicate cross-national variation in Global Life Work Balance (GLWBI) index values, reflecting differing levels of work–life balance across countries. Moreover, national cultures are shown to vary systematically according to Hofstede's cultural dimensions. The analysis demonstrates that cultural factors such as power distance, individualism, long-term orientation, and indulgence significantly influence employees' work–life balance across cultural contexts.

Practical implications: This study contributes to understanding the relationship between work–life balance and culture, offering valuable insights for managerial practice. The findings guide managers in designing work–life balance strategies, particularly within international organizations where culturally diverse employees interact. Furthermore, the results may serve as a foundation for shaping work–life balance policies not only at the national level but also within international institutions.

Originality/Values: Previous studies on the relationship between culture and work–life balance have primarily focused on organizational culture, with relatively few addressing the issue from a cross-cultural perspective. Those that do often limit their scope to specific groups of countries, such as developed or developing economies. The originality of this research lies in its global approach, analysing the impact of national culture on work–life balance across a wide range of cultural contexts. This contribution is enabled by integrating the Global Life Work Balance Index with Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

Keywords: Standard of living, well being, quality of working life, work-life balance, cultural management, Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

[1]University of Szczecin, institute of Management, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0002-2923-2302, e-mail: anna.wieczorek-szymanska@usz.edu.pl;

1. Introduction

Work–life balance (WLB) has become one of the most widely discussed issues in contemporary research on labour, organizations, and human resource management. As societies face increasing pressures from globalization, technological advancement, and changing work patterns, the ability to reconcile professional and private spheres has become particularly important for both employees and employers.

A well-established body of research has demonstrated that maintaining WLB is associated with employees' engagement (Björk-Fant *et al.,* 2023), well-being (Rahim *et al.,* 2020), higher productivity (de Sivatte *et al.,* 2015), and stronger organizational performance (Kumar, 2016). At the same time, a lack of balance may lead to adverse outcomes such as stress (Mulyadi *et al.,* 2024), burnout (Yester, 2019), or reduced job satisfaction (Abd Hamid *et al.,* 2020).

While many studies have explored WLB at the individual and organizational levels, the cultural context in which employees operate has received comparatively less attention. Existing research shows that values, norms, and social expectations embedded in national cultures strongly influence employees' attitudes toward work (Przybyszewska, 2022).

This article seeks to contribute to the literature by analysing WLB from a cross-cultural perspective. Unlike studies that focus on selected groups of countries, this research adopts a global approach, drawing on both the Global Work–Life Balance Index and Hofstede's cultural dimensions.

Such a perspective allows examination not only of variation in WLB levels across countries but also of the role of cultural determinants in shaping these differences. By doing so, the study sheds light on how national cultures condition the experience

of WLB and offers practical implications for organizations operating in multicultural environments.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Work-Life Balance – Theoretical Approach

Work-life balance is a time management concept that focuses on balancing professional and personal life. It emerged in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a response to growing social problems such as workaholism, occupational diseases, chronic stress, burnout, as well as a decline in motivation to work, decreasing commitment to tasks and lower efficiency (Piecuch and Szczygieł, 2019).

Despite the concept having been used in theory and practice for several decades, there is still no single, consistent definition of WLB. For instance, Kirchmayer (2000) emphasises that the key to WLB is for individuals to achieve satisfying experiences across different areas of life, which require different resources, and that these resources are shared across domains, whereby these experiences are subjective and determined individually by employees (Muster and Leksy, 2022).

On the other hand, Clutterbuck (2005) identifies WLB as a state in which an individual copes with the potential conflict between different demands on their time and energy across different areas of life, in such a way that their desire for well-being and fulfilment is satisfied. WLB is also embedded in a broader context as an important area of human resource management, which is increasingly attracting the attention of politicians, academics and employees at various levels of the organization (Roopavathi and Kishore, 2021). It is worth noting that most definitions share common elements.

These include emphasising the pursuit of harmony between different areas of human life (work, family, health, hobbies, etc.) (McMillan *et al.,* 2011). Secondly, the authors of the definitions point to the need for people to allocate limited resources across different areas of life, which involves individual choices (Hill *et al.,* 2007).

Furthermore, employees should be supported in these choices by the company's management processes, especially those that foster a positive organizational culture conducive to implementing WLB (Stefanovska-Petkovska *et al.,* 2019; Espasandín-Bustelo *et al.,* 2021). Finally, most authors emphasise the positive effects of WLB on employees and organizations (Wensley *et al.,* 2012; Wong *et al.,* 2020).

To sum up, work–life balance is the general evaluation of how well professional and family roles align (Allen, 2013). For working individuals, the goal is to maintain equilibrium between their professional duties and other aspects of life (Eurofound-ETF, 2022). As a result, the topic of work–life balance has attracted growing interest within the field of human resource management.

Work–life balance represents a key element of EU policy. Both the European Pillar of Social Rights and Directive (EU) 2019/1158 on work–life balance for parents and carers highlight the need to strengthen support for balancing professional and private responsibilities.

The directive seeks to foster gender equality in access to the labour market, ensure equal treatment in the workplace, and enhance employment levels across the EU by facilitating the reconciliation of work and family duties for parents and carers. The state of the labour market is assessed through multiple surveys, such as the European Quality of Life Survey (EQLS), the European Enterprise Survey (EES), and the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS), carried out by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

These surveys compare countries on work–family balance, flexible work practices, and the availability of high-quality care services. The issue of WLB is examined not only within European countries. It is also discussed in a global context. One indicator used to measure WLB across countries is the Global Life-Work Balance Index (GLWBI). Remote created the index[2] based on data analysis of the world's top 60 countries by GDP. The study reviewed the following indicators (Remote, 2025):

- Statutory annual leave (total days of paid leave, including public holidays);
- Minimum statutory sick pay (per cent of wage, or a flat amount);
- Statutory maternity leave (weeks paid);
- Statutory maternity leave payment rate (per cent of wage);
- Minimum wage (USD per hour);
- Healthcare status;
- Happiness index score (1-10, 10 being highest);
- Average hours per week per employed person;
- LGBTQ+ Inclusivity (0–100, 100 being the highest to reflect the Legal Index scores the legal rights and freedoms LGBTQ+ people have, while the Public Opinion Index scores how the general public feels in each region);
- Safety: Global Peace Index (1-4, lower is better).

The objective of the index is to provide an accurate depiction of each country's life–work balance, shifting the traditional notion of "work–life balance" to highlight how companies prioritize employees' well-being and place life above work (Remote, 2025). To ensure comparability across countries, each country is assigned an overall score out of 100.

---

[2]*Remote is a company that provides an all-in-one global HR platform to help businesses hire, manage, and pay employees and contractors worldwide. The platform offers core products including HR Management, an Employer of Record (EOR) service to employ workers in countries without a local entity, Contractor Management, and international Payroll. Remote handles global payrolls, benefits, taxes, and compliance with local labor laws to simplify cross-border hiring and support a distributed workforce.*

2.2 How Culture Shapes WLB

The concept of work–life balance (WLB) has been extensively examined in the literature. However, the relationship between WLB and culture remains ambiguous, particularly given that it can be analysed at multiple levels, including the global (Fleetwood, 2007), national (Lewis *et al.,* 2009), and organizational (Webber *et al.,* 2010) levels. This paper specifically addresses the connection between WLB and national culture.

Ratnes *et al.* (2019) suggest that work-family structure may be influenced by the context in which the work and family domains operate within a particular culture, as employees from different cultural backgrounds analyse work and family roles differently. What is more, it is not clear whether and how the interpretation of WLB and use of WLB practices vary across time and place, within and across countries, nor how this can be assessed in culture-sensitive ways (Lewis and Beauregard, 2018).

Many researchers state that cultural expectations and institutional settings vary across societies (Bardoel and DeCieri, 2006; Kossek and Ollier-Malaterre, 2012). For that reason, cultural differences within and across national contexts can affect interpretations of WLB. Consequently, a key issue arises: how should national culture be defined and classified?

In 1976, American anthropologist Edward T. Hall introduced a classification of cultures based on communication styles. He distinguished between high-context cultures, where meaning is largely conveyed indirectly, and low-context cultures, where communication relies on explicit statements. Earlier, Inkeles and Levinson (1969) highlighted that culture is dynamic rather than fixed, stressing the value of examining culture through specific analytic dimensions such as attitudes toward authority, self-concept, and key social dilemmas or conflicts.

Another influential framework is Geert Hofstede's Cultural Dimension Theory. Developed by the Dutch management scholar, this model provides a systematic approach for examining and comparing cultural differences across nations. It serves as a tool for understanding how cultural values influence behaviour, communication, and social norms, particularly in fields such as business and international relations.

The theory emerged from an extensive survey carried out during the 1960s and 1970s and led to the identification of six dimensions of culture (Hofstede *et al.,* 2010):

1. Power Distance (PDI) describes how a society handles inequalities among people. A high index level indicates acceptance of a hierarchical structure in which each individual has a predefined role that requires no justification, with relationships being more autocratic, decision-making concentrated at

the top, and employees refraining from openly challenging their managers. On the contrary, a low level of PDI characterizes a society in which individuals seek a more balanced distribution of power, favouring democratic and consultative forms of interaction, in which employees demonstrate a preference for active involvement in decision-making processes.

2. Individualism vs. Collectivism (II) explains the extent to which people are expected to take care of themselves and their families. In countries with a high index, cultural and economic systems emphasise individual contributions, with personal initiative and achievement as central values. High employment mobility characterizes such contexts, and verbal communication is the primary mode of interaction. In turn, a low level of individualism indicates that social identity is grounded in group affiliation, with a strong emphasis on belonging. Decision-making and responsibility are shared, while nonverbal communication plays a significant role.

3. Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI) indicates whether members of a culture feel threatened by the unknown. High UAI indicates strict adherence to established norms, beliefs, and behaviours, coupled with a low tolerance for unconventional ideas or practices. Employees generally perceive organizational rules as inviolable, and there is an expectation of long-term commitment to a single employer. Low UAI favours a more relaxed orientation, where practical considerations take precedence over rigid principles. Such contexts are characterized by greater flexibility in employment mobility and a societal tendency toward risk-taking.

4. Motivation towards Achievement and Success (MASI) (earlier called Masculinity vs. Femininity) tells what motivates people: the desire to be the best (Decisive) or enjoy what they do (Consensus-oriented). The society with a high index score is oriented toward competition, accomplishment, and success, with achievement understood as attaining superiority or excelling over others—a value framework instilled through education and subsequently reinforced in organizational contexts. In societies with low MASI, prevailing values emphasise concern for others and the pursuit of quality of life. Success is primarily assessed through well-being rather than status or competition, and individual distinction is not regarded as desirable.

5. Long-Term vs. Short-Term Orientation (LTOI) refers to the orientation towards future rewards. A pragmatic society (with high LTOI) places significant emphasis on education as a means of preparing individuals for future challenges and opportunities. On the other hand, societies with low LTOI prioritize the pursuit of absolute truth and adhere to normative standards, often viewing social change with scepticism and maintaining a short-term orientation toward the future.

6. Indulgence vs. Restraint (INDULGI) clarifies whether people believe that they are in control of their own lives. In societies with high INDULGI, individuals place a high value on enjoying life and on openly expressing emotions, with both verbal and nonverbal forms of communication playing significant roles. Whilst societies with low INDULGI exhibit strong social control, with rigid norms governing social behaviour, and communication is primarily oriented toward the exchange of information.

In Hofstede's model, each dimension is clearly defined to establish a common understanding of the concept. Furthermore, the framework assumes these dimensions are quantifiable, enabling countries to be assessed and assigned a score of 0 to 100 for each dimension. For the aforementioned reason, the concept of cultural dimensions is used in the following article to analyse the relationship between national culture (NC) and the WLB.

The concepts of work-life balance (WLB) and Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions (CD) are not entirely new, as many researchers have conducted theoretical and empirical studies on both. However, the relationship between WLB and CD remains unclear, as researchers have paid little attention to examining work-life balance from a cross-cultural perspective.

Issues of work-life balance have mostly been discussed in developed countries, but the situation has rarely been studied in non-Western developing nations (Ratnes et al., 2019). Several studies concerned specific professional groups, e.g., the medical or tourism sectors, while others focused on specific age groups. The table below presents selected studies on the relationship between WLB and Hofstede's CD.

Table 1. *Research by various authors on relationship between WLB and CD*

Authors	The aim and the method	The key findings
Haar, Russo Sune, Ollier-Malaterre (2014)	The study investigates the effects of work-life balance (WLB) on several individual outcomes across cultures. Using a sample of 1,416 employees from seven distinct populations – Malaysian, Chinese, New Zealand Maori, New Zealand European, Spanish, French, and Italian.	The study shows that individualism/collectivism and gender egalitarianism moderated relationships between WLB and life satisfaction.
Lucia-Casademunt; García-Cabrera, Cuéllar-Molina (2015)	The goal of the research was to analyse whether significant cross-country differences exist in employees' perceptions of work–life balance, based on an empirical investigation of a sample of 745 employees working in tourism firms across 17 European countries.	The findings confirm that national culture moderates the relationship between human resource practices aimed at supporting work–life balance and employees' workplace well-being.
Farivar, Cameron, Yaghoubi	The aim is to investigate the interplay between cultural dimensions and the underlying causes of work–family balance	The study suggests certain cultural dimensions such as high power distance hinders

(2016)	challenges within a developing, non-Western cultural context. A survey was distributed among employees of 12 companies operating in the health industry.	social interactions in the work and family domains, thereby increasing levels of work conflict, family conflict, and stress.
Walga (2018)	The project investigates the extent of and the relationship between Job Satisfaction (JS) and Work-Life Balance (WLB) across cultures. European Social Survey (ESS) data 2012 from 29 countries.	Of the six dimensions of culture, only power distance had moderate inverse relationships with both job satisfaction and satisfaction with WLB.
Kling (2023)	The author of the research explored the impact of culture on work-life balance expectations among millennials in Austria, Canada, and Taiwan. Twelve semi-structured interviews were conducted with recent university graduates.	The culture plays a significant role in shaping millennials' work-life balance expectations, influencing their priorities, values, and behaviors.

Source: *Author's study based on the literature.*

Nevertheless, further research is needed to determine whether work–life balance–related HR practices are culturally specific to individual countries or can be generalized across national contexts (Poelmans et al., 2005).

3. Research Methodology

This study follows a structured approach to ensure the validity and replicability of results. The research question is: How does the NC affect the level of WLB?

Based on the research question, the central hypothesis is: *National culture differentiates the level of WLB across countries.*

In order to achieve the aim of the paper, the author presents the following hypotheses:

1. *There is a correlation between the value of the Power Distance Index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*
2. *There is a correlation between the value of the Individualism Index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*
3. *There is a correlation between the value of the Uncertainty Avoidance Index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*
4. *There is a correlation between the value of the Long Term Orientation index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*
5. *There is a correlation between the value of the Motivation towards Achievement and Success Index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*
6. *There is a correlation between the value of the Indulgence Index and the level of GLWBI in a given country.*

The theoretical framework of this study is grounded in a literature review, drawing primarily on sources from the Web of Science Core Collection, EBSCO, and SpringerLink databases. The literature search, conducted by the author in September 2025, aimed to identify publications addressing the keywords "work-life balance," "national culture, "Hofstede's cultural dimensions," and "cross-cultural approach."

The empirical component of the paper relies on secondary data analysis, drawn from scholarly articles, the Global Life-Work Balance Index 2025 Report, and relevant websites. The paper also incorporates findings from Hofstede's survey, recognized as one of the most influential and frequently cited studies on national cultural values (Epaminonda, 2021). The outcomes derived from Hofstede's model are subsequently compared with international work-life balance data published by Remote for 60 countries worldwide.

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistica software. In the examined study, the independent variables are the values of cultural dimension indicators. In contrast, the dependent variable is the level of work-life balance, as measured by the Global Life-Work Balance Index[3].

To evaluate relationships among quantitative variables, a correlation analysis was employed. Spearman's rho was used in cases where at least one variable deviated from normality[4]. The normality of the distributions of the quantitative variables was assessed using the Shapiro–Wilk W test.

4. Research Results and Discussion

The data presented in Table 2 indicate that countries exhibit considerable variation in their GLWB index scores. Among the ten highest-ranking countries, seven are located in Europe, two in Australia and Oceania, and one in North America. By contrast, the lowest index values are predominantly observed in African (four of the ten lowest-ranking) and Asian countries (five of the bottom ten). Notably, the United States—a highly developed nation—appears among those with the lowest GLWB index scores.

From an analytical perspective, countries also display significant variation across Hofstede's cultural dimensions. When examined by continental groups, the highest Power Distance Index (PDI) is observed in Asian countries, whereas European countries report the lowest levels.

In contrast, countries in Australia and Oceania score highest on the Individualism Index (II), while Asian countries record the lowest values. The Motivation towards Achievement and Success Index (MASI) tends to be higher in North American

---

[3]*The data for the GLWBI was pulled and analyzed in April 2025.*
[4]*GLWBI, PDI,UAI,LTO, INDULI have non-normal distribution.*

countries but lower in Europe. Regarding the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI), North America records the highest average values, while Asian countries lie at the opposite end of the spectrum.

The Long-Term Orientation Index (LTOI) is particularly high in Australia and Oceania but relatively low in South America. Finally, in terms of the Indulgence Index (INDULGI), the highest scores are found in South American countries, while Asian countries have the lowest INDULGI.

Additionally, the highest average CD value (see Table 3) is recorded for the Power Distance Index (PDI), with 23.33% of countries scoring at a high level in this dimension. In contrast, the lowest are observed for the Indulgence Index (INDULGI), with only 5% of the countries analysed achieving scores of 80 points or higher.

Table 2. *The average level of GLWBI and CD for continents*

Continent	GLWBI	PDI	II	MASI	UAI	LTOI	INULGI
Africa	40.33	69.80	16.60	55.20	59.40	18.00	50.00
Asia	46.89	71.76	31.14	51.81	59.00	51.91	31.11
North America	49.56	53.33	55.33	61.00	58.67	42.33	77.67
South America	57.11	62.40	37.00	47.80	83.00	16.00	63.60
Europe	63.97	52.04	66.17	47.04	70.25	49.83	45.21
Australia and Oceania	79.49	30.00	71.00	59.50	50.00	55.50	73.00

Source: *Author's own study based on: Remote, 2025; The Culture Factor Group.*

Table 3. *Percentage of countries with high and low levels of CD*

Cultural Dimension	High level	Low level	Average
PDI	23.33	3.50	60.62
II	8.33	16.67	46.97
MASI	3.33	5.00	50.57
UAI	36.67	1.67	65.22
LTOI	8.33	13.33	44.90
INDULGI	5.00	6.67	43.00

Source: *Author's own calculation.*

In summary, the results indicate that continents—and by extension, individual countries—differ significantly across cultural dimensions. Asian societies tend to value hierarchy and authority, emphasise group belonging, and display restraint in expressing emotions. In contrast, Europeans are more inclined to question authority and place greater emphasis on cooperation rather than intense competition.

For Australians and New Zealanders, personal initiative and achievement constitute core values; they exhibit the lowest levels of uncertainty avoidance, attach considerable importance to education, and demonstrate a pragmatic orientation. North American culture is firmly rooted in the pursuit of success, with individuals showing a marked inclination to satisfy impulses and desires, particularly those

related to enjoyment and leisure. Finally, South American countries are most frequently characterized by a normative orientation, reflected in a strong preference for avoiding future uncertainty.

Following the analysis of GLWBI values and CD indicators across countries, the subsequent stage of the research examined potential associations between GLWBI and CD. The research findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Relationship between GLWBI and CD*

Pairs of variables	Correlation (Cultural Dimensions and GLWBI) Correlation coefficients are significant with p <,05000		
	N	R Spearman	p
GLWBI & PDI	60	-0.653341	0.000000
GLWBI & II	60	0.799088	0.000000
GLWBI & MASI	60	-0.048647	0.712046
GLWBI & UAI	60	-0.010730	0.935152
GLWBI & LTOI	60	0.435179	0.000511
GLWBI & INDULGI	58	0.438255	0.000580

Source: *Author's own calculation.*

Testing the first hypothesis indicates that the total effect of PDI on GLWBI is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$; R = –0.653341). This relationship is of moderate strength; therefore, H1 is supported by the data. The second hypothesis was likewise confirmed: the results show a positive correlation between II and GLWBI, suggesting that higher levels of individualism are associated with greater work-life balance in a country ($p < 0.05$; R = –0.799088).

Moreover, this relationship is strong. In contrast, hypotheses three and four could not be confirmed, as the relationships between MASI and GLWBI and between UA and GLWBI were found to be statistically insignificant and very weak. The fifth hypothesis, which proposed an impact of LTOI on work-life balance, was confirmed, although the relationship observed is moderate.

Finally, the sixth hypothesis, which posited a relationship between INDULI and GLWBI, is supported by the data, demonstrating a positive, moderate correlation ($p < 0.05$; R = 0.43825).

5. Conclusions, Proposals, Recommendations

The findings of this study highlight a significant relationship between work-life balance, as measured by the GLWBI, and selected cultural dimensions from Hofstede's model. Four of the six sub-hypotheses were supported. Specifically, statistically significant relationships were identified between the GLWBI and the dimensions of Power Distance (PDI), Individualism (II), Long-Term Orientation (LTOI), and Indulgence (INDULGI).

The results suggest that, within a given country, greater social inequality, a more hierarchical societal structure, or a more autocratic management style are associated with lower levels of work-life balance, as measured by the GLWBI. The observed negative correlation between PDI and GLWBI aligns with previous findings.

For instance, Brandth and Kvande (2015) and Haas and Hwang (2008) show that countries with higher levels of gender egalitarianism are more likely to implement policies supporting working families, whereas those with lower levels of gender equality are less likely to do so.

In addition, the strong positive relationship between Individualism and GLWBI indicates that higher levels of individualism are associated with greater work-life balance. This result is consistent with previous research. Haar et al. (2014), for example, found that work-life balance was more strongly and positively linked to job and life satisfaction in individualistic cultures, where work engagement is primarily associated with personal achievement and advancement, compared to collectivistic cultures, where work is more frequently viewed as serving family interests.

The moderate positive relationship identified between LTOI and GLWBI suggests that pragmatic societies place greater value on the concept of work-life balance. This finding partially corroborates the research by Farivar et al. (2016), who argue that moderate long-term orientation reflects a balance between pursuing long-term goals and achieving short-term outcomes, thereby supporting work-life balance. Similarly, Graafland (2020) notes that long-term-oriented individuals are more likely to anticipate and account for the negative long-term consequences of poor work-life balance and to adjust their behaviour accordingly.

Finally, the positive association between indulgence and GLWBI confirmed in this study is in line with earlier research. Farivar et al. (2016) observe that in indulgent cultures, work-life balance is promoted through flexible schedules and leisure activities, whereas in restrained cultures, professional achievement is prioritized.

Furthermore, indulgent cultures encourage individuals to set boundaries, embrace mindfulness, and prioritise their personal values to achieve a sustainable, satisfying balance.

In contrast, this study did not find statistically significant relationships between GLWBI and Masculinity (MASI) or Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI). This outcome is noteworthy, given that previous research has emphasised their relevance to work-life balance.

For example, Wilton and Ross (2017) identified the challenges individuals face in balancing professional and personal demands while striving for satisfaction in both

domains. Similarly, Rothbard (2001) highlighted how competing work and family demands can reduce role fulfilment due to employees' limited time and energy. Moreover, Ollo-López and Goñi-Legaz (2015) argued that higher levels of uncertainty avoidance can reduce work-family conflict, thereby enhancing the perception of balance.

These discrepancies suggest that further research is warranted, ideally by expanding the sample of countries analysed, to clarify the potential relationships between GLWBI and MASI or UAI.

As four of the six sub-hypotheses were confirmed, the overarching hypothesis— that national culture determines cross-country differences in work-life balance— cannot be fully validated.

Despite the promising findings, the study has several limitations. First, the analysis was conducted at a single point in time, which precludes the identification of temporal changes. Second, the scope of the research was limited by data availability, as the GLWBI currently covers only 60 countries. Third, the study focused on national cultures while overlooking the ethnic subcultures within countries.

These ethnic cultures, which may diverge substantially from the dominant national culture, can powerfully shape perceptions and expectations regarding work-life balance.

Further research should address these methodological limitations by employing longitudinal designs that expand the scope of analysis. Future studies could also draw on alternative models of cultural differences, such as Hall's framework of high- and low-context cultures, Schwartz's Cultural Value Model, or the Inglehart– Welzel Cultural Map."

References:

Abd Hamid, A., Mohamad, M., Bahrin, F.S.K. 2020. Assessing the Relationship between Work Life Balance and Employee Job Satisfaction. 9th International Economics and Business Management Conference (IEBMC 2019) 100. DOI10.15405/epsbs.2020.12.05.86, 797-802.

Allen, T.D. 2013.The work–family role interface: a synthesis of the research from industrial and organizational psychology. In: Schmitt, N.W., Highhouse, S.I., Weiner, I.B. (Eds.), Handbook of Psychology, 2nd rev ed. Hoboken: Wiley, 698-718.

Bardoel, A., DeCieri, H. 2006. Developing a Work/Life Strategy in a Multinational Enterprise (MNE). Work and Family Encyclopedia. Available at: https://wfrn.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Developing_Work-Life_Strategy-encyclopedia.pdf.

Björk-Fant, J.M, Bolander, P., Forsman, A.K. 2023. Work–life balance and work engagement across the European workforce: a comparative analysis of welfare states European. Journal of Public Health, 33(3),430-434.

Brandth, B., Kvande, E. 2015. Parental leave and classed fathering practices in Norway. In: Eydal, G.B., Rostgaard, T. (Eds.). Fatherhood in the Nordic 17 welfare states: Comparing care policies and practices. Bristol, UK: Policy Press, 121-140.

Clutterbuck, D. 2005. Równowaga między życiem zawodowym a osobistym. Kraków: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.

Directive (EU) 2019/1158 on work-life balance for parents and carers emphasise the importance of improving the work-life balance of parents and carers. Avaliable at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/1158/oj.

Espasandín-Bustelo, F., Ganaza-Vargas, J., Diaz-Carrion, R. 2021 Employee happiness and corporate social responsibility: the role of organizational culture. Employee Relations, 43(3), 609-629.

Eurofound-ETF. 2022. Living, working and COVID-19 in the European Union and 10 EU neighbouring countries. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Farivar, E., Cameron, R., Yaghoubi, M. 2016. Work-family balance and cultural dimensions: from a developing nation perspective. Personnel Review, 45(2). DOI:10.1108/PR-09-2014-0196, 315-333.

Fleetwood, S. 2007. Why work–life balance now? International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(3), 387-400.

Graafland, J. 2020. When Does Economic Freedom Promote Well Being? On the Moderating Role of Long-Term Orientation. Social Indicators Research, 149(1), 127-153.

Haar, J.M., Russo M., Sune, A. Ollier-Malaterre, A. 2014. Outcomes of Work-Life Balace, Life Satisfaction and Mental Health: A study across seven cultures. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 85, 361-373.

Haas, L., Hwang, C.P. 2008. The impact of taking parental leave on fathers' participation in childcare and relationships with children: Lessons from Sweden. Community, Work and Family, 11(1), 85-104.

Hill, E.J., Allen, S., Jacob, J., Bair, A.F., Bikhazi, S.L., Van Langeveld, A., Walker, E. 2007. Work family facilitation: Expanding theoretical understanding through qualitative exploration. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 9, 507-526.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. 2010. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind (Rev. 3rd ed.). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Inkeles, A., Levinson, D.J. 1969. National character: The study of modal personality and socio-cultural systems. In: G. Lindzey, E. Aronson (Eds). The handbook of social psychology 4. MA: Addison-Wesley, 418-506.

Kirchmeyer, C. 2000. Work-life initiatives: Greed or benevolence regarding workers' time? Trends in organizational behavior 7. New York, NY, US, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Kling, A.M. 2023. Millennials' Work–Life Balance Expectations: A qualitative study among Austrian. Canadian and Taiwanese University Graduates. Linz: Johannes Kepler University Linz.

Kossek, E. E., Ollier-Malaterre, A. 2012. Linking National Contexts, Organizational Practice and People for Multi-Level Change. In: J. Greenhaus, S.A.Y., Poelmans, M. Las Heras (Eds.), New Frontiers in Work-Family Research. A Vision for the Future in a Global World. United Kingdom, Palgrave.

Kumar, N.S. 2016. A Study on Work Life Balance and its Impact on Employee and Organizational Performance. Gurukul Business Review-Gbr, 12, 26-30.

Lewis, S., Brannen, J., Nilsen, A. 2009. Work, families and organisations in transition: European perspectives. Bristol, UK, Policy Press.

Lewis, S., Beauregard, T.A. 2018. The meanings of work life balance: a cultural perspective. In: Shockley, K., Shen, W., Johnson, R. (eds.) The Cambridge handbook of the global work-family interface. Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 720-732.

Lucia-Casademunt, A.M., García-Cabrera, A.M., Cuéllar-Molina D.G. 2015. National culture, work-life balance and employee well-being in European tourism firms: the moderating effect of uncertainty avoidance values. Tourism & Management Studies 11(1), 62-69.

McMillan, H.S., Morris, M.L., Atchley, E.K. 2011. Constructs of the work/ life Interface: A synthesis of the literature and introduction of the concept of work/life harmony. Human Resource Development Review, 10, 6-25.

Mulyadi, M., Sitiari, N.W., Meryawan, I.W., Saputri, L.G.E.A. 2024. The role of Workload, Work Life Balance and Psychological towards Employee Performance through Work Stress as mediation. Quality-Access to Success, 25(200). DOI10.47750/QAS/25.200.15, 143-152.

Muster, R., Leksy, K. 2022. Zarządzanie szkołą w czasie pandemii COVID-19- pomiędzy ideą work-life balance a rzeczywistością. Polityka społeczna, 10, 13-19.

Ollo-López, A., Goñi-Legaz, S. 2015. Differences in work–family conflict: which individual and national factors explain them? The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1118141, 499-525.

Piecuch, T., Szczygieł, E. 2019. Work-life balance w teorii i praktyce funkcjonowania współczesnych organizacji. Rzeszów: Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Rzeszowskiej.

Poelmans, S., O'Driscoll, M., Beham, B. 2005. An overview of international research on the work- family interface. In: S. Poelmans (Eds.), Work and family: An international research perspective. Mahwah N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, 3-46.

Przybyszewska, A. 2022. Downward professional mobility, cultural difference and immigrant niches: Dynamics of and changes to migrants' attitudes towards interpersonal communication and work performance. European Journal of Cultural Studies, 25(5). DOI:10.1177/13675494221074712, 1249-1265.

Rahim, N.B., Osman, I., Arumugam, P.V. 2020. Evaluating Work-Life Balance and Individual Well-Being with the Moderating Role of Organisational Climate. Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 27(4), 2731-2752.

Ratnes, M., AliÌ, A., SinhaÎ, R.A. 2019. Determinants of Work-Life Balance: A Cross- Cultural Review of Selected Asian Countries. Space and Culture, India, 7(1), 223- 239.

Remote. 2025. Global Life-Work Balance Index 2025 Dreaming of a better life-work balance? Discover which countries are setting the global standard in 2025. Remote Technology, Inc.

Roopavathi, S., Kishore, K. 2021. The Impact of Work Life Balance on Employee performance. Journal of Interdisciplinary Cycle Research, XII(X), 31-37.

Rothbard, N.P. 2001. Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 46, 655-684.

de Sivatte, I., Gordon, J.R., Rojo, P., Olmos, R. 2015. The impact of work-life culture on organizational productivity. Personnel Review, 44(6). DOI:10.1108/PR-12-2013- 0226, 883-905.

Stefanovska-Petkovska, M., Petrovska, I., Bojadziev, M., Schaeffer, I., Tomovska-Misoska, A. 2019. The Effects of Organizational Culture and Dimensions on Job Satisfaction and Work-Life Balance. Montenegrin Journal of Economics, 15(1). DOI:10.14254/1800-5845/2019.15-1.8, 99-112.

The Culture Factor Group. Country comparison tool. Available at: https://www.theculturefactor.com/country-comparison-tool.

Walga, T.K. 2018. Job Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Work-Life Balance across Cultures. Journal of Intercultural Management, 10(2). DOI: 10.2478/joim-2018-0013, 159-179.

Webber, M. Sarris, A., Bessell, M. 2010. Organisational Culture and the Use of Work–Life Balance Initiatives: Influence on Work Attitudes and Work–Life Conflict. The. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Organisational Psychology, 3. DOI:10.1375/ajop.3.1.54, 54-65.

Wilton, S., Ross, L. 2017. Flexibility, sacrifice and insecurities: A Canadian study assessing the challenges of balancing work and family in academia. Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 29(1-2). doi: 10.1080/08952833.2016.1272663, 66-87.

Wensley, A., Cegarra-Leiva, D., Sanchez-Vidal, M.E., Cegarra-Navarro, J.G. 2012. Linking Congenital Learning With Organizational Performance Through Work-Life Balance Culture. Proceedings of the 13th European Conference on Knowledge Management 1 and 2, 1275-1283.

Wong, K.P., Chan, A.H.S., Teh, P.L. 2020. How Is Work-Life Balance Arrangement Associated with Organisational Performance? A Meta-Analysis. International Journal Of Environmental Research And Public Health 17 (4446) https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17124446.

Yeaster, M. 2019. Work-Life Balance, Burnout, and Physician Wellness. Health Care Manager, 28(3). DOI:10.1097/HCM.0000000000000277, 239-246.