



## A STUDY OF WORK LIFE BALANCE OF TEACHERS WORKING AT UNIVERSITIES IN TAMILNADU

<sup>1</sup>R. Gayathiri, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Lalitha Ramakrishnan

<sup>1</sup>Research Scholar, Department of Management, Pondicherry University, Karaikal Campus  
Karaikal, Pondicherry UT, India.

<sup>2</sup>Professor and Head, Department of Management, Pondicherry University, Karaikal campus,  
Karaikal, India.

### ABSTRACT

*Since the 1960s, there has been an increasing interest in the conflict between work and family life domains. Several developments, such as, changing economic trends, competitive forces, dominance of services sector, information revolution that has led to 24/7 work models, changes in demographics, increased levels of education and employment of female population, rise of dual-earner families, and changes in the composition of households, have made the work-life balance a pertinent area of concern to scholars, individuals and Universities across the globe. Accordingly, Universities and individuals are making efforts to strike a crucial balance between work and family life by reducing the incompatibilities between the two, i.e. “work-family conflict”. Even for a machine to be at its best it requires some downtime and maintenance, so for a human to work at good capacity, caring and nurturing is required. The human machine also needs food, good working condition, rest to recuperate, mental peace and much more to perform at peak capacity. With this background the present study seeks to identify the work life balance status of teachers working in various universities and its relation with their satisfaction level. The researchers has used ANOVA, Chi square for analytical part of the study.*

**Keywords:** Work Life Conflict, Work life enrichment.

## **Introduction**

An organization is a function in designed to maximize faculty performance in service of their employer's strategic objectives. It is primarily concerned with how people are managed within Universities, focusing on policies and systems. The process of hiring and developing faculty so that they become more valuable to the organization includes conducting job analyses, planning personnel needs, recruiting the right people for the job, orienting and training managing wages and salaries providing benefits and incentives, evaluating performance, resolving disputes and communicating with all faculty at all levels.

The core purpose of the human resource management is to make efficient use of existing human resource in the organization. Faculty work life environment is a term had been used to describe the boarder job-related experience an individual has. In contrast to such theory based pragmatically identified the essential components of quality of working life as basic extrinsic job factors of wages, hours and working conditions and the intrinsic job notions of the nature of the work itself. He suggested that a number of other aspects could be added including; individual power, faculty participation in the management, fairness and equity, social support, use of one's present skills, self-development, a meaningful future at work, social relevance of the work or product, effect on extra work activities.

Factors more obviously and directly affecting work has, however, served as the main focus of attention as researchers have tried to tease out the important influences on quality of working life in the workplace. A work place environment is not only the physical parts of an office or workspace. It also involves relationship between management and faculty, community styles, faculty expectations, set processes and procedures, growth and development opportunities and the overall tone of the business.

Faculty work life environment refers to the level of happiness or dissatisfaction with one's career are said to have a high quality of work life, while those who are unhappy or whose needs are otherwise unfilled are said to have a low quality of work life.

Faculty work life environment is specifically related to the level of happiness a person derives for his career. Each person has different needs when it comes to their careers the quality level of their work life is determined by whether those needs are being met. While some people might be content with a simple minimum wage job as long as it helps pay the bills, others would find such a job to be too tedious of involve too much physical labour and would find such a position to be highly unsatisfactory. Thus requirements for having a high "faculty work life environment" vary from person to person. Regardless of their standards,

those with a high quality of work life generally make enough to live comfortably, find their work to be interesting or engaging and achieve a level of personal satisfaction or fulfilment from the job that they do. In other words, faculty who are generally happy with their work are said to have a high quality of work life, and those who are unhappy or unfulfilled by their work are said to have a low quality of work life.

### **Statement of the problem:**

Most of the Indian University do not have any meticulous Work Life Balance Policy for its faculty. Indian faculty face a lot of difficulties in harmonizing their work and family life. India have certainly realized the need for work-life balance of faculty and have started offering policies and programs that are more faculty growth oriented and family-friendly than mere welfare and safety oriented. The most significant resources of the organization are human resources, without it the organization cannot function. The study of the faculty work life and the aspects relating the job satisfaction and work life balance as far as women faculty. The contribution of factors like machinery, raw material, and marketing is undoubtedly substantial, but the role and importance of the human resources on which the critically depends cannot be under-rated. The full extent of development in the developing economies can be archived only if the human resources are utilized to the optimum level. It is a means as the decision making involves workers participation and the job redesign which improve the productivity and the overall performance. The faculty's quality of work life is became basic necessity of any company.

### **Objectives of the study**

1. To measure the reliability of the questionnaire
2. To do construct validity of work life conflict scale
3. To know the level of satisfaction with roles at work, in family and social groups of the respondents.
4. To assess the work life enrichment of the respondents
5. To know the overall satisfaction with work and life of the respondents

### **Hypotheses of the study**

1. **Ho:** There is no significant difference between the designation and work life enrichment.
2. **Ho:** There is no significant difference between the gender and satisfaction with work and life.

3. **Ho:** There is no significant difference between gender and various roles played by the respondents.

### **Research methodology**

The primary data were used for the study and the reliable data for the study were collected from the selected respondents by the way of structured questionnaire. The researcher has selected 120 respondents by convenient sampling method from the various Universities of Tamilnadu. The researcher has used Chi square and ANOVA for analysis. The researcher has applied Chi square and ANOVA for testing the above mentioned hypothesis.

### **ANOVA**

The researcher has taken the following variables to know about the work life enrichment of the university faculty.

G1: My work schedule helps me to plan and regularly

G2: My work gives me ample opportunities arising from the family life

G3: The experience I gained at work makes me a better parent/spouse

G4: My family responsibilities and experience make me punctual and responsible work

G5: Due to the supportive nature of my family members and able to relieve tensions originating at work

G6: My family life enables me to perform well my duties at work places

G7: My job keeps my personal life enjoyable

G8: My work provides me enthusiasm and happiness to pursue my personal roles

G9: My work contributes to the positive development of my personality

G10: My hobbies and social service make me active at work place

G11: The time demands of my personal interests and work demand have taught me time management skills

G12: Fulfilment of personal interests keeps me energetic in doing work at University.

***Ho:*** *There is no significant difference between the designation and work life enrichment.*

**Ha:** There is a significant difference between the designation and work life enrichment.

Table 1 - ANOVA

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
G1	Between Groups	59.709	4	14.927	4.906	.001
	Within Groups	349.883	115	3.042		
	Total	409.592	119			
G2	Between Groups	56.346	4	14.086	4.688	.002
	Within Groups	345.521	115	3.005		
	Total	401.867	119			
G3	Between Groups	57.617	4	14.404	4.248	.003
	Within Groups	389.975	115	3.391		
	Total	447.592	119			
G4	Between Groups	47.063	4	11.766	3.857	.006
	Within Groups	350.803	115	3.050		
	Total	397.867	119			
G5	Between Groups	15.906	4	3.976	1.647	.167
	Within Groups	277.686	115	2.415		
	Total	293.592	119			
G6	Between Groups	17.155	4	4.289	1.823	.129
	Within Groups	270.545	115	2.353		
	Total	287.700	119			
G7	Between Groups	47.917	4	11.979	4.747	.001
	Within Groups	290.208	115	2.524		
	Total	338.125	119			
G8	Between Groups	38.746	4	9.686	3.681	.007
	Within Groups	302.579	115	2.631		
	Total	341.325	119			
G9	Between Groups	37.473	4	9.368	4.377	.002
	Within Groups	246.119	115	2.140		
	Total	283.592	119			

G10	Between Groups	33.330	4	8.333	3.230	.015
	Within Groups	296.636	115	2.579		
	Total	329.967	119			
G11	Between Groups	19.912	4	4.978	2.008	.098
	Within Groups	285.080	115	2.479		
	Total	304.992	119			
G12	Between Groups	26.282	4	6.570	2.698	.034
	Within Groups	280.085	115	2.436		
	Total	306.367	119			

The above table represents the ANOVA analysis. It is inferred from the table that all the factors have their p value, less than the 5% level of significance except the variables G5, G6 and G11. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected for those factors and confirmed that there is a significant difference between the designation and work life enrichment. The variables of G5, G6 and G11 the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference between the designation and work life enrichment.

The researcher has taken the following variables to know about the level of satisfaction with work and life.

The variables are as follows:

K1: I am satisfied with my role as a teacher in the University;

K2: I have satisfaction that I am able to meet University standards in research;

K3: I am satisfied that I could meet expectations of authorities in administration;

K4: I have satisfaction with my participation in seminars/conferences/workshops;

K5: I am satisfied with the publications of papers in journals;

K6: I have satisfaction with my relationships with others at work in my University;

K7: I have got what I considered important at work in University;

K8: I have satisfaction as a family head or member of the family;

K9: The conditions of my life at home are satisfactory to me;

K10: I have satisfaction that I could meet the expectations of my family members;

K11: I have satisfaction in my being able to be with my spouse, as expected by him/her.

K12: I am contended that I am able to further my interests and hobbies;

K13: I am satisfied that I am able to spend time with friends;

K14: I have satisfaction that I am able to attend social functions and meetings.

## Hypothesis II

**Ho:** There is no significant difference between Gender and satisfaction with work and life.

**Ha:** There is no significant difference between Gender and satisfaction with work and life

Table 2: ANOVA

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
K1	Between Groups	9.747	1	9.747	9.084	.003
	Within Groups	126.620	118	1.073		
	Total	136.367	119			
K2	Between Groups	24.121	1	24.121	12.715	.001
	Within Groups	223.846	118	1.897		
	Total	247.967	119			
K3	Between Groups	5.203	1	5.203	3.330	.071
	Within Groups	184.389	118	1.563		
	Total	189.592	119			
K4	Between Groups	19.249	1	19.249	7.827	.006
	Within Groups	290.217	118	2.459		
	Total	309.467	119			
K5	Between Groups	33.567	1	33.567	13.811	.000
	Within Groups	286.800	118	2.431		
	Total	320.367	119			

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
K6	Between Groups	5.704	1	5.704	4.209	.042
	Within Groups	159.888	118	1.355		
	Total	165.592	119			
K7	Between Groups	4.315	1	4.315	1.661	.200
	Within Groups	306.485	118	2.597		
	Total	310.800	119			
K8	Between Groups	2.667	1	2.667	1.951	.165
	Within Groups	161.300	118	1.367		
	Total	163.967	119			
K9	Between Groups	2.923	1	2.923	2.364	.127
	Within Groups	145.877	118	1.236		
	Total	148.800	119			
K10	Between Groups	1.871	1	1.871	1.522	.220
	Within Groups	145.120	118	1.230		
	Total	146.992	119			
K11	Between Groups	.180	1	.180	.088	.767
	Within Groups	240.812	118	2.041		
	Total	240.992	119			
K12	Between Groups	11.786	1	11.786	4.331	.040
	Within Groups	321.139	118	2.722		
	Total	332.925	119			
K13	Between Groups	10.369	1	10.369	3.685	.057
	Within Groups	331.998	118	2.814		
	Total	342.367	119			
K14	Between Groups	5.301	1	5.301	1.580	.211
	Within Groups	396.024	118	3.356		
	Total	401.325	119			

The above table represent the ANOVA analysis. It is inferred from the table that all the factors have its p value, less than the 5% level of significance except the variables K3,



K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K13 and K14. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected for those factors and confirmed that there is a significant difference between the level of satisfaction with work and life. In case of the variables K3, K7, K8, K9, K10, K11, K13 and K14, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference between the level of satisfaction of the selected respondents with work and life.

### Chi square

The researcher has used chi square to know the role of the respondents at work, in family and in social groups.

**Ho:** There is no significant difference between Gender and Role.

**Ha:** There is a significant difference between Gender and Role.

Table 3: Chi-square value

Variables	Chi square	Sig.
Gender and Role as faculty member	9.497	0.002
Gender and roles as member of family	8.767	0.050
Gender and roles as friend & Relative	8.132	0.021
Gender and role in social life	5.786	0.064

The above table represents the Chi-Square analysis carried out for the study. All the factors except gender and role in social life, has its p value less than 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected for those factors and there is a significant difference between Gender and role as faculty member, member of family and as friend and relative. In case of gender and role in social life, p value is higher than 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference between Gender and role in social life.

### Conclusion

In recent times, huge interest has been given by the educational institutions the working conditions or factors that foster greater faculty satisfaction. The interest is to be believed that the behaviours of satisfied faculty made positive contributions to any Universities effectiveness and performance Efficient human resource management and maintaining higher job satisfaction level determine not only the performance of educational institution but also affect the growth and performance of the entire economy. So, for the success of any educational institutions, it is very important to manage human resource

effectively and to find whether its faculty are satisfied or not. Only if they are satisfied, they will work with commitment and project a positive image of any kind of organization.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Achinstein, B. (2002). Conflict amid community: The micropolitics of teacher collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 104(3), 421-455.
- Agarwala, T., Arizkuren-Eleta, A., Del Castillo, E., Muniz-Ferrer, M., & Gartzia, L. (2014). Influence of managerial support on work–life conflict and organizational commitment: an international comparison for India, Peru and Spain. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(10), 1460-1483.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Gordani, Y. (2012). Motivation and Quality of Work Life among Secondary School EFL Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(7).
- Bird, J. (2006). Work-life balance: Doing it right and avoiding the pitfalls. *Employment Relations Today*, 33(3), 21-30.
- Bubb, S., & Earley, P. (2004). *Managing teacher workload: Work-life balance and wellbeing*. Sage.
- Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2005). Work–family conflict among female teachers. *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(4), 365-378.
- Crosswell, L. J., & Elliott, R. G. (2004). Committed teachers, passionate teachers: The dimension of passion associated with teacher commitment and engagement.
- Doherty, L. (2004). Work-life balance initiatives: implications for women. *Employee relations*, 26(4), 433-452.
- Emslie, C., & Hunt, K. (2009). ‘Live to Work’ or ‘Work to Live’? A Qualitative Study of Gender and Work–life Balance among Men and Women in Mid-life. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 16(1), 151-172.
- Gambles, R., Lewis, S., & Rapoport, R. (2006). *The myth of work-life balance: The challenge of our time for men, women and societies*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Guest, D. E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance. *Social Science Information*, 41(2), 255-279.

- Michel, J. S., Kotrba, L. M., Mitchelson, J. K., Clark, M. A., & Baltes, B. B. (2011). Antecedents of work–family conflict: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 689-725.
- Pounder, D. G. (1999). Teacher teams: Exploring job characteristics and work-related outcomes of work group enhancement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 317-348.
- Rantanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Mauno, S., & Tillemann, K. (2011). Introducing theoretical approaches to work-life balance and testing a new typology among professionals. In *Creating Balance?* (pp. 27-46). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Udod, S. A., & Care, W. D. (2012). ‘Walking a tight rope’: an investigation of nurse managers’ work stressors and coping experiences. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 1744987111434189.
- Van Saane, N., Sluiter, J. K., Verbeek, J. H. A. M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction—a systematic review. *Occupational medicine*, 53(3), 191-200.
- Wiese, B. S. (2015). Work-life-balance. In *Wirtschaftspsychologie* (pp. 227-244). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.