



INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON WORK LIFE BALANCE (WLB) AMONG PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES TEACHERS IN KARNATAKA

Management

**Sonia Delrose
Noronha**

Research Scholar, Department Of Management, Srinivas University, Pandeshwar - 575001, Karnataka, India.

Dr. P. S. Aithal*

Srinivas Institute Of Management Studies, Pandeshwar, Mangaluru –575 001, India.
*Corresponding Author

ABSTRACT

In today's fast paced society managing Human resources has become a challenging yet dynamic and exciting task. Organizations have realized that human resources are their most unique and valuable assets. In this era where the world has become a global village educational institutions are trying to keep pace with the competition by retaining key employees through reducing disparities, improving faculty effectiveness, morale and increasing developmental opportunities. Work Life balance is a delicate aspect that results in teacher satisfaction and effectiveness. It has been proved over the years that the balanced work life results in well-being of the faculties, students as well as the organization. Work life Imbalance affects the performance at work place on one side and family care on the other side. This can also create Glass ceiling resulting in lack of opportunities for career growth and development. Organizations are formulating policies and women themselves have adopted strategies to maintain work life balance and overcome glass ceiling. The present study is an attempt to understand the influence of socio-demographic factors on WLB among the faculties of the public universities in Karnataka. This study is based on the primary data. For this purpose a survey was carried out among the university teachers of the Public universities of Karnataka. An attempt has been made to highlight the challenges faced by women in maintaining the work life balance in this sector.

KEYWORDS

Work Life Balance, Wlb, Glass Ceiling, Educational Institutions, Human Resources, University Teachers.

INTRODUCTION:

In the traditional society, women's role was naturally limited to the family. Since she was the bearer of children, she was fully occupied with her responsibilities as a mother and homemaker. Man's responsibility was to provide the household with raw materials, which were then converted by the woman into consumable products or conditions by means of rudimentary methods and tools. Work-Life Balance can be described as the 'fit' between multiple roles in a person's life.

The fundamental theory behind the concept of Work-Life Balance is that individuals have varying and sometimes mutually exclusive demands on them due to the roles that they play in the different facets of their lives for example, mother versus worker.

Work-Life Balance is not one single ultimate experience" but a series of individual experiences unfolding over time.

Work-Life Balance, is not just about women juggling between home and family but also about adjusting working patterns so that everyone, regardless of age, race or gender, can find a rhythm that enables them more easily to combine work with their other responsibilities or aspirations.

RESULTS:

Table 1: Socio-demography

		Count	Column N %
Age:	< 30yrs	27	25.5%
	31 - 35	41	38.7%
	36 - 40	18	17.0%
	41 - 50	15	14.2%
	Above 50	5	4.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Residence Type	Rural	14	13.2%
	Urban	92	86.8%
	Total	106	100.0%
Dwelling place	Own house	58	54.7%
	Quarters	7	6.6%
	Rented	41	38.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Income (monthly)	< 50,000	67	63.2%
	50,000 - 100,000	29	27.4%

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

- To study the influence of Socio-demographic factors on Work life balance among the women faculties of the public universities in Karnataka

ALTERNATE HYPOTHESES:

There is an association between socio-Demographic factors and WBL.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

- Questionnaire method is used for the study
- Data was collected from 106 women faculties from 27 different public or state Universities of Management department working in Public Universities of Karnataka
- 5 point Likert scale was used to measure components
- Under Demographic factors 17 variables were measured
- Under Work Life Balance 9 components were measured.
- Descriptive methods such as Mean, standard deviation, frequency and percentage has been used.

Inferential method such as Fishers exact test was used to find the association between Demographic variables and Work life balance.

	Above 100,000	10	9.4%
	Total	106	100.0%
Qualification	PG	82	77.4%
	M.Phil	5	4.7%
	Ph.D	19	17.9%
	Total	106	100.0%
Designation	Assistant Professor	81	76.4%
	Associate Professor	20	18.9%
	Professor	5	4.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Total Experience	< 2yrs	4	3.8%
	2 - 5	35	33.0%
	6 - 10	23	21.7%
	11 - 15	30	28.3%
	16 - 20	9	8.5%
	Above 20	5	4.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Experience in the present college	< 2yrs	26	24.5%
	2 - 5	48	45.3%
	6 - 10	22	20.8%
	11 - 15	5	4.7%
	Above 20	5	4.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Hours worked per day:	<8 Hrs	43	40.6%
	8 - 10Hrs	57	53.8%
	10 - 12Hrs	6	5.7%
	Total	106	100.0%
Marital status	Single	17	16.0%
	Married	89	84.0%
	Total	106	100.0%
Family type	Joint	16	15.1%
	Nuclear	90	84.9%
	Total	106	100.0%
Parental Responsibility:	No	23	21.7%
	Yes	83	78.3%
	Total	106	100.0%
Family Size	1 - 2	14	13.2%
	3 - 4	70	66.0%
	5 - 6	22	20.8%
	Total	106	100.0%
Number of Dependents	0	16	15.1%
	1	27	25.5%
	2	34	32.1%
	3+	29	27.4%
	Total	106	100.0%
Number of Children	0	24	27.0%
	1	44	49.4%
	2	21	23.6%
	2+	0	.0%
	Total	89	100.0%
Age of Children	0 - 2	8	12.3%
	3 - 8	31	47.7%
	9 - 15	15	23.1%
	Above 15	11	16.9%
	Total	65	100.0%

Table 2: WLB

	SD		D		N		A		SA		Total			
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
I have sufficient time away from mywork to maintain adequate work life balance.	0	.0%	28	26.4%	13	12.3%	53	50.0%	12	11.3%	106	3.46	1.01	4.00
I am able to negotiate and accomplish what is expected of me at work and in my family	0	.0%	18	17.0%	15	14.2%	63	59.4%	10	9.4%	106	3.61	.88	4.00

I am able to accomplish the expectations that my supervisors and my family have for me.	0	.0%	15	14.2%	16	15.1%	48	45.3%	27	25.5%	106	3.82	.97	4.00
I enjoy enough time to spend for my personal needs	0	.0%	26	24.5%	25	23.6%	38	35.8%	17	16.0%	106	3.43	1.03	4.00
I have time and energy to engage myself in the leisure activities I enjoy	0	.0%	23	21.7%	23	21.7%	42	39.6%	18	17.0%	106	3.52	1.02	4.00
I have enough time to spend on my health requirements	0	.0%	41	38.7%	23	21.7%	30	28.3%	12	11.3%	106	3.12	1.06	3.00
I have time to spend on my own self development	0	.0%	28	26.4%	26	24.5%	35	33.0%	17	16.0%	106	3.39	1.05	3.00
I have time to socialize with friends	0	.0%	35	33.0%	35	33.0%	24	22.6%	12	11.3%	106	3.12	1.00	3.00
My work demands does not interfere with my family life	0	.0%	43	40.6%	36	34.0%	10	9.4%	17	16.0%	106	3.01	1.07	3.00

Table 3: Association

		WLB					
		Low		Moderate		Good	
		Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Age:	< 30yrs	6	22.2%	4	14.8%	17	63.0%
	31 - 35	0	.0%	33	80.5%	8	19.5%
	36 - 40	0	.0%	6	33.3%	12	66.7%
	41 - 50	0	.0%	15	100.0%	0	.0%
	Above 50	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
Residence Type	Rural	0	.0%	4	28.6%	10	71.4%
	Urban	6	6.5%	54	58.7%	32	34.8%
Dwelling place	Own house	6	10.3%	22	37.9%	30	51.7%
	Quarters	0	.0%	0	.0%	7	100.0%
	Rented	0	.0%	36	87.8%	5	12.2%
Income (monthly)	< 50,000	6	9.0%	36	53.7%	25	37.3%
	50,000 - 100,000	0	.0%	22	75.9%	7	24.1%
	Above 100,000	0	.0%	0	.0%	10	100.0%
Qualification	PG	0	.0%	45	54.9%	37	45.1%
	M.Phil	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
	Ph.D	6	31.6%	13	68.4%	0	.0%
Designation	Assistant Professor	2	2.5%	42	51.9%	37	45.7%
	Associate Professor	4	20.0%	16	80.0%	0	.0%
	Professor	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
Total Experience	< 2yrs	0	.0%	4	100.0%	0	.0%
	2 - 5	6	17.1%	12	34.3%	17	48.6%
	6 - 10	0	.0%	15	65.2%	8	34.8%
	11 - 15	0	.0%	23	76.7%	7	23.3%
	16 - 20	0	.0%	4	44.4%	5	55.6%
	Above 20	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
Experience in the present college	< 2yrs	6	23.1%	20	76.9%	0	.0%
	2 - 5	0	.0%	20	41.7%	28	58.3%
	6 - 10	0	.0%	18	81.8%	4	18.2%
	11 - 15	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
	Above 20	0	.0%	0	.0%	5	100.0%
Hours worked per day:	<8 Hrs	0	.0%	27	62.8%	16	37.2%
	8 - 10Hrs	0	.0%	31	54.4%	26	45.6%
	10 - 12Hrs	6	100.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
Marital status	Single	6	35.3%	5	29.4%	6	35.3%
	Married	0	.0%	53	59.6%	36	40.4%
Family type	Joint	6	37.5%	10	62.5%	0	.0%
	Nuclear	0	.0%	48	53.3%	42	46.7%
Parental Responsibility:	No	0	.0%	14	60.9%	9	39.1%
	Yes	6	7.2%	44	53.0%	33	39.8%
Family Size	1 - 2	0	.0%	9	64.3%	5	35.7%
	3 - 4	6	8.6%	39	55.7%	25	35.7%
	5 - 6	0	.0%	10	45.5%	12	54.5%

Number of Dependents	0	0	.0%	5	31.3%	11	68.8%
	1	0	.0%	7	25.9%	20	74.1%
	2	0	.0%	30	88.2%	4	11.8%
	3+	6	20.7%	16	55.2%	7	24.1%
Number of Children	0	0	.0%	9	37.5%	15	62.5%
	1	0	.0%	28	63.6%	16	36.4%
	2	0	.0%	16	76.2%	5	23.8%
	2+	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
Age of Children	0 - 2	0	.0%	4	50.0%	4	50.0%
	3 - 8	0	.0%	24	77.4%	7	22.6%
	9 - 15	0	.0%	10	66.7%	5	33.3%
	Above 15	0	.0%	6	54.5%	5	45.5%

Table 4: Fishers exact test p

	Fishers exact test p	
Age:	0.000	HS
Residence Type	0.030	sig
Dwelling place	0.000	HS
Income (monthly)	0.000	HS
Qualification	0.000	HS
Designation	0.000	HS
Total Experience	0.000	HS
Experience in the present college	0.000	HS
Hours worked per day:	0.000	HS
Marital status	0.000	HS
Family type	0.000	HS
Parental Responsibility:	0.393	NS
Family Size	0.264	NS
Number of Dependents	0.000	HS
Number of Children	0.023	sig
Age of Children	0.339	NS

RESULTS FROM WLBCOMPONENTS:

- Respondents have sufficient time away from work to maintain WLB(3.46)
- Respondents are able to negotiate and accomplish that is expected from them at work and family (3.61)
- Respondents are able to accomplish the expectations of the supervisor and family.(3.82)
- Respondents enjoy enough time to spend for personal needs(3.43)
- Respondents have time and energy to engage in leisure activities they enjoy(3.52)
- Respondents have to enough time to spend on health requirements(3.12)
- Respondents have time to spent on self development (3.39)
- Respondents have time to socialize with friends (3.12)
- Respondents work demands does not interfere with family life(3.01)

LEVEL OF WORK LIFE BALANCE

TOTAL SCORE	9-45
9-21	LOW
22-33	MODERATE
34-45	HIGH

Frequency	Percent	Mean	s.d	
Low	6	5.7	30.49	7.43
Moderate	58	54.7		
Good	42	39.6		
Total	106	100.0		

Overall Mean value score is 30.49 –MODERATE WLB

DISCUSSION:

The balance between the work-life and professional life has to be maintained and has already been defined by the WHO (1,2). It is the primary responsibility of the Employer to ascertain issues like work-life balance policies and practices, employee engagement via Proper balance between professional and personal life of employees and work-place culture in different industries in order to increase their productivity and retain them in the organization for a long period are the need of hour (3-7). In fact with a shift in the policies the productivity is also known to go high. Work-life balance and employee engagement becomes a visible benchmark among high performing organizations. Specially married individuals are caught in the web of

managing both activities and it is known to be a burden and often to compensate one the other one is known to suffer (8,9,10). It is basically not equal division of time and work rather it's a purely mental Health activity. Major factors are known to play their roles and even geographical location and the race of the individual is supposed to play a role. So a regression model has to be made for particular individuals so as to maximize the productivity of the overall. Working time, family friendly policies, managerial practices and organizational cultures also act as determinants of how men and women experience work-family balance.

CONCLUSION:

Overall Mean value score is 30.49 –MODERATE WLB. Out of 17 factors considered 14 show highly significance.

REFERENCES:

1. Ioan, IazĂ, & CodruŢ. (2010). The Role of Work-Life Balance Practices in order to improve Organizational Performance. *European Research Studies*, XIII(1), 201-214.
2. Delecta, P. (2011). Review Article Work Life Balance. *International Journal of Current Research*, 33(4), 186-189.
3. Susi, & Jawaharrani. (2011). Work-Life Balance: The key driver of employee engagement. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 2(1).
4. Ujvala, Rajadhyaksha. (2012). Work-life balance in South East Asia: the Indian experience. *South Asian Journal of Global Business Research*, 1(1), 108 – 127.
5. Namita. (2014). Work-Life Balance In India-The Key Driver of Employee Engagement. *International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations*, 2(1), 103-109.
6. Delina, & Prabhakara, Raya. (2013). A study on Work-Life Balance in Working Women. *International Journal of Commerce, Business and Management*, 2(5), 274.
7. Lubna, Riz. (2013). An Empirical Study on The Effectiveness of Work-Life Balance In Banking Industry. *Life SciJ*, 10(4), 3075-3081. Retrieved from <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>
8. Manjula, & Selvakumar. (2014). Analysis of quality of work life of employees in private sector commercial banks – application of discriminant analysis. *Abhinav National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research In Commerce & Management*, 3(9), 7-16.
9. Manisha, Purohit. (2013). A Comparative Study Of Work Life Balance In Various Industrial Sectors In Pune Region. *International Journal Of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, 2(3), 198-206.
10. Purna, Patwa. (2011). Work-Life Balance: A Cross Sectional Study of Banking & Insurance Sector. *International Journal Of Research In Commerce, It & Management*, 1(3).