DMI.ST.JOHN THE BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Malawi, central Africa

Multi Spectrum Rural Skill Development and Educational Trust

Kanyakumari-629204, Taml Nadu, India

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that

Mr./Mrs./Ms/Dr. K. Suresh Babu Associate Professor

of psu college of Arts & science, coimbatore

has participated & Presented a paper titled

A Study on work - Like Balance of college Professors with Reference to coimbator city

in the International Conference on

"Multidisciplinary Research on Integrating Knowledge for Sustainable Future in Global Outlook,"

2nd October 2024

Dr.Muthuvel Laxmikanthan
DVC - Research & Innovation
Malawi, Africa

Dr.D.Samson Davidson
Director ICT
Malawi, Africa

Dr.E.Joseph Rubert
Convener
Tamilnadu, India

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS ON MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ON INTEGRATING KNOWLEDGE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURE IN GLOBAL OUTLOOK

2nd October 2024

Organised By

DMI – ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST UNIVERSITY, MALAWI, CENTRAL AFRICA

&

MULTI SPECTRUM RURAL SKILL DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATIONAL TRUST KANYAKUMARI, TAMILNADU, INDIA

EDITORS
Dr. Robert Edwin Chester
Dr. E. Joseph Rubert
Dr. Tania Sur Roy
Dr. Neeta Baglari
Dr. A. Fathima
Dr. Anto Pravin Singh

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS ON MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ON INTEGRATING KNOWLEDGE FOR SUSTAINABLE FUTURE IN GLOBAL OUTLOOK

2nd October 2024

Organised By

DMI – St. John the Baptist University, Malawi, Central Africa

&

Multi Spectrum Rural Skill Development and Educational Trust
Kanyakumari, Tamilnadu,India

EDITORS

Dr.Robert Edwin Chester
Dr.E.Joseph Rubert
Dr.Tania Sur Roy
Dr.Neeta Baglari
Dr.A.Fathima
Dr.Anto Pravin Singh

www.multispectrum.org

A study on Work-life balance of College Professors with reference to Coimbatore City

Dr. K. Suresh Babu,

Associate Professor,

Department of Commerce with Retail Marketing

PSG College of Arts & Science,Coimbatore.

Abstract

Changes happen every moment, time, price, rate, human, moods, climate and even more. People started to live for them in the present scenario and work has become a part of life for bothmale and female work for meeting their financial goals irrespective of the time asked to work. Leaving back their family, male worked abroad and anywhere in the world. The following are the objectives of the study 1. To present the socio economic profile of the respondents, 2. To discover the change between socio economic profile and work life balance of the respondents, 3. To analyse the connection between socio-economic profile and work life balance of the respondents. This present study is important to understand the concept of work life balance and the factors which has variance with female staff of the sample respondents. The convenient sampling method is used to collect the data from 150 college women teachers. Fifteen variables were framed to measure the work life balance of the respondents, used likert five-point scale to measure the level of work life balance. It concluded that the staff should understand the nature oftheir work before start; this process will reduce the clerical work and need not bring the office work to their house. The women have more responsibility and work in house than the male, so the women have to plan the house work and responsibility to run the smoothly.

Key words: work life balance, college staff, women teaching staff and measure variance.

Introduction

Changes happen every moment, time, price, rate, human, moods, climate and even more. People started to live for them in the present scenario and work has become a part of life for bothmale and female work for meeting their financial goals irrespective of the time asked to work. Leaving back their family, male worked abroad and anywhere in the world. The broke up of jointfamily system created a new way of life, nuclear family which calls for more financial needs to meet the day-to-day expenses that shoot higher than ever. The raising price, changing food habits, innovation in technology due to tough competitions, stressed out life in meeting the society quo; make the people to work harder than ever before. The scenario started before two decades and the days were pleasant with the grandparents taking care of the young children, when left home backby their Parents. When women started working they were not able to balance their family life withthat of the work life. They could not work in peace thinking of the children left back at home alone.Now-a-days, women manage the work life in a way they carry the family life also. The independency in travelling, purchasing, self- decision, calculation in case of time and money

makethem work peacefully at work place and to manage the family life. In IT companies, the female employees are given stay back home work, where they will finish off their work sitting at home the given task in a certain days of work. Handicrafts help them in earning at home, managing household activities. Mother of today make sure that they find a school near to their working place for their children to drop them in the morning and take back home at the time of signing out. Somemanagement runs their own school near to the college they work, where it has become easier for them to take care of their children even at free times, attending meetings, programmes held at school. Women are more aware of what they do and what happens around them. Taking the right decisions and planning accordingly, helps them to attain the work life balanced with the family life. To conclude with the women of current scenario is full of power and enthusiasm where they manage the stress given by the work place and at home, making themselves free mindedness in all aspects of life.

Objectives of the study

1. To present the socio economic profile of the respondents.
2. To discover the change between socio economic profile and work life balance of therespondents.
3. To analyse the connection between socio-economic profile and work life balance of therespondents.

Importance of the Study

The work life balance is very important topic in the present years. The female income is essential in to live conformable and standard life, the same time the work life balance is very difficult if the family members has not support to complete the family work and commitment. Thetopic is very aware of all the peoples, the male are understand the importance of female income totheir family. So, now a day's all the male persons ready sent the female to job according to their education and interest. This present study is important to understand the concept of work life balance and the factors which has variance with female staff of the sample respondents.

Methodology

The present study conducted in Coimbatore city. Many educational institutions are situation in Coimbatore. Coimbatore is best place for higher education; many people are switchover here for quality education. More number of self financing college is situated here, majority of the colleges are accredited by NAAC (National assessment and accreditation council). The staffs have more clerical work than government and aided colleges; in this regard staffs haveto stay back at college for work after working hours. The colleges, which situated in Coimbatore city has NAAC are selected for this study, because they has more work than the other college. 10colleges were selected for this study, and 15 staff was selected from the 10 colleges. So, totally 150 staff are selected for this study, used convenient sampling method.

Socio economic profile of the respondents

Socio economic profile of the respondents mentioned below:

In this research work 24 Respondents from age group of upto 30 years, 76 respondents from the age group of 31 years to 40 years, 37 respondents from the age group of 41 years to 50 years, and the remaining 13 respondents from the age group of above 50 years. Majority of the respondents come under the age group of 31 years to 40 years.

Ninety-four (62.66%) respondents completed M.Phil. and the remaining 56 (62.66%) respondents completed Ph.D. Majority (62.66%) of the respondents completed M.Phil. Thirty one (20.67%) respondents are having five years of teaching experience. Fifty three (35.33%) respondents are having 6 years to 10 years to teaching experience. Forty two (28.00%) respondents are having 11 years to 15 years and the remaining twenty four (16.00%) respondents are having above 15 years of teaching experience. Majority (35.33%) of the respondents are having 6 to 10 years of teaching experience.

Forty four (29.33%) respondents are regularly doing college work at house. Eighty two (54.67%) respondents are doing college work at home sometimes and the remaining twenty four (16.00%) respondents are not at all doing college work at house. Majority (54.67%) of the respondents are sometime doing college work at house.

Twenty seven (18.00%) respondents are need 20 minutes to reach their college. Seventy three (48.67%) respondents are need 21 to 40 minutes to reach their college and the remaining fifty 933.33%) respondents need more than 40 minutes to reach their college. Majority (48.67%) of therespondents need 21 minutes to 40 minutes to reach their college.

Seventeen (11.33%) respondents said they are very high level of balance of work and life.Twenty two (14.67%) respondents said they are high level of balance of work and life. Sixty four(42.67%) respondents said they are neutral level of balance of work and life. Fifteen (10.00%) respondents said they are low level of balance of work and life and the remaining twenty one (14.00%) respondents said they are very low level of balance of work and life. Majority (42.67%) respondents said they have neutral level of balance of work and life.

Table No. 1 Socio Economic profiles of the respondents

Category		Number of respondents	Category		Number of respondents
Age group	Up to 30 years	24 (16.00%)	Marital Status	Single	59 (39.33%)
	31 years to 40 years	76 (50.67%)		Married	85 (56.67%)
	41 years to 50 years	37 (24.67%)		Divorce	4 (2.67%)

	Above 50 years	13 (8.67%)		Separated	2 (1.33%)
Educational Qualification	M.Phil.	94 (62.66%)	Family Type	Joint	67 (44.67%)
	Ph.D.	56 (37.33%)		Nuclear	83 (55.33%)
Years of experience	Up to 5 years	31 (20.67%)	Family size	Up to 3 members	45 (30.00%)
	6 years to 10 years	53 (35.33%)		3 to 5 members	77 (51.33%)
	11 years to 15 years	42 (28.00%)		Above 5 members	28 (18.67%)
	Above 15 years	24 (16.00%)		Up to Rs. 30,000	37 (24.67%)

oing office work at house	Regularly	44 (29.33%)	Monthly Family Income	Rs. 30,001 to Rs. 50,000	42 (28.00%)
	Some time	82 (54.67%)			
	Not at all	24 (16.00%)		Above Rs. 50,000	71 (47.33%)
Travelling time	Up to 20 minutes	27 (18.00%)	Time spent with family members	Up to 2 hour	28 (18.67%)
	21 to 40 minutes	73 (48.67%)		2 hours to 4 hours	85 (56.67%)
	Above 40 minutes	50 (33.33%)		Above 4 hours	37 (24.67%)
Balance of work and personal life	Very high	17 (11.33%)	Amount of time spent at work	Very Happy	9 (6.00%)
	High	22 (14.67%)		Happy	22 (14.57%)
	Neutral	64 (42.67%)		Neutral	72 (48.00%)
	Low	15 (10.00%)		Unhappy	31 (20.67%)
	Very low	21 (14.00%)		Very unhappy	16 (10.67%)
* Majority		Total Sample : 150		Source : Collected Data	

Fifty nine (39.33%) respondents are single. Eighty five (56.67%) respondents are married. Four (2.67%) respondents are divorce and the remaining two (1.33%) respondents are separated. Majority (56.67%) respondents are married.

Sixty seven (44.67%) respondents are with joint family and the remaining eighty three (55.33%) respondents are nuclear family. Majority (55.33%) of the respondents are nuclear family.

Forty five (30.00%) respondents family size is up to 3 members. Seventy seven

(51.33%) respondents family size is between 3 and 5 members and the remaining twenty eight (18.67%) respondents family size is above 5 members. Majority (51.33%) of the respondents family size isbetween 3 and 5 members.

Thirty seven (24.67%) respondents monthly family income in up to Rs. 30,000. Forty two(28.00%) respondents monthly family income is between Rs. 30,001 and Rs. 50,000 and the remaining seventy one (28.00%) respondents monthly family income is above Rs. 50,000.Majority of the respondent's monthly family income is above Rs. 50,000.

Twenty eight (18.67%) respondents are spending up to 2 hours per day for family members. Eighty five (56.67%) respondents are spending 2 hours to 4 hours per day for family members andthe remaining thirty seven (24.67%) respondents are spending above 4 hours per day for family members. Majority (56.67%) of the respondents spending time with their family is between 2 hours and 4 hours.

Nine (6.00%) respondents are very happy about the amount of time spent at work. Twenty two (14.57%) respondents are happy about the amount of time spent at work. Seventy two (48.00%) respondents are unhappy about the amount of time spent at work and the remaining sixteen (10.67%) respondents are very unhappy about the time spent at work. Majority (48.00%) of the respondents are neutral about the amount of time spent at work.

HYPOTHESIS

The researcher to find out the different exists by using the following hypothesis
H_1 : There is no significant variance between the Age group, educational qualification, years of experience, Doing office work at house, Travelling Time, Balance of work and life, Marital Status,Family type, Family size, Monthly Family income, Time spent with family members, Amount oftime spent at work place and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance at 5% significantlevel.

Table No. 2

Age group of the Residence and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	637.734	2	637.734	4.931	.027
Within Groups	64403.154	147	129.324		
Total	65040.888	149			

The above table shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.027. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows

that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the age group and the level of factorinfluencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 3 Educational Qualification and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	7773.823	1	3886.911	3.733	.071
Within Groups	57267.065	148	115.225		
Total	65040.888	149			

The above table shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.071. Since the P-value is greater than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant variance between the educational qualification andthe level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 4 Years of experience and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	6014.113	3	2004.704	16.845	.001
Within Groups	59026.775	146	119.006		
Total	65040.888	149			

The table no.4 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the years of experience and the levelof factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 5 Doing office work at house and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	5863.309	2	2931.654	24.621	.001
Within Groups	59177.579	147	119.070		
Total	65040.888	149			

The table no.5 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the doing office work

at house and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 6 Travelling Time and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	1868.835	2	934.417	7.351	.064
Within Groups	63172.053	147	127.107		
Total	65040.888	149			

The above table shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.064. Since the P-value is greater than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant variance between the travelling time between house and office and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table 7 Balance of work and life and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	22536.292	3	7512.097	87.661	.001
Within Groups	42504.596	146	85.695		
Total	65040.888	149			

The table no.7 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the balance of work and life and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 8 Marital Status and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	641.252	1	641.252	4.959	.062
Within Groups	64399.636	148	129.317		
Total	65040.888	149			

The above table shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.062. Since the P-value is greater than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant variance between the marital status and the level offactor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 9 Family type and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	1123.336	2	1745.247	5.487	0.034
Within Groups	63917.552	147	453.884		
Total	65040.888	149			

The table no.9 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.034. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the family type and the level of factorinfluencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 10 Family size of the respondents and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	1166.561	3	6574.558	45.418	.001
Within Groups	63874.327	146	76.451		
Total	65040.888	149			

The table no.10 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the family size and life and the levelof factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 11 Monthly Family income and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	815.419	2	487.495	8.347	.001
Within Groups	64758.457	147	141.247		
Total	66870.419	149			

The table no.11 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the monthly family income and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 12 Time spent with family members the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	815.419	2	743.312		
Within Groups	64758.457	147	217.3398	6.441	.001
Total	66870.419	149			

The table no.7 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.001. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the time spent with family members and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Table No. 13 Amount of time spent at work place and the Level of factors influencing Work Life Balance

	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	P- Value
Between Groups	815.419	2	737.338		
Within Groups	64758.457	147	117.8837	7.771	.003
Total	66870.419	149			

The table no.13 shows that, the model can be simplified, notice that the P-value on the variable is 0.003. Since the P-value is less than 0.05, at 5% significant level it shows that null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant variance between the amount of time spent at work place and the level of factor influencing work life balance of the respondents.

Findings
The following are findings of this study

1. Majority (50.67%) of the respondents are come under the age group of 31 years to 40 years.

2. Majority (62.66%) of the respondents completed M.Phil.

3. Majority (35.33%) of the respondents are having 6 to 10 years of teaching experience.

4. Majority (54.67%) of the respondents are sometime doing college work at house.

5. Majority (48.67%) of the respondents need 21 minutes to 40 minutes to reach their college.

6. Majority (42.67%) respondents said they have neutral level of balance of work and life.

7. Majority (56.67%) respondents are married.

8. Majority (55.33%) of the respondents are nuclear family.

9. Majority (51.33%) of the respondents family size is between 3 and 5 members.

10. Majority of the respondent's monthly family income is above Rs. 50,000.

11. Majority (56.67%) of the respondents spending time with their family is between 2 hoursand 4 hours.

12. Majority (48.00%) of the respondents are neutral about the amount of time spent at work.

13. The age group, years of experience, Doing office work at house, Balance of work and life, Family type, Family size, Monthly Family income, Time spent with family members, Amount of time spent at work place are do not have significant variance withthe level of factors influencing Work Life Balance.

Suggestions

The following are some suggestion given by the researcher.

1. The management has to arrange some useful seminar to talk about the work life balance. It will help the staff to understand the nature of the job and to concentrate in their work with out any interruption of family issues.
2. The management should give adequate time to complete the official work of the staff.
3. The staff should understand the nature of the clerical work before they start. It will helpfulto reduce the working time and to complete the work as early as possible.

Conclusion

The present study conducted to measure the work life of private college teaching staff. The teaching is ethical profession compared to other business or professions. The future of our countryis in the preset students, the present students life is in teachers hands. The teachers understand well and doing their duties, the women teachers has more responsibility than male teachers. The study has taken the women staff of higher education. The work life balance of women teaching staff is presented in this study. The ANOVA used to measure the variance between the socio economic factors and level of work life balance of the respondents and presented in this study. It concluded that the staff should understand the nature of their work before start; this process will reduce the clerical work and need not bring the office work to their house. The women have moreresponsibility and work in house than the male, so the women have to plan the house work and responsibility to run the smoothly.

References:

1. Bettina-Johanna, Krings, (2009). "Working Time, Gender and Work-Life Balance", et al.,Leuven, Belgium.

2. Bryman Alan & Emma Bell (2008), "Business Research Methods", 2P nd P edition, Oxford press.

3. Burke, R. J. 2002. Organizational values, job experiences and satisfaction among managerial and professional women and men: Advantage men? Women in Management Review 17 (5): 5–6

4. Emslie, Carol (2009). "Live to work or work to live?" Harvard Educational Review 16 (1):151–172.

5. Fisher, K., and M. Layte. 2002–2003. Measuring work-life balance and degrees of sociability: A focus on the value of time use data in the assessment of quality of life. Working Paper of the European Panel Analysis Group 32.

6. Greenhaus, J. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. Journalof Vocational Behavior, 63(3), 510-531. Information, 41(255), 255-79.

7. Guest, D.E. (2002). Perspectives on the study of work-life balance, Social Science.

8. Kofodimos, J. R. (1993). Balancing act. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

9. Kothari C.R.(2007), "Research Methodology", New Delhi Age International (P) Limited,revised edition.

10. Newstorm, John W. & Keith Davis, Organization Behaviour, Tata McGraw Hill, NewDelhi.

11. O. B. Luthans organizational behaviour, Fred Mc Graw Hill

12. Pareek Udai & Purohit Surbhi 3Prd P Edition, Training Instrument in HRD & OD ,published by Tata Mcgraw Hill publishing co. ltd., New Delhi.

13. Rao VSP, Human Resource Management, 2P nd P Edition, Excel Publications, New Delhi

14. Robbins, Stephen P. & Timothy A. Judge. Organizational Behaviour, 13P th P ED,Prentice Hall, New Delhi.

Multi
Spectrum