

Personal and Professional Synergy of Employees in Software Companies

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 13

Special Issue: 1

Month: May

Year: 2026

P-ISSN: 2321-4643

E-ISSN: 2581-9402

Citation:

Abinisha, PS, and V. Darling Selvi. "Personal and Professional Synergy of Employees in Software Companies." *Shanlax International Journal of Management*, vol. 13, no. S1, 2026, pp. 242-252.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v13iS1-i3-may.11038>

P.S. Abinisha

*II MBA Student, Department of Management Studies
St. Xavier's Catholic College of Engineering (Autonomous)
Chunkankadai, Nagercoil*

Dr. V. Darling Selvi

*Professor and Head, Department of Management Studies
St. Xavier's Catholic College of Engineering (Autonomous)
Chunkankadai, Nagercoil*

Abstract

The study examines the personal and professional synergy of employees in software companies with special reference to Eloiacs Software Private Limited. The research focuses on the relationship between employee well-being, work-life balance, organizational support, stress, and professional performance. The study uses statistical tools such as percentage analysis, crosstabulation, Chi-square test, and Mann-Whitney U test with the help of SPSS. The findings indicate that employee well-being and work-life balance positively influence job satisfaction and productivity, while workload and stress negatively affect employee efficiency and personal life. The study also highlights the importance of organizational support, flexibility, and wellness initiatives in improving employee engagement and performance. The research concludes that maintaining a healthy balance between personal and professional life is essential for enhancing both employee satisfaction and organizational effectiveness in software companies.

Introduction

In today's competitive software industry, employee well-being and professional performance are closely interconnected. Organizations increasingly recognize that employees perform effectively when they are able to maintain a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives. Factors such as work-life balance, organizational support, workplace culture, stress management, and job satisfaction play an important role in improving employee productivity and engagement. However, heavy workload, long working hours, and workplace stress often create challenges that affect both employee well-being and organizational performance. The present study focuses on analyzing the personal and professional synergy of employees in software companies, like Eloiacs Software Private Limited, in order to understand the factors influencing employee satisfaction, well-being, and overall effectiveness.

Review of Literature

Slavkovic et al., (2023) looked at how different types of motivation together affect job satisfaction among healthcare professionals in public blood bank units. It considers factors like recognition, work environment, leadership support, and opportunities for growth. The results show that when these factors are combined effectively, they improve employees' satisfaction, commitment, performance. The study also highlights the need for a supportive work environment and suggests that organizations should use better motivation strategies to improve both employee well-being and overall performance.

Eddy et al., (2021) examined how meaningful recognition can improve the relationship between employees and organizations, especially in healthcare settings. It shows that recognition is more effective when it matches employees' values, efforts, and goals. The study finds that proper and timely recognition increases job satisfaction, motivation, and engagement. It also helps improve employee retention and overall performance.

Jia et al., (2024) explored how AI-driven HR practices affect employee engagement and performance in organizations. Based on a survey of employees in Chinese companies, the study finds that AI-based HR systems improve employee engagement, which leads to better performance. It also shows that employees with strong conscientiousness benefit more from these practices.

Tu et al., (2023) examined how leadership and HR practices together influence employees' pro-environmental behavior (PEB). It finds that environmentally focused leadership and green HR practices work together to encourage employees to act in environmentally friendly ways. The study also shows that factors like confidence, responsibility, and passion for the environment play an important role in shaping this behavior.

Hajjali et al., (2022) explored how work motivation, leadership style, and employee competence affect job satisfaction and performance. Based on data collected from employees, the study finds that motivation has a negative impact on job satisfaction, while competence has a positive but weak influence on performance. It also shows that job satisfaction does not strongly improve performance.

Research Gap

Previous studies mainly focus on individual factors such as motivation, leadership, recognition, and employee engagement in different sectors. However, limited research has been conducted on the combined effect of personal well-being, work–life balance, organizational support, and stress on employee performance in software companies. Very few studies specifically examine the personal and professional synergy of employees in emerging software firms. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill this gap by analyzing how personal and professional factors together influence employee satisfaction and performance in Eloiacs Software Private Limited.

Research Methodology

The research design adopted for this study is descriptive research. Descriptive research is used to systematically describe the characteristics, behavior, and opinions of employees regarding personal and professional synergy. It helps in understanding the current situation without manipulating any variables. Primary data were collected from 150 employees through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using statistical tools such as percentage analysis, crosstabulation, Chi-square test, and Mann–Whitney U test with the help of SPSS. This type of research is suitable for the study as it focuses on analyzing how personal well-being, work–life balance, stress, and organizational support influence employee performance in software companies.

Objectives

- To analyze the impact of work–life balance on job satisfaction, productivity, and employee engagement.
- To identify organizational factors such as workplace culture, flexibility, and support systems that influence personal–professional synergy.
- To evaluate the effects of stress and workload on employees’ personal lives and professional effectiveness.

Data Analysis

Percentage Analysis

Percentage can also be used to compare the relationship distribution of two or more items. For calculations the percentage the following formula used.

Percentage of Respondents

Frequency of Specific Response

=

Total Number of Responses × 100

The percentage analysis reveals that employees in the software company experience a moderately positive level of personal and professional synergy. A majority of respondents agree that personal well-being influences work performance, with about 68%–72% of employees agreeing or strongly agreeing with statements related to mental health and productivity. Similarly, work–life balance is perceived positively, with nearly 70%–78% of respondents expressing satisfaction with their ability to balance personal and professional life. Organizational support and workplace culture are also viewed favorably, with around 65%–71% of employees agreeing that their organization provides a supportive environment, encourages teamwork, and recognizes contributions. However, stress and workload remain key concerns, as approximately 65%–70% of respondents report that workload, deadlines, and work pressure create stress and affect efficiency. In terms of general factors, 32% of respondents identified heavy workload as the main issue affecting work–life balance, while 67.3% of employees are satisfied or highly satisfied with their jobs. Despite this, organizational support for well-being appears inconsistent, with over 56% reporting that such support is rarely or never provided.

Crosstabulation and Chi-Square Test

The chi-square test is a statistical analysis method used to determine the association between two categorical variables. It involves calculating the chi-square test statistic using the formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left| \frac{(O - E)^2}{E} \right|$$

Where O represents the observed frequencies and E represents the expected frequencies under the assumption of independence.

Gender vs Work Experience

H_0 : There is no significant association between gender and work experience of employees.

H_1 : There is a significant association between gender and work experience of employees.

Gender * Work Experience Crosstabulation							
			Work Experience				Total
			Below 1 Year	1 – 3 Years	3 – 5 Years	Above 5 Years	
Gender	Male	Count	20	24	17	19	80
		% within Gender	25.0%	30.0%	21.3%	23.8%	100.0%
		% within Work Experience	50.0%	57.1%	45.9%	61.3%	53.3%
	Female	Count	20	18	20	12	70
		% within Gender	28.6%	25.7%	28.6%	17.1%	100.0%
		% within Work Experience	50.0%	42.9%	54.1%	38.7%	46.7%
Total	Count	40	42	37	31	150	
	% within Gender	26.7%	28.0%	24.7%	20.7%	100.0%	
	% within Work Experience	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.023a	3	.568
Likelihood Ratio	2.031	3	.566
Linear-by-Linear Association	.280	1	.597
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.47.

The crosstabulation shows that both male and female respondents are fairly evenly distributed across different levels of work experience, with slight variations in proportions. Males have a slightly higher representation in the 1–3 years and above 5 years categories, while females are more represented in the below 1 year and 3–5 years groups.

The Chi-square test result ($p = 0.568 > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant association between gender and work experience. Hence, gender does not significantly influence the distribution of work experience among respondents.

Age Group vs Job Role Level

H_0 : There is no significant association between age group and job role level of employees.

H_1 : There is a significant association between age group and job role level of employees.

Table 1 Age Group * Job Role Level Crosstabulation

Age Group * Job Role Level Crosstabulation							
			Job Role Level				Total
			Entry Level	Executive/ Junior	Senior/ Lead	Managerial	
Age Group	Below 25 Years	Count	7	4	11	7	29
		% within Age Group	24.1%	13.8%	37.9%	24.1%	100.0%
		% within Job Role Level	17.9%	11.4%	28.2%	18.9%	19.3%

	26 – 35 Years	Count	10	15	5	8	38
		% within Age Group	26.3%	39.5%	13.2%	21.1%	100.0%
		% within Job Role Level	25.6%	42.9%	12.8%	21.6%	25.3%
	36 – 45 Years	Count	9	9	17	8	43
		Years	20.9%	20.9%	39.5%	18.6%	100.0%
		% within Job Role Level	23.1%	25.7%	43.6%	21.6%	28.7%
	Above 45	Count	13	7	6	14	40
		Years	32.5%	17.5%	15.0%	35.0%	100.0%
		% within Job Role Level	33.3%	20.0%	15.4%	37.8%	26.7%
Total	Count	39	35	39	37	150	
	% within Age Group	26.0%	23.3%	26.0%	24.7%	100.0%	
	% within Job Role Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.645 ^a	9	.028
Likelihood Ratio	18.274	9	.032
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.913
N of Valid Cases	150		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.77.			

Source: Primary Data

The crosstabulation shows variation in job roles across different age groups. Employees aged 36–45 years have a higher representation in Senior/Lead roles, while those above 45 years are more concentrated in managerial position. Younger employees (below 35 years) are more likely to be in entry-level and executive/junior roles. The Chi-square test result ($p = 0.028 < 0.05$) indicates that there is a significant association between age group and job role level. Hence, age has a meaningful influence on the job position held by employees.

Educational Qualification vs Department / Functional Area

H_0 : There is no significant association between educational qualification and department/functional area of employees.

H_1 : There is a significant association between educational qualification and department/functional area of employees.

Educational Qualification * Department/Functional Area Crosstabulation						
		Department/ Functional Area				
		Operations/ Production	HR/ Administration	Finance/ Accounts	Others	Total
Under Graduate	Count	10	15	5	8	38
	% within Educational Qualification	26.3%	39.5%	13.2%	21.1%	100.0%
	% within Department/ Functional Area	25.6%	42.9%	12.8%	21.6%	25.3%

Educational Qualification	Post Graduate	Count	9	9	17	8	43
		% within Educational Qualification	20.9%	20.9%	39.5%	18.6%	100.0%
		% within Department/ Functional Area	23.1%	25.7%	43.6%	21.6%	28.7%
	Professional	Count	13	7	6	14	40
		% within Educational Qualification	32.5%	17.5%	15.0%	35.0%	100.0%
		% within Department/ Functional Area	33.3%	20.0%	15.4%	37.8%	26.7%
Total	Count	39	35	39	37	150	
	% within Educational Qualification	26.0%	23.3%	26.0%	24.7%	100.0%	
	% within Department/ Functional Area	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Data

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.942 ^a	6	.685
Likelihood Ratio	3.967	6	.681
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.069	1	.150
N of Valid Cases	150		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.96.

Source: Primary Data

The crosstabulation shows that respondents from different educational backgrounds are fairly distributed across all departments, with slight variations. Undergraduate and postgraduate employees are more represented in HR/ Administration, while professionally qualified employees have a relatively higher presence in Operations/Production.

The Chi-square test result ($p = 0.685 > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant association between educational qualification and department. Hence, educational background does not significantly influence the department in which employees work.

Gender vs Nature of Employment

H_0 : There is no significant association between gender and nature of employment of employees.

H_1 : There is a significant association between gender and nature of employment of employees.

Gender * Nature of Employment Crosstabulation							
		Nature of Employment					Total
		Full-time	Part-time	Contract	Intern/Trainee		
Male	Count	20	14	26	20	80	
	% within Gender	25.0%	17.5%	32.5%	25.0%	100.0%	
	% within Nature of Employment	51.3%	42.4%	61.9%	55.6%	53.3%	

Gender	Female	Count	19	19	16	16	70
		% within Gender	27.1%	27.1%	22.9%	22.9%	100.0%
		% within Nature of Employment	48.7%	57.6%	38.1%	44.4%	46.7%
Total		Count	39	33	42	36	150
		% within Gender	26.0%	22.0%	28.0%	24.0%	100.0%
		% within Nature of Employment	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Primary Data

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.955 ^a	3	.399
Likelihood Ratio	2.968	3	.397
Linear-by-Linear Association	.766	1	.381
N of Valid Cases	150		
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.40.			

Source: Primary Data

The crosstabulation shows that male respondents are more represented in contract (32.5%) and full-time roles (25.0%), while female respondents are relatively more represented in part-time positions (27.1%). Both genders have a fairly similar distribution in intern/trainee roles.

The Chi-square test result ($p = 0.399 > 0.05$) indicates that there is no significant association between gender and nature of employment. Hence, gender does not significantly influence the type of employment among respondents.

Mann–Whitney U test

The Mann-Whitney U test (also known as the Wilcoxon rank-sum test) is a non-parametric statistical test used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the distributions of two independent groups. Let,

- n_1 = number of observations in Group 1
- n_2 = number of observations in Group 2
- R_1 = sum of the ranks for Group 1
- R_2 = sum of the ranks for Group 2

The U statistics for each group are:

$$U_1 = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1(n_1 + 1)}{2} - R_1$$

$$U_2 = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_2(n_2 + 1)}{2} - R_2$$

The smaller of U_1 and U_2 is used as the test statistic U .

Work-Life Balance

H_0 : There is no significant difference in work–life balance (WLB1) between low-stress and high-stress employees.

H_1 : There is a significant difference in work–life balance (WLB1) between low-stress and high-stress employees.

Variables Used

Grouping Variable: STR_GRP = Mean (STR1+STR2+STR3+STR4)

1, 2, 3 → Low Stress (1)

4, 5 → High Stress (2)

Test Variable: WLB1

Ranks				
	Stress and Workload	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
I am able to balance my work and personal life effectively.	Low Stress	16	48.38	774.00
	High Stress	74	44.88	3321.00
	Total	90		

Source: Primary Data

Test Statistics ^a	
	I am able to balance my work and personal life effectively.
Mann-Whitney U	546.000
Wilcoxon W	3321.000
Z	-.516
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.606
a. Grouping Variable: Stress and Workload	

The Mann–Whitney U test was conducted to compare work–life balance (WLB1) between low-stress and high-stress employees. The mean rank for low-stress employees (48.38) is slightly higher than that of high-stress employees (44.88), indicating a marginally better work–life balance among low-stress respondents.

However, the p-value (0.606 > 0.05) is not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in work–life balance between low-stress and high-stress employees.

Job Satisfaction

H_0 : There is no significant difference in job satisfaction (G15) between low-support and high-support employees.

H_1 : There is a significant difference in job satisfaction (G15) between low-support and high-support employees.

Variables Used

Grouping Variable: ORG_GRP = Mean (ORG1+ORG2+ORG3+ORG4+ORG5)

1, 2, 3 → Low Support (1)

4, 5 → High Support (2)

Test Variable: G15 (Job Satisfaction)

Ranks				
	Organizational Support and Workplace Culture	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Job satisfaction level	Low Support	13	47.31	615.00
	High Support	74	43.42	3213.00
	Total	87		

Source: Primary Data

Test Statistics ^a	
	Job satisfaction level
Mann-Whitney U	438.000
Wilcoxon W	3213.000
Z	-.537
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.592
a. Grouping Variable: Organizational Support and Workplace Culture	

Source: Primary Data

The Mann–Whitney U test was conducted to compare job satisfaction (G15) between low-support and high-support employees. The mean rank for low-support employees (47.31) is slightly higher than that of high-support employees (43.42), indicating only a minimal difference in job satisfaction levels between the two groups.

However, the p-value ($0.592 > 0.05$) is not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted, indicating that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction between low-support and high-support employees.

Findings

- The percentage analysis reveals that most respondents belong to the age group of 36–45 years, indicating that middle-aged employees form a major part of the workforce in the organization.
- The male employees slightly outnumber female employees, showing a balanced gender representation in the company.
- It was observed that undergraduate and postgraduate employees are equally represented, while professional qualification holders also form a considerable proportion of the workforce.
- The analysis indicates that most employees have 1–3 years of work experience, suggesting the presence of a relatively young and growing workforce. The HR/Administration department has the highest number of employees compared to other departments.
- Most respondents agreed that personal well-being, mental health, and good physical health positively affect their work performance and productivity.
- Employees generally expressed satisfaction with their work–life balance, and many respondents agreed that flexible work arrangements improve motivation and job satisfaction.
- The employees perceive the workplace culture as supportive, with teamwork, managerial encouragement, and recognition contributing positively to employee engagement.
- A considerable number of respondents reported that workload, tight deadlines, and work pressure create stress and affect their personal life and efficiency.
- Most employees agreed that employee well-being programs, healthy work environments, and work–life balance policies improve organizational performance and teamwork.
- The Chi-square analysis showed no significant association between gender and work experience ($p = 0.568$), educational qualification and department ($p = 0.685$), and gender and nature of employment ($p = 0.399$).

- The study identified a significant association between age group and job role level ($p = 0.028$), indicating that higher age groups are more likely to occupy senior and managerial positions.
- The Mann–Whitney U test revealed no significant difference in work–life balance between low-stress and high-stress employees ($p = 0.606$), and no significant difference in job satisfaction between low-support and high-support employees ($p = 0.592$).

Suggestions

- The company should introduce flexible working hours to help employees maintain better work–life balance.
- It should provide employee wellness and mental health programs to reduce stress and improve well-being.
- The organization needs to manage workload effectively to avoid employee burnout.
- Management should improve communication with employees to understand their concerns and needs.
- The company should offer more training and career development opportunities to enhance motivation.
- It is important to create a more supportive and positive work environment through recognition and teamwork.

Conclusion

The study on personal and professional synergy of employees in software companies highlights the strong connection between employees' well-being and their work performance. The findings reveal that most employees experience a reasonably good level of work–life balance and job satisfaction, which positively influences their productivity and motivation.

However, issues such as work-related stress, heavy workload, and limited organizational support for well-being still affect a significant number of employees. While the workplace culture is generally supportive, there is scope for improvement in areas like flexibility, mental health support, and workload management.

Therefore, enhancing employee well-being through better policies, supportive practices, and flexible work arrangements can lead to improved individual performance and overall organizational effectiveness.

References

Books

1. Achor, S. (2010). *The happiness advantage*. Crown Publishing.
2. Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy and engagement at work*. Harvard Business Review Press.
3. Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace*. Wiley.
4. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.
5. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). *Burnout and engagement in the workplace*. APA Press.
6. NASSCOM. (2023). *Indian IT industry report*. National Association of Software and Service Companies.
7. Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us*. Riverhead Books.
8. Pfeffer, J. (2018). *Dying for a paycheck*. Harper Business.
9. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.

10. Senge, P. M. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.

Articles

1. Adiza, Gogo Rachael, et al. "The Influence of Socio-Cultural Factors on the Performance of Female Entrepreneurs." *International Journal of Financial, Accounting, and Management*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2020, pp. 13-27.
2. Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences of work–family conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308.
3. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285.
4. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
5. Eddy, J. R., Kovick, L., & Caboral-Stevens, M. (2021). Meaningful recognition: A synergy between the individual and the organization. *Nursing Management*, 52(1), 14–21.
6. Eshun, E. N. K. (2024). Work–life balance and employee performance. *SAGE Open*, 14(2).
7. Godliauskas, P. (2025). The well-being of software engineers: A systematic review. *Empirical Software Engineering*.
8. Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 10–55.
9. Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692–724.
10. Russo, D., Hanel, P. H. P., & van Berkel, N. (2021). Understanding developers’ well-being and productivity. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering*.
11. Smite, D., Moe, N. B., & Hildrum, J. (2022). Work-from-home is here to stay. *Journal of Systems and Software*.