

Geeks, Bosses & Gigabytes: Decoding the Secrets of Satisfaction in the Silicon Sphere

Dr. Sushil Kumar Pare^{1*}, Dr. Vivek Sharma², Dr. Shailendrakumar Kale³, Dr. Yesha Mehta⁴,

¹*Professor, KLS – Institute of Management Education and Research, Belagavi, Karnataka, India
Email: piresushil@hotmail.com ORCID : 0000-0003-3482-9901

²Professor, Institute of Management Studies, Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, MP, India,
Email: drvivek.ims@gmail.com ORCID: 0009-0008-0226-3740

³Professor, School of Business, Dr. Vishwanath Karad MIT World Peace University, Pune, Maharashtra, India
Email: shailendrakumar725@gmail.com ORCID : 0000-0002-7414-8898

⁴Associate professor, Thakur Institute of Management Studies and Research, Mumbai , India
Email: yesha.m@gmail.com ORCID : 0000-0002-1291-6652

Abstract:

The IT industry has always been in the limelight. There has been much debate in mainstream media regarding working conditions in the IT industry. Sometimes, it is moonlighting and sometimes, it is pressure to work from the office. The footage of the IT industry has attracted our attention to study satisfaction with life in this industry.

This research delves into a comparative study of life satisfaction among Indian and Canadian IT professionals with a decade or more of experience, presenting a nuanced understanding of the factors contributing to their well-being. This study, rooted in basic statistical analysis and Diener's scale, explores the intricate relationship between personal factors, such as rapport with superiors, familial health, and the influence of work location on overall life satisfaction.

This study is crucial in shedding light on the often-overlooked personal dimensions that significantly shape life satisfaction in the demanding realm of IT. It offers invaluable insights for industry leaders, HR professionals, and policymakers aiming to foster an environment that nurtures the productivity and holistic well-being of IT professionals. The paper shifts attention from job perks to a broader and more stable outcome: satisfaction with life. The study also explores geographic comparison to understand the global discourse on satisfaction with life, making it a useful for those committed to understanding and enhancing life satisfaction in the technological industry.

Key Words: Satisfaction with life, IT Professionals

How to cite this article: Pare SK, Sharma V, Kale S, Mehta Y., Geeks, Bosses & Gigabytes: Decoding the Secrets of Satisfaction in the Silicon Sphere. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2026;16(44s): 909-919; DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.44s.100,

Introduction:

Globally, as well as in India, the IT industry is known for its good pay packages, better working conditions, growth, and opportunities. However, is it all that glitter gold? Courtesy COVID-19, the moonlighting debate, and pressure for work- from-office incidences have shown that there may be some issues under the carpet. While many reports are available on attractive pay packages and fringe benefits worth envious in the IT industry, the following question arises: Are these pay packages and perks the ultimate indicators of employee well-being?

The present moment calls for an exploration of the thoughts and ideas of individuals working in the field of information technology. There are various indicators and studies, such as median pay packages, average stay in the company (Selar et al., 2023), employee loyalty to the organization, happiness (Bellamkonda & Pattusamy, 2022), happiness satisfaction with life (Badri et al., 2022), mental well-being and satisfaction with life (Zábó et al., 2022), and psychological well-being and satisfaction with life (Tekir, 2022). The list of indicators is very large. However, we can see that these parameters would boil down to satisfaction with life. Therefore, it is logical to understand the satisfaction with life in the IT industry. This situation also stimulated our curiosity about the factors impacting satisfaction with life.

*Author for Correspondence: piresushil@hotmail.com

Two theories in life satisfaction research have been discussed intensely: bottom-up theory (Erdogan et al., 2012) and top- down theory (Diener, 1984; Heady et al., 1993; Loewe et al., 2014). Bottom-up theory looks at overall satisfaction as a function of several aspects of life satisfaction. Top-down theory views overall life satisfaction or specific areas of life satisfaction as a result of personality and other stable characteristics. The theoretical approaches may be different. However, every theory of satisfaction with life supports a broad spectrum of constructs. The construct encompasses various aspects of an individual's life, such as personal relationships, health, financial situation, and an overall sense of purpose (Diener, 1984).

Review of Literature Satisfaction with life

Satisfaction with life has been extensively studied in social science, particularly in psychology and sociology. It refers to a person's overall life evaluation, including their emotions, attitudes, subjective well-being, and happiness.

The scope of the study is not happiness, although both terms are treated on par. Happiness is unstable. Happiness may come to a base level after some roller coaster drives, as suggested by Brickman and Campbell (1971) in the theory of Set Point. Satisfaction with life is more stable from the perspective of an individual. This

includes emotions, subjective well-being, and happiness.

The roots of satisfaction with life can be traced to 167 AD when Marcus Aurelius wrote in his book 'The Meditations' that "Life's happiness depends upon the quality of your thoughts." The word 'life satisfaction' first appeared in an article written by Karapetoff (1903), where he argues that satisfaction with life is not only about material possessions but also the speed of gathering the same.

The journey to define and capturing satisfaction with life has been very engaging. A few essential milestones can be considered such as the work of Abraham Maslow (1943), the Positive Psychology Movement of the 90s, the work of Veenhoven (1996) in drafting the journey of satisfaction, and the quantification attempt by Hills and Argyle (2002), popularly known as the Oxford scale.

In the 1980s and the 1990s, researchers shifted their focus from objective well-being (income and education) to subjective measures such as well-being. This shift highlights the importance of cognitive components, such as individual perceptions and experiences, in determining satisfaction with life.

The 90s can be remembered as the Positive Psychology Movement, a psychology research focused on understanding well-being and life satisfaction (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Later, the concept of satisfaction with life was expanded to Cross-Cultural Research Expansion (Diener & Oishi, 2000) and economic factors such as government policies and economic conditions (Frey & Stutzer, 2002). Later, technological influences such as modern lifestyle factors (Tromholt, 2016) were creped in. Recently, the pandemic has attracted the attention of researchers in this field, and the psychological impacts of lockdowns, social isolation, and health anxieties (Brodeur et al., 2020) have been studied in detail. There is a long list of scholars trying to define and measure satisfaction with life in society.

The study is primarily takes the bottom-up view (Diener, 1984) of life satisfaction. Here overall life satisfaction is shaped by the sum of our satisfaction in various specific life domains.

From this perspective, factors such as relationship within the family domain (spouse relationship), relationship within the work domain (reporting-manager relationship), financial strain, and family health challenges may influence an individual's evaluation of satisfaction with life. At the same time, demographic variables such as age, gender, and country context may structure these evaluations. Accordingly, the study examines whether life satisfaction varies systematically across these personal and professional domains.

Why Ed Diener's scale?

There is an impressive list of studies on satisfaction with life. However, Ed Diener's work is considered the most influential on the journey, with approximately 37,000 citations in this area. Starting with subjective well-being, wrote many articles, including a scale on subjective well-being (Diener, 1984). This scale is considered one of the most influential measures of satisfaction with life.

Satisfaction with life: Spouse, Reporting Manager, Family Health, and Location

The factors related to satisfaction with life are innumerable. Some of the factors include mental health (Rumpf et al., 2004), culture (Diener et al., 2003), personal values (Kasser & Ryan, 1993), personal characteristics (Sousa & Lyubomirsky, 2001), Positive and Negative Emotions (Cerezo et al., 2022; Kahneman & Riis, 2012), Religion and Spirituality (Koburtay et al., 2023), and even cities that prefer to live (Schkade & Kahneman, 1998) are some of the examples.

Here, we focus on the inner space. We chose factors that were more 'personal' in nature. This study focuses on the impact of relationships with spouses, reporting managers, the health of near and dear, and work location.

Satisfaction with life: Spouse

Marriage is considered one of the most important and influential factors in a person's life, and the quality of the marital relationship significantly affects satisfaction with life. Research in this area has shown that marital satisfaction positively affects satisfaction with life. Kim and McKenry (2002) and Powdthavee (2008) found that marital satisfaction was a significant predictor of satisfaction with life among married individuals. In the case of singles, satisfaction diminishes with time (Jeewon et al., 2022).

A longitudinal study by Proulx and Snyder-Rivas (2013) found that the quality of the marital relationship was a significant predictor of changes in satisfaction with life over time, and that these effects were independent of other factors such as age, gender, and income. Similarly, Luhman et al. (2012) found that changes in marital status and life events were associated with changes in satisfaction with life over time.

The impact of relationship quality with one's spouse on satisfaction with life is significant. Every phase of life is impacted from romantic relationships (Adamczyk & Segrin, 2015) to families with children (Proulx et al., 2007) and older adults (Bookwala et al., 2018). Overall, these findings highlight the critical role of the relationship with one's spouse in determining satisfaction with life.

Satisfaction with life: Reporting Manager

Most of us spend half of our lives at home and half of our lives in the office; hence, the relationship between employees and their reporting managers is a crucial factor in determining overall satisfaction with life. Studies have shown that employees with positive relationships with their managers have higher satisfaction levels with life (Rathi & Lee, 2018; Rathi & Lee, 2017).

On the other hand, negative relationships with reporting managers can lead to decreased satisfaction with life (Monnot & Beehr, 2014). Negative behaviors from reporting managers, such as bullying, power abuse, and micromanagement, can lead to decreased job satisfaction and overall well-being (Rafferty & Restubog, 2011). These negative behaviors can also increase stress and burnout, further affecting life satisfaction (Baygi et al.,

2022).

However, the office climate is more than just a relationship with reporting managers. Effective communication (Sinčić Ćorić et al., 2020), career adaptability, self-efficacy (Topino et al., 2022), and coping resource availability (Hamarat et al., 2001) also been shown to influence overall well-being.

Satisfaction with life: Family Health

Health is the genesis of life satisfaction (Chokkanathan and Mohanty 2017). Family health can significantly impact an individual's overall satisfaction with life. Family members' well-being is interconnected, and health issues affecting one family member can have a ripple effect on the entire family system (Castañeda & Melo, 2014). Sezek et al. (2023) argued that family health positively impacts life satisfaction, especially if one is a caregiver. Povedano-Diaz et al. (2020) found that family functioning and support significantly increased adolescent satisfaction with life. In a family, life satisfaction is impacted if a child faces severe challenges (Chadasch & Kotchoubey, 2021).

However, the relationship between life satisfaction and family health has not always been direct. Factors such as perceived social support sometimes mediate the relationship between family health and satisfaction (Cheng and Chan 2006).

Healthy families ensure life satisfaction (Kleszczewska et al., 2013; Kleszczewska et al., 2018). The relationship between family health and life satisfaction was more evident during challenging times, such as the pandemic (Gawrych et al., 2021), where a decrease in life satisfaction has been reported (Zarei & Fooladvand, 2022).

Therefore, individuals must take care of their family's health, as it can significantly affect their satisfaction with life.

Satisfaction with life: Work Location

The World Happiness Report released by the UN Sustainable Development Solutions Network has always been discussed. If one nation is 'happier' than another, would it get translated into satisfaction with life? Would people working in one geography be 'happier' than those working in another?

Studies have found that individuals living in certain regions, such as those with higher levels of social trust (Helliwell et al., 2018) or more green spaces (Bertram and Rehdanz, 2015; van Dinter et al., 2022), tend to report higher levels of satisfaction with life. Moreover, factors such as access to resources may also impact satisfaction with life (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010).

People living in urban areas tend to report lower levels of satisfaction with life than those living in rural areas (Fernandez and Kulik, 1981; Weckroth & Kemppainen, 2021). This could be due to pollution, noise, and overcrowding in urban areas, leading to stress and decreased well-being. Some studies have focused on a particular city and connected it to satisfaction with life (Chen et al., 2020; Munoz et al., 2020).

Generally, Western countries such as the US and CANADA are perceived as more employee-friendly than Eastern countries such as India and China. This may

be due to their legal framework, policies (Lo et al., 2019), or average national income (Chancel et al., 2022). This makes a case if there is any relationship between work location and the level of satisfaction with life.

We can see that the life satisfaction has been widely studied. However, there are no studies addressing the relationship of professional factors, personal factors, and cross country context among experienced IT professionals.

As prior research consistently shows that the personal relationship, and official relationship quality is positively associated with life satisfaction. In case of IT professional wherein long working hours, deadline pressure, mix of work from office and work from home culture makes it more complex, we can expect a positive association of the chosen factors and life satisfaction.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a cross-sectional survey design to examine the correlates of life satisfaction among IT professionals. Data were collected from 91 IT professionals located in India and Canada using snowballing technique. The sample predominantly consisted of respondents with substantial full-time work experience, with a majority reporting 10 or more years of employment. Of the 91 respondents, 69 were from India and 22 from Canada, indicating an imbalanced cross-national distribution that should be considered while interpreting comparative findings.

Life satisfaction was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener et al. (1985), a widely used instrument for assessing life satisfaction. The study also collected data on country, job role, tenure, gender, age, and relationship with spouse, relationship with reporting manager, family medical condition, and money crunch.

Research Questions

This study investigates pivotal aspects of life satisfaction among IT professionals, addressing crucial questions about the influence of country-specific factors, job roles, age, spousal relationships, managerial rapport, family health crises, and financial constraints. These questions are vital, as they unravel the complex interplay between professional and personal spheres. They offer a holistic view of what truly shapes life satisfaction in the technological world and provide critical insights for crafting more empathetic and supportive work environments. The questions were as follows.

- Does satisfaction with life differ across countries?
- Does the job role make a difference?
- Does age make a difference?
- Does a relationship with a spouse make any difference?
- Does the relationship with the reporting manager make a difference?
- Does the critical medical condition of any family member make a difference?
- Does the experience of a money crunch make a difference?

The hypothesis

H1: Life satisfaction differs significantly between IT professionals working in India and Canada. H2: Life satisfaction differs significantly across job roles.
 H3: Life satisfaction differs significantly across Tenure
 H4: Life satisfaction differs significantly by gender
 H5: Life satisfaction differs significantly across age groups.
 H6: Relationship of Life Satisfaction with Money Crunch, Family Medical Condition, Quality of Spouse

Relationship, and Quality of relationship with Reporting Manager.

The Analysis

Independent-samples t-tests were used for binary-group comparisons, one-way ANOVA for multi-group comparisons, and simple linear regression to examine associations between selected predictors and life satisfaction.

Satisfaction with Life: India and Abroad

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances

	<i>India</i>	<i>Aborad</i>
Mean	23.98551	26.5
Variance	28.80861	31.02381
Observations	69	22
Pooled Variance	29.3313	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	89	
t Stat	-1.89627	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.030584	
t Critical one-tail	1.662155	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.061169	
t Critical two-tail	1.986979	

Interpretation: No statistically significant difference was observed in life satisfaction between respondents from India and Canada at the 5% level ($p = 0.061$). However, the mean score was higher for the Canada-based group, suggesting a pattern that may merit examination in a larger and more balanced sample.

Satisfaction with Life: Job role

Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
Coding / Testing	27	628	23.25926	34.35328
People Mgt	25	645	25.8	24.66667
Both	39	965	24.74359	30.14305

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	85.33496	2	42.66748	1.42732	0.245451	3.100069
Within Groups	2630.621	88	29.89342			
Total	2715.956	90				

Interpretation: We accept the null hypothesis since the p-value is more than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the means of satisfaction with life between various job roles.

Satisfaction with Life: Tenure (Number of years in full-time employment)

Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
00-05 Yrs	13	324	24.92308	37.07692
06-10 Yrs	10	259	25.9	27.21111
11-15 Yrs	19	440	23.15789	38.14035
16 +	49	1215	24.79592	26.66582

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	59.64747	3	19.88249	0.651196	0.58432	2.709402
Within Groups	2656.309	87	30.53228			
Total	2715.956	90				

Interpretation: We accept the null hypothesis since the p-value is more than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the means of satisfaction with life between the different tenures.

Satisfaction with Life: Gender

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Equal Variances

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
Mean	24.5	25.27273
Variance	29.8481	35.21818
Observations	80	11
Pooled Variance	30.45148	
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
Df	89	
t Stat	-0.43545	
P(T<=t) one-tail	0.332143	
t Critical one-tail	1.662155	
P(T<=t) two-tail	0.664287	
t Critical two-tail	1.986979	

Interpretation: No statistically significant gender-based difference in life satisfaction was observed in this sample (p = 0.664). However, this result should be interpreted cautiously because the female subgroup was substantially smaller than the male subgroup.

Satisfaction with Life: Age

Anova: Single Factor

SUMMARY

<i>Groups</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Variance</i>
20-30	17	432	25.41176	30.25735
31-40	24	564	23.5	24.08696
41-50	39	907	23.25641	26.45884
51 +	11	335	30.45455	18.47273

ANOVA

<i>Source of Variation</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P-value</i>	<i>F crit</i>
Between Groups	487.6752	3	162.5584	6.346858	0.000609	2.709402
Within Groups	2228.281	87	25.61242			
Total	2715.956	90				

Interpretation: Since the p-value for age-group differences was below 0.05 (p = 0.000609), the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, life satisfaction differed significantly across age groups in this sample. Mean scores indicate that

respondents aged 51 and above reported the highest life satisfaction.

Summary Table

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Test</i>	<i>p-value</i>	<i>Direction</i>	<i>Supported?</i>
Country	t-test	0.061	Canada mean higher	No
Job role	ANOVA	0.245	No clear difference	No
Tenure	ANOVA	0.584	No clear difference	No
Gender	t-test	0.664	No clear difference	No
Age	ANOVA	0.001	Significant group difference	Yes

Regression Analysis

(Life Satisfaction with Money Crunch, Family Medical Condition, Quality of Spouse Relationship, and Quality of relationship with Reporting Manager)

To assess the relative contribution of personal and work-related factors to life satisfaction, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted for the India subsample. Life satisfaction (ls_total) was entered as the dependent variable, while money crunch, family medical condition, spouse relationship, and relationship with reporting manager were entered simultaneously as predictors

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Life Satisfaction	23.9855	5.36737	69
Money Crunch	2.3478	1.52263	69
Family Medical Condition	2.6667	1.64197	69
Spouse Relationship	4.0145	1.10471	69
Reporting Manager Relationship	4.0290	.93888	69

a. Selecting only cases for which country = India

Correlations						
		Life Satisfaction	Money Crunch	Family Medical Condition	Spouse Relationship	Reporting Manager Relationship
Pearson Correlation	Life Satisfaction	1.000	-.251	-.202	.308	.470
	Money Crunch	-.251	1.000	.341	-.204	-.192
	Family Medical	-.202	.341	1.000	-.224	-.089
	Spouse	.308	-.204	-.224	1.000	.382
	Reporting	.470	-.192	-.089	.382	1.000

a. Selecting only cases for which country = India

Model Summary							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson Statistic		
	Country = India (Selected)	Country = India (Unselected)			country= India (Selected)	country=India(Unselected)	
1	.520 ^a	.308	.270	.472643	1.894	2.254	

a. Predictors: (Constant), rep_mgr_rel, fam_med_con, moneycrunch, spouse_rel

b. Unless noted otherwise, statistics are based only on cases for which country = India.

c. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	529.281	4	132.320	5.923	.000 ^c
	Residual	1429.704	64	22.339		
	Total	1958.986	68			

a. Dependent Variable: ls_total

b. Selecting only cases for which country = India

c. Predictors: (Constant), rep_mgr_rel, fam_med_con, moneycrunch, spouse_rel

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients			t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	14.598	3.375		4.326	.000
	Money Crunch	-.415	.408	-.118	-1.018	.312
	Family Medical	-.335	.377	-.103	-.889	.377
	Spouse Relationship	.529	.576	.109	.919	.362
	Reporting Manager	2.267	.666	.396	3.401	.001

a. Dependent Variable: ls_total

b. Selecting only cases for which country = India

Residuals Statistics

	country = India (Selected)					country ~= India (Unselected)				
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std.	N
Predicted Value	16.3610	27.8263	23.9855	2.78990	69	18.9250	27.8263	24.4473	2.61867	22
Residual	12.1559	8.17919	.00000	4.58531	69	-8.07579	12.80966	2.05270	5.37438	22
Std.	-2.733	1.377	.000	1.000	69	-1.814	1.377	.166	.939	22
Std.	-2.572	1.731	.000	.970	69	-1.709	2.710	.434	1.137	22

a. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction

b. Pooled Cases

The model aimed to predict Life Satisfaction (ls_total) based on four predictors: Money Crunch, Family Medical Conditions, Spouse Relationship, and Relationship with Reporting Manager. The overall model is statistically significant and explains approximately 22.5% of the variance in life satisfaction.

1. Model Fit and Diagnostics

- **Overall Significance:** The ANOVA table shows
-

- $F(4, 64) = 5.923$, $p < .001$. This indicates that the combination of the four predictors significantly predicts life satisfaction.

- **Explanatory Power:** The Adjusted R Square value is .225. This means that 22.5% of the variation in life satisfaction is explained by the independent variables in this model.

- **Autocorrelation:** The Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.894. Since this is close to 2, it suggests that there is no significant autocorrelation in the residuals, satisfying one of the key assumptions of regression.

2. Predictor Analysis (Coefficients)

Looking at the Coefficients table, we evaluate the individual contribution of each variable:

Predictor	Unstandardized B	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized)	t-value	Sig. (p)
(Constant)	14.598	3.375	-	4.326	< .001
Money Crunch	-0.415	0.408	-0.118	-1.018	.312
Family Medical Condition	-0.335	0.377	-0.103	-0.889	.377
Spouse Relationship	0.529	0.576	0.109	0.919	.362
Reporting Manager	2.267	0.666	0.396	3.401	.001

Key Findings:

- **The Dominant Predictor:** The only statistically significant predictor in this model is the Relationship with the Reporting Manager ($p = .001$). For every 1-unit increase in the quality of the manager relationship, life satisfaction is expected to increase by 2.267 units, holding all other variables constant.
- **Non-Significant Predictors:** Surprisingly, Money Crunch, Family Medical Conditions, and Spouse Relationships did not reach statistical significance ($p > .05$) in this specific multivariate model. While they show correlations with life satisfaction individually, they do not contribute unique significant variance when the

manager relationship is included.

Conclusion & Recommendation

This study suggests that life satisfaction among IT professionals in India and Canada is significantly influenced by personal relationships, particularly with superiors and spouses. These relational factors play an important role in shaping individuals' overall well-being and productivity in the IT sector. Age, Gender, Money Crunch, and the geographical location of their workplace may not significantly impact their satisfaction with life significantly.

When the predictors were entered simultaneously in a

multivariate regression model for the India subsample, only relationship with reporting manager retained statistical significance, suggesting that this variable explains unique variance in life satisfaction beyond the effects of financial strain, family medical condition, and spouse relationship

Family health conditions impact the satisfaction with life as the relationship is negative. However, this effect was not statistically significant. These results contradict those of previous studies, wherein family health conditions had a significant impact (Chokkanathan & Mohanty, 2017) and location (Schkade & Kahneman, 1998).

This study provides exploratory evidence to the theoretical understanding of life satisfaction in the IT sector. Examining the personal and professional lives of IT professionals in India and Canada extends understanding of the literature by offering a cross-national perspective. This study underscores the importance of considering relationships with reporting managers and spouses in the theoretical framework of life satisfaction. These findings support the view that life satisfaction is shaped not only by broad structural work definition but also by the quality of relationships in key life domains.

In practice, organizations need to foster a supportive and understanding management structure, provide resources for family healthcare, and consider the impact of the relationship between the reporting manager and spouse on employees' life satisfaction. Additionally, fostering a culturally sensitive work environment that respects and integrates diverse backgrounds of the workforce can further enhance life satisfaction. These initiatives will benefit employees and contribute to the overall growth and sustainability of organizations in the competitive IT industry.

Limitations

The study has several limitations. The first one is potential for cultural bias due to the focus on two different locations, possibly limiting the generalizability of the findings to other locations or industries. Sample imbalance and modest sample size is another major limitations. However, taking time of senior executives has always been a challenge.

Because of this data imbalance, the regression uses Indian data set and hence it does not compares the two countries.

Reliance on self-reported measures also introduces subjectivity. Moreover, the dynamic nature of the IT industry and the evolving definition of satisfaction with life over time might affect the long-term applicability of the results.

References:

- Adamczyk, K., & Segrin, C. (2015). Direct and Indirect Effects of Young Adults' Relationship Status on Life Satisfaction through Loneliness and Perceived Social Support. *Psychologica Belgica*, 55(4), 196–211. <https://doi.org/10.5334/pb.bn>
- Badri, M. A., Alkhaili, M., Aldhaheri, H., Yang, G., Albahar, M., & Alrashdi, A. (2022). Exploring the Reciprocal Relationships between Happiness and Life Satisfaction of Working Adults—Evidence from Abu Dhabi. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(6). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063575>
- Baygi, F., Smith, A., Mohammadian Khonsari, N., Mohammadi-Nasrabadi, F., Mahmoodi, Z., Mahdavi-Gorabi, A., & Qorbani, M. (2022). Seafarers' mental health status and life satisfaction: Structural equation model. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.969231>
- Bellamkonda, N., & Pattusamy, M. (2022). Intention to stay and happiness: a moderated mediation model of work engagement and hope. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, July. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-05-2021-0174>
- Bertram, C., & Rehdanz, K. (2015). The role of urban green space for human well-being. *Ecological Economics*, 120(1911), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.10.013>
- Bookwala, J., & Gaugler, T. (2018). Negative relationship quality predicts mortality in older adults. *Innovation in Aging*, 2(Suppl 1), 280–280.
- Boyce, C. J., Brown, G. D. A., & Moore, S. C. (2010). Money and Happiness. *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 471–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610362671>
- Brickman, P., & Campbell, D. T. (1971). Hedonic relativism and planning a good society. In M. H. Appley (Ed.), *Adaptation-level theory* (pp. 287–305). New York: Academic Press.
- Brodeur, A., Clark, A. E., Fleche, S., & Powdthavee, N. (2020). Assessing the impact of the coronavirus lockdown on unhappiness, loneliness, and boredom using Google Trends. 1–12. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2004.12129>
- Cacioppo, M., Pace, U., & Zappulla, C. (2013). Parental psychological control, quality of family context and life satisfaction among Italian adolescents. *Child Indicators Research*, 6(1), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-012-9164-4>
- Castañeda, H., & Melo, M. A. (2014). Health Care Access for Latino Mixed-Status Families: Barriers, Strategies, and Implications for Reform. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(14), 1891–1909. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550290>
- Cerezo, M. V., Soria-Reyes, L. M., Alarcón, R., & Blanca, M. J. (2022). The Satisfaction with Life Scale in breast cancer patients: Psychometric properties. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijchp.2021.100274>
- Chadasch, C., & Kotchoubey, B. (2021). Life satisfaction in families with a child in an Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome. *BMC Pediatrics*, 21(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-021-02549-8>
- Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2022). *World Inequality Report 2022 - Executive*

- Summary. 1–19. https://wir2022.wid.world/website/uploads/2022/01/Summary_WorldInequalityReport2022_English.pdf
16. Chen, H., Zhu, Z., Chang, J., & Gao, Y. (2020). The effects of social integration and hometown identity on the life satisfaction of Chinese rural migrants: The mediating and moderating effects of a sense of belonging in the host city. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 18(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01415-y>
 17. Cheng, S. T., & Chan, A. C. M. (2006). Relationship with others and life satisfaction in later life: Do gender and widowhood make a difference? *Journals of Gerontology - Series B Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 61(1), 46–53. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/61.1.P46>
 18. Chokkanathan, S., & Mohanty, J. (2017). Health, family strains, dependency, and life satisfaction of older adults. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 71, 129–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2017.04.001>
 19. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542–575.
 20. Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Sem, R. J. L., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 1.
 21. Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). Money and happiness: Income and subjective well-being across nations. *Culture and subjective well-being*, 185–218.
 22. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, Culture, and Subjective Well-being: Emotional and Cognitive Evaluations of Life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54(February 2003), 403–425. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145056>
 23. Doerwald, F., Albrecht, B. M., Stalling, I., & Bammann, K. (2021). Domain-specific life satisfaction among older adults with and without children: The role of intergenerational contact. *PLoS ONE*, 16(9 September), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0257048>
 24. Erdogan, B., Bauer, T. N., Truxillo, D. M., & Mansfield, L. R. (2012). Whistle While You Work: A Review of the Life Satisfaction Literature. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 1038–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311429379>
 25. Fernandez, R. M., & Kulik, J. C. (1981). A Multilevel Model of Life Satisfaction: Effects of Individual Characteristics and Neighborhood Composition. *American Sociological Review*, 46(6), 840. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095082>
 26. Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2010). *Happiness and economics: How the economy and institutions affect human well-being*. Princeton University Press.
 27. Gawrych, M., Cichoń, E., & Kiejna, A. (2021). COVID-19 pandemic fear, life satisfaction and mental health at the initial stage of the pandemic in the largest cities in Poland. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, 26(1), 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2020.1861314>
 28. Hamarat, E., Thompson, D., Zabrucky, K. M., Steele, D., Matheny, K. B., & Aysan, F. (2001). Perceived stress and coping resource availability as predictors of life satisfaction in young, middle-aged, and older adults. *Experimental Aging Research*, 27(2), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/036107301750074051>
 29. Heady, B., Kelly, J., & Wearing, A. (1993). Bruce headey, jonathan kelley and alex wearing. *Social Indicator Research*, 29, 63–82.
 30. Helliwell, J. F., Huang, H., Grover, S., & Wang, S. (2018). Empirical linkages between good governance and national well-being. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 46(4), 1332–1346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2018.01.004>
 31. Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2002). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: A compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(7), 1073–1082. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(01\)00213-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00213-6)
 32. Jeewon, O., Chopik, W. J., & Lucas, R. E. (2022). Happiness Singled Out: Bidirectional Associations Between Singlehood and Life Satisfaction. 48, 1597–1613. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211049049>
 33. Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. (2010). High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(38), 16489–16493. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1011492107>
 34. Kahneman, D., & Riis, J. (2012). Living, and thinking about it: Two perspectives on life. *The Science of Well-Being*, 285–304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198567523.003.0011>
 35. Karapetoff, W. (1903). On Life-Satisfaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 8(5), 681–686. <https://about.jstor.org/terms>
 36. Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). A Dark Side of the American Dream: Correlates of Financial Success as a Central Life Aspiration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65(2), 410–422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.410>
 37. Kim, H. K., & McKenry, P. C. (2002). The relationship between marriage and psychological well-being: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(8), 885–911. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251302237296>
 38. Kleszczewska, D., Dzińska, A., Salonna, F., & Mazur, J. (2018). The Association Between Physical Activity and General Life Satisfaction in Lower Secondary School Students: The Role of Individual and Family Factors. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 54(8), 1245–1252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-018-0309-x>
 39. Koburtay, T., Jamali, D., & Aljafari, A. (2023). Religion, spirituality, and well-being: A systematic

- literature review and futuristic agenda. *Business Ethics, Environment and Responsibility*, 32(1), 341–357. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12478>
40. Kupcewicz, E., Szczypiński, W., & Kędzia, A. (2018). Satisfaction with life in the context of professional life of nurses. *Nursing and Public Health*, 8(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.17219/pzp/75494>
 41. Lo, L., Li, W., & Yu, W. (2019). Highly-skilled Migration from China and India to Canada and the United States. *International Migration*, 57(3), 317–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imig.12388>
 42. Loewe, N., Bagherzadeh, M., Araya-Castillo, L., Thieme, C., & Batista-Foguet, J. M. (2014). Life domain satisfactions as predictors of overall life satisfaction among workers: Evidence from Chile. *Social Indicators Research*, 118(1), 71–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0408-6>
 43. Luhman, M., Lucas, R. E., Eid, M., & Diener, E. (2012). The Prospective Effect of Life Satisfaction on Life Events. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 66, 37–39.
 44. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(August), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315258324-16>
 45. Monnot, M. J., & Beehr, T. A. (2014). Subjective well-being at work: Disentangling source effects of stress and support on enthusiasm, contentment, and meaningfulness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(2), 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.07.005>
 46. Munoz, R. T., Walker, A. C., Bynum, G. T., & Brown, A. (2020). Social Connectedness with the City of Tulsa as a Driver of Life Satisfaction, Hope, and Flourishing. *International Journal of Community Well-Being*, 3(2), 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42413-020-00058-7>
 47. Norberg-Hodge, H. (2012). The economics of happiness. *Sustainability*, 5(5), 289–294. <https://doi.org/10.1089/SUS.2012.9931>
 48. Park, C. (2002). Discussion papers in economics. 02.
 49. Povedano-Diaz, A., Muñiz-Rivas, M., & Vera-Perea, M. (2020). Adolescents' life satisfaction: The role of classroom, family, self-concept and gender. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17010019>
 50. Powdthavee, N. (2008). Putting a price tag on friends, relatives, and neighbours: Using surveys of life satisfaction to value social relationships. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(4), 1459–1480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2007.04.004>
 51. Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital quality and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(3), 576–593. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00393.x>
 52. Proulx, C. M., & Snyder-Rivas, L. A. (2013). The longitudinal associations between marital happiness, problems, and self-rated health. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(2), 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031877>
 53. Rafferty, A. E., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2011). The influence of abusive supervisors on followers' organizational citizenship behaviours: The hidden costs of abusive supervision. *British Journal of Management*, 22(2), 270–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00732.x>
 54. Rathi, N., & Lee, K. (2017). Understanding the role of supervisor support in retaining employees and enhancing their satisfaction with life. *Personnel Review*, 46(8), 1605–1619. <https://doi.org/10.1108/pr-11-2015-0287>
 55. Rumpf, H. J., Löntz, W., & Uessler, S. (2004). A self-administered version of a brief measure of suffering: First aspects of validity. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 73(1), 53–56. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000074440>
 56. Schkade, D. A., & Kahneman, D. (1998). Does Living in California Make People Happy? A Focusing Illusion in Judgments of Life Satisfaction. *Psychological Science*, 9(5), 340–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00066>
 57. Selar, N. A., Gagné, M., Hellgren, J., Falkenberg, H., & Sverke, M. (2023). Compensation profiles among private sector employees in Sweden: Differences in work-related and health-related outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(February). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.949711>
 58. Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. An introduction. *The American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
 59. Sezek, I., Cubukcu, M., & Muderrisoglu, S. (2023). Care Burden and Life Satisfaction of Caregivers Who are Providing Home Health Care to Patients. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 16(September), 2139–2150. <https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S426598>
 60. Sinčić Čorić, D., Pološki Vokić, N., & Tkalac Verčić, A. (2020). Does good internal communication enhance life satisfaction? *Journal of Communication Management*, 24(4), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-11-2019-0146>
 61. Sousa, L., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2001). Life Satisfaction. In J. Worell (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Women and Gender: Sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender* (Issue 2). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-33228-4_125
 62. Tekir, Ö. (2022). The relationship between fear of COVID-19, psychological well-being and life satisfaction in nursing students: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS ONE*, 17(3 March), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0264970>
 63. Topino, E., Svicher, A., di Fabio, A., & Gori, A. (2022). Satisfaction with life in workers: A chained mediation model investigating the roles of resilience, career adaptability, self-efficacy, and years of education. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(September), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1011093>

65. Tromholt, M. (2016). The Facebook Experiment: Quitting Facebook Leads to Higher Levels of Well-Being. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 19(11), 661–666. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2016.0259>
66. Tsurumi, T., & Managi, S. (2015). Environmental value of green spaces in Japan: An application of the life satisfaction approach. *Ecological Economics*, 120, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.09.023>
67. Van Dinter, M., Kools, M., Dane, G., Weijs-Perrée, M., Chamilothoni, K., van Leeuwen, E., Borgers, A., & van den Berg, P. (2022). Urban Green Parks for Long-Term Subjective Well-Being: Empirical Relationships between Personal Characteristics, Park Characteristics, Park Use, Sense of Place, and Satisfaction with Life in The Netherlands. *Sustainability* (Switzerland), 14(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14094911>
69. Veenhoven, R. (1996). The Study of Life Satisfaction. *Quality*, 11–48.
70. Weckroth, M., & Kempainen, T. (2021). (Un)Happiness, where are you? Evaluating the relationship between urbanity, life satisfaction and economic development in a regional context. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*, 8(1), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21681376.2021.1925146>
71. Wells, T., Nickels, L., Musich, S., Rush, S., Wu, L., & Yeh, C. (2018). Older Adults With Hearing Loss and the Increased Risk for Psychosocial Conditions. *Innovation in Aging*, 2(suppl_1), 280–281. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geroni/igy023.1036>
72. Zábó, V., Oláh, A., & Vargha, A. (2022). A new complex mental health test in a positive psychological framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(September), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.775622>
73. Zarei, S., & Fooladvand, K. (2022). Family functioning and life satisfaction among female university students during COVID-19 outbreak: the mediating role of hope and resilience. *BMC Women's Health*, 22(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-022-02103-3>