



## **A STUDY ON WORK- LIFE BALANCE AMONG MARRIED WOMEN TEACHERS OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN ERODE DISTRICT**

**Dr. N. Kasthuri**

*Assistant Professor of Management, Gobi Arts & Science College.*

### **Introduction**

Now-a- days, the past tradition has been changed. Today men and women are equal in earning and at the same time, both of them are working hard for their better life. Hence it is necessary to know how the women balance both profession and domestic life. In the initial stages, women had to struggle a lot to establish their identity in this competitive world, both in the society as well as in the professional life. But now-a-days the advancement in education and training institutions, things has been improved to a great extent.

### **Work-Life Balance**

Work-life balance is a concept including proper prioritizing between "work" (career and ambition) and "lifestyle" (health, pleasure, leisure, family and spiritual development/meditation).

### **Review of Literature**

**Preeti (2002)** observed that India is a transition phase of transforming itself from a traditional to modern economy through a planned development phase. Women have a definite economic role to play and it has become crucial for both men and women to work for the development of the economy. **Kinnie et al. (2005)** found that work-life balances are associated with the organisational commitment of all employee groups. Furthermore, the authors found that there is some evidence that company efforts to help employees achieve a balance between work and home life is linked to the commitment of all groups of employees. **Wesley and Muthuswamy (2005)** in a study of 230 teachers in an engineering college in Coimbatore, India, found that work to family conflict was more prevalent than family to work conflict, thus indicating that permeability of work into family was more than permeability of family into work. **Andreassi and Thompson (2007)** conducted a more recent study on employees in the United States of America and found that internal locus of control was negatively related to work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict. **Harvey and Spinney (2000)** identified a number of common stressors regarding workload. Time pressures, problems associated with class size, inclusive classrooms, the implications of a heavy workload on family life, and the repercussions of on-going change are illuminating their effect on stress. **Pandey and Srivastava (2000)** had studied the female personnel working in railway, bank and teaching institutions. A sample of 96 females, 16 subjects in each professional area both from nuclear and joint family were taken. The study identified that respondents belonging to nuclear family had expressed more interpersonal work stress.

### **Research Methodology**

A married woman's nature of responsibilities changes according to her life cycle. The married working women still find themselves in a very difficult position to adjust with the work and home. The fact of being married and having a family imposes certain restrictions on women teachers. The performance of dual role is supposed to result in role conflict and stress. Thus, striking a balance between work and family have been an ongoing challenge for all married working Women.

It is important to note that very little research exists which quantifies of work-life balance in Arts & Science and Engineering Colleges. In the present scenario with the dearth of researches, it is worthy to probe aspects of work-life balance among married women in order to strengthen this vital link. The present study attempts to analyze how they achieve equilibrium between family and profession. This study answers to the questions such as: How do they balance their work and family life?

### **Objectives of the Study**

With the above questions in mind, the following objectives are framed for the purpose of the study:

- To study the work-life balance methods of married women teachers.
- To offer suggestions to balance their work and life.

### **Population and Sample Design**

For the purpose of the study, data were collected from the teachers of Arts & Science and Engineering Colleges in Erode district adopting convenient sampling method.

For the purpose of the study samples are selected in Engineering and Arts & Science Colleges in which 620 respondents were selected as sample for the study. Primary data collected by using the questionnaire were entered in to the number



character – Excel in tabular form. The entered data were validated using tabulators. The master table in texdata.xls format was then imported into SPSS for further analysis. The data were analyzed by using the following Percentage analysis and Chi-square test and statistical tools.

### Research Instrument

Questionnaire was used as instrument for the study. The researcher designed the questions keeping in mind the factors of work-life balance in the context of higher education. The factors related to the study were identified from the related literature and discussions with married women teachers.

### Collection of Data

Both primary and secondary data were used for the study. The secondary data were collected from Government publications and reports, publications of the higher education in India, various journals, books, magazines and websites. The primary data were collected from the teachers of Arts & Science and Engineering Colleges in Erode District using the questionnaire.

### Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed by using Discriminant Analysis.

### Discriminant Function Analysis – Work-Life Balance

Opinion towards work-life balance of married women teachers of Higher Educational Institutions according to their experience was collected. In the study area 620 respondents were divided into two groups viz., poor and good. The difference of opinion of the respondents in one group with the other was studied with the help of Discriminant Function Analysis. For the purpose of the study, eight variables were selected.

Age, Size of Family, Number of children, Experience, Salary, Travelling distance, Working hours, Working days

The discriminant function analysis was attempted to construct a function with these and other variables, so that the respondents belonging to these two groups are differentiated at the maximum. The linear combination of variables is known as discriminant function and its parameters are called discriminant function coefficients. In constructing this discriminant function, all the variables which contribute more to differentiate these two groups were examined.

Mahalanobis minimum  $D^2$  method is based on the generalized squared Euclidean distance that adjusts for unequal variances in the variables. The major advantage of this procedure is that it is computed in the original space of the predictor (independent) variables rather than as a collapsed version which is used in the other method.

Generally, all the variables selected will not contribute to explain the maximum discriminatory power of the function. So a selection rule is applied based on certain criteria to include those variables which best discriminate. Stepwise selection method was applied in constructing discriminant function which selects one variable at a time to include in the function. Before entering into the function, the variables are examined for inclusion in the function.

The variables which have maximum  $D^2$  value, if entered into the function are selected for inclusion in the function. Once entered, any variable already in the equation is again considered for removal based on certain removal criteria. Likewise, at each step, the next best discriminating variable is selected and included in the function and any variable already included in the function is considered for removal, based on the selection and removal criteria respectively.

### Discriminant Analysis for the Problem under Study

Since discriminant function analysis involved classification problem also, to ascertain the efficiency of the discriminant function analysis all the variables which satisfy the entry and removal criteria were entered into the function. Normally, the criteria used to select the variables for inclusion in the function is minimum 'F', to enter into the equation (i.e) F statistic calculated for the qualified variable to enter into the function is fixed as 1.

Similarly, any variable entered in the equation will be removed from the function if 'F' statistic for the variable calculated is 1. The two groups are defined as

Group 1-Poor Work-life Balance and Group 2 -Good Work-life Balance

The mean and standard deviation for these groups and for the entire samples are given for each variable considered in the analysis.



**Table 1: Group means: (between poor and good groups)**

S. No	Factor	Poor		Good		Total	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1	Age	33.09	6.12	32.33	5.54	32.73	5.86
2	Size of Family	3.92	1.01	3.76	0.96	3.84	0.99
3	Number of children	1.23	0.49	1.19	0.52	1.21	0.50
4	Experience	7.72	5.80	6.92	4.67	7.34	5.31
5	Salary	23003.95	17692.89	23071.2	18596.5	23035.78	18111.25
6	Travelling distance	17.67	17.40	18.20	16.20	17.92	16.83
7	Working Hours	18.60	3.25	19.52	3.71	19.04	3.51
8	Working Days	98.95	14.01	103.15	15.55	100.94	14.90

The overall step wise Discriminant Function Analysis results after all significant discriminators have been included in the estimation of discriminated function are given in the following table:

**Table 2: Summary table between poor and good Work-life balance**

Step	Variable entered	Wilk's lambda	Minimum D <sup>2</sup>	Sig.
1.	Working days	0.981	0.076	1% Level
2.	Working hours	0.974	0.106	1% Level

\* Significant at 1% level

The summary table indicates that the variable working days entered in step 1 and the variable working hours entered in the step 2. The variables Working days and Working hours are significant at 1% level. All the variables are significant discriminator's based on their Wilk's Lambda and D<sup>2</sup> value. The multivariate aspect of the model is given in the following table:

**Table 3: Canonical Discriminant function (Between poor and good work-life balance)**

Canonical correlation	Wilks Lambda	Chi-square	D.F.	Sig
0.167	0.972	17.245	2	Significant at 1% level

The canonical correlation is 0.167 when squared is 0.028 that is 2.8 per cent of the variance in the discriminant group can be accounted by this model, Wilk's Lambda and Chi-square value suggested that Discriminant Function is significant at 1% level.

The variables given above are identified finally by the Discriminant Function Analysis as the eligible discriminating variables. Based on the selected variables, the corresponding Discriminant Function coefficients are calculated. They are given in the following table:

**Table 4: Discriminant function coefficients (Between poor and good groups)**

Working hours (X <sub>1</sub> )	0.163
Working days (X <sub>2</sub> )	0.045
Constant	-7.616

$$Z = -7.616 + 0.163 (X_1) + 0.045 (X_2)$$

Using this Discriminant Function coefficients and variables, discriminating scores for 2 groups are found out which are called group centroids or group means.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{For poor work-life balance (Z}_1\text{) it is} & \quad - 0.160 \\ \text{For good work-life balance (Z}_2\text{) it is} & \quad + 0.178 \end{aligned}$$

Discriminating factor is the weighted average of Z<sub>1</sub> and Z<sub>2</sub>.

$$\begin{aligned} & (325 \times Z_1) + (295 \times Z_2) \\ \text{(ie.) } Z & = 325 + 295 \end{aligned}$$



If it is represented diagrammatically it will be,

Thus, to classify any respondents as to poor or good work-life balance of the married women teachers, the Z score for the respondents is found out by using the equation. If the score found out for any respondents is  $Z_0$  and if the value is  $>Z$  (i.e.  $Z_0 > Z$ ) then it is classified into good work-life balance of the women teachers and if  $Z_0 < Z$  then (i.e.  $Z_0 < Z$ ) it is classified in the poor work-life balance of the women teachers.

Now the questions remain to be answered are,

- How efficient are the discriminating variables in the Discriminant Function Analysis?
- How efficient the Discriminant Function itself is?

The first question cannot be answered directly however, the discriminating power or the contribution of each variable to the function can sufficiently answer the question. For this, the following table is considered:

**Table 5: Relative Discriminating Index (Between poor and good work-life balance)**

Variables	Group 1 Mean $X_1$	Group 2 Mean $X_2$	Unstandardized dic. Coeff. (kj)	$I_i = \text{ABS}(K_i) / \text{Mean}(X_{j_0} - x_{ji})$	$R_j = I_j / \text{sum } I_j * 100$
Working Hours ( $X_1$ )	18.60	19.52	0.163	0.0086	95.05
Working Days ( $X_2$ )	98.95	103.15	0.045	0.0004	4.95
<b>Total</b>				0.0090	100

### Relative Discriminating Index

For each variable, the respective Discriminant Function co-efficient, its mean for each group and  $R_j$  are given.  $R_j$  called Relative Discriminating Index is calculated from the discriminant function coefficient and group means.  $R_j$  tells how much each variable is contributing to the function. By looking at this column it is found that 'Working hours ( $X_1$ )' is the maximum discriminating variable and 'Working days ( $X_2$ )' is the least discriminating variable. The efficiency of the Discriminant Function is how correctly it predicts the respondents into respective groups.

**Table 6: Classification Results (Between poor and good work-life balance)**

Actual group	No. of cases	Predicted group membership	
		Group I	Group II
Group 1 (Poor)	325	218(67.1%)	107(32.9%)
Group 2 (Good)	295	162(54.9%)	133(45.1%)

Per cent of grouped cases correctly classified: 56.6%

The above table gives the results of the reclassification. The function, using the variables selected in the analysis classified 56.6% of the cases correctly in the respective groups.

Discriminate Function Analysis was applied based on the poor and good work-life balance of the women teachers. The following factors significantly discriminate the two groups. They are

- Working hours per week (at 1% level)
- Working days per semester (at 1% level)

The variables were significant difference is taken into consideration as per the Table 6.21 by calculating the mean difference and multiplying into canonical discriminant coefficients. The value of variables was calculated and relative importance percentage was ascertained followed by ranking of the variables. Working hours of the respondents is the most important factor that discriminates between poor and good work-life balance followed by working days.

### Findings

Discriminate Function Analysis was applied to find out the work-life balance of teachers. The factors significantly discriminate the two groups are working hours and Working days. Working hours per week of the teachers is the most important factor that discriminates between poor and good work-life balance followed by working days per semester.



### **Suggestions**

- Time management is one of the best solutions which can help to reduce the imbalance between the personal and the work-life of the teachers. Prioritizing the tasks and planning the activities can help to spare some free time which can be utilized for other purposes. Taking some time out for hobbies and leisure activities, spending time with loved ones can help to beat the stress.
- The trend in Higher education demands more contribution from the teachers. They have to focus on the development of students, institution and their own development. Hence they have to undertake more responsibility and do more work. The teachers should understand the trend and cope with it accordingly.
- Counselling may be organized by the respective institutions to support teachers in making adjustments in their work and family life. A positive and supportive culture should also be developed within the institutions to encourage and reward the women teachers.

### **References**

1. Andreassi, J.K. and Thompson, C. A. (2007), “Dispositional and Situational sources of control: Relative impact on work-family conflict and positive spillover”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22 (8), pp. 722-740.
2. Harvey, A. and Spinney, J. (2000), “Life on the job: A time use study of Nova Scotia teachers”, Halifax: Saint Mary’s University: Time-Use Research Programme.
3. Kinnie, N. Hutchinson, S. Purcell, J. Rayton, B. and Swart, J. (2005), “Satisfaction with HR practices and commitment to the organisation: why one size does not fit all”, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 15(4), pp. 9-29.
4. Pandey, S. and Srivastava, S. (2000), “Copying with work stress in career oriented females”, *J.Com. Gui. Res.*, Vol. 17(3), pp. 313-323.
5. Preeti Singh, (2002), “Women in the corporate world in India -Balancing work and family cite”, Alva Myrdal conference, Uppsala University, Sweden, March.
6. Wesley, R. and Muthuswamy, P.R. (2005), “Work-Family Conflict in India -An Empirical Study”, *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, Vol. 2(4), pp. 95-102.