

# A Study on Work Life Balance of The Employees Working In The Self Financed Colleges In Coimbatore

Dr. P. Pirakatheeshwari<sup>1</sup>, Harini E<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Associate Professor, Dept of B Com – PA

<sup>2</sup>Dept of B Com – PA

<sup>1,2</sup>Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts and Science (Autonomous), Coimbatore – 6.

**Abstract-** *This research examines the intricate dynamics of Work-Life Balance (WLB) among employees in the self-financed college sector in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. Utilizing a qualitative approach, the study employs semi-structured interviews and surveys to gather insights from a diverse spectrum of employees across different roles and levels within these institutions. Through thematic analysis, it identifies critical determinants influencing WLB, including workload, organizational culture, support systems, and individual coping mechanisms. Furthermore, the study investigates the reciprocal relationship between WLB and various outcomes such as job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational effectiveness. The findings are expected to offer valuable implications for policymakers, college administrators, and employees, facilitating the development of targeted strategies to enhance WLB and promote a healthier work environment in Coimbatore's self-financed colleges.*

**Keywords-** Work Life Balance, Stress, Work and Personal Life, Employee Satisfaction

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the world of higher education, self-financed colleges deal with the tricky task of maintaining academic standards while facing financial challenges. This study dives into the "Work-Life Balance of Employees in Self-Financed Colleges in Coimbatore," understanding the unique pressures on faculty and staff. By focusing on finding the right balance between work and personal life, aim to uncover specific challenges, factors that influence this balance, and practical ways to improve it. The goal is to contribute insights that can be easily understood and applied, making work environments in self-financed colleges more supportive for the dedicated people who make academic excellence possible. Navigating the demands of work and personal life poses a significant challenge. Through surveys and interviews, we aim to uncover perceptions, identify key determinants, and explore coping mechanisms. By understanding these dynamics, we seek to offer insights that can inform strategies for promoting employee well-being and productivity. This research fills a crucial gap in existing literature by focusing specifically on

self-financed colleges in Coimbatore, contributing to a deeper understanding of work-life dynamics in the educational sector. Ultimately, our findings aspire to foster a more supportive and enriching work environment, benefitting both employees and institutions alike

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Veena Latha (2019) "A Study on Work Life Balance on the Employees in the Field of Education" analyzed that the study of work life balance is a state where the tensions between the work-life and personal life is minimized by having proper policies, supportive management, provisions at work place and good relations in personal life. Performance and job satisfaction of the employees are said to be affected by work-life balance. Work-life balance of employees helps in reducing the stress level at work and increases job satisfaction.

John A (2016), "Work-Life Balance in Corporate Sector" analysed that this examines the relationship between work/life balance and job stress. The pattern is clear that the workers who have experienced difficulties in balancing work and personal life also are likely to report more job stress. Indeed, the 55 percent of survey respondents who found it harder to balance work-life reported often or always being under stress in their job, compared with 26 percent of those who found work-life balance easier to achieve. So, there is an inverse relationship between Job Stress and Work/Life Balance

Thilagavathy S (2020), "Work-Life Balance - A Systematic Review" analysed that the study is to identify the various measures that are to be followed by the organization to improve the work life of the employees and provide a motivational environment in which the employees are highly satisfied. It identifies the extent to which the employees are able to balance the personal, social & organizational work life.

Niveditha (2023), "A Study On Work Life Balance among the Colleges" analysed that the study is to identify the various measures that are to be followed by the organization to improve the work life of the employees and provide a

motivational environment in which the employees are highly satisfied. It identifies the extent to which the employees are able to balance the personal, social & organizational work life. Julia Akuezilo (2021), “Work-Life Balance among Employees in the Workplace and Covid-19” analysed that the work life balance among employees in the workplace and COVID-19. The study adopted the descriptive survey research design. Three research questions guided the study. The population and sample were drawn from Anambra and Enugu states. The sample of the study is 992 employees in the workplace, that is, business administrators, contractors, lecturers drawn using proportionate stratified sampling technique It was concluded that most of these indices, challenges and solutions are triggered by the Nigeria unique workplace, culture and institutional framework that impact managing work life balance.

### III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Within the evolving landscape of self-financed colleges, concerns have arisen regarding the work-life balance of employees. This study addresses the lack of research on the unique challenges faced by individuals in these institutions. The research aims to understand the factors influencing work-life balance, including workload, organizational culture, and policies. It also explores coping mechanisms, the impact of technology, and variations across job roles. By doing so, the study seeks to provide actionable insights for enhancing the work-life balance of employees in self-financed colleges, contributing to broader discussions on employee well-being and organizational effectiveness in higher education. The study is based on the factors that impact the employees work life balance, study the level of stress between work and personal life and to recommend areas for improving work-life balance satisfaction among employees.

### OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To identify the factors that impact the employees work life balance.
- To analyse the level of stress between work and personal life.
- To recommend the areas for improving work-life balance satisfaction among employees.

### IV. RESERCH METHODOLOGY

Research is based on the primary data collected from self-financed colleges in Coimbatore. Data has been collected using a structured questionnaire which was prepared by the researcher on the basis of extensive literature review. Questionnaire has been checked by guide.

### SAMPLE SIZE

The data is collected among 148 respondents of various age categories; convenience sampling technique is used for this study. As the study is conducted through online, the data was collected from self-financed colleges in Coimbatore city

### SOURCES OF DATA PRIMARY DATA

Primary data is collected with the help of questionnaires. Questionnaires method is adopted in this study to solve the problem.

### TOOLS USED

- Percentage Analysis
- Weighted Average Score Analysis
- Chi-Square Test
- ANOVA

### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The study focuses only on the respondents that work in the self-financed colleges in Coimbatore city
- The study is entirely dependent on the data collected via questionnaire

### V. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS

**TABLE:1 SOCIO ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS**

| Demographic Variables | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Age                   | 20 – 30            | 68.53      |
|                       | 31 – 40            | 18.18      |
|                       | 41 – 50            | 13.29      |
| Gender                | Female             | 60.81      |
|                       | Male               | 39.19      |
| Monthly Income        | Below 20000        | 50.68      |
|                       | 20000 – 40000      | 27.40      |
|                       | 40000 – 60000      | 17.81      |
|                       | 60000 – 80000      | 4.11       |
|                       | Above 80000        | 4.11       |
| Type of Family        | Joint              | 31.51      |
|                       | Nuclear            | 68.49      |
| Marital Status        | Married            | 27.03      |
|                       | Unmarried          | 72.97      |

|                                  |               |     |       |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-----|-------|
| Number of Members in the Family  | Below 2       | 6   | 4.05  |
|                                  | 2 – 4         | 92  | 62.16 |
|                                  | Above 4       | 50  | 33.78 |
| Number of Children in the Family | No Children   | 100 | 67.57 |
|                                  | One           | 24  | 16.22 |
|                                  | Two           | 18  | 12.16 |
|                                  | More than one | 6   | 4.05  |

Table 1 shows that majority of the respondents (68.53%) were aged between 20-30 years (60.81%) of respondents are Female, (50.68%) of the respondents are attaining a monthly income of Below 20000, (68.49%) of the respondents are nuclear family and (72.97%) of the respondents are unmarried. 62.16% of the respondents belong to the 2-4 number of Family members. 100 respondents select the group of None of the Children in the Family with 67.57%.

**TABLE 2 : YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**

| Years            | No. of Respondents | Percentage   |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 2-5 Years        | 76                 | 51.39        |
| 6-8 Years        | 23                 | 15.28        |
| Above 8 Years    | 10                 | 6.94         |
| Less Than 1 Year | 39                 | 26.39        |
| <b>Total</b>     | <b>148</b>         | <b>100.0</b> |

Table 2 shows the number of respondents based on years of experience. Out of that 74 respondents select the group of (2-5 years) with (51.39%), 22 respondents select the group of (6-8 years) with (15.28%), 10 respondents select the group of (Above 8 years) with (6.94%) and 38 respondents select the group of (less than 1 year) with (26.39%). (2-5 years) no of children category comprise a larger percentage (51.39%) compared to other groups.

**TABLE 3 : FACTORS THAT IMPACT WORK LIFE BALANCE**

| S. No | Factors                      | Total | Total Weighted Score | Ranks |
|-------|------------------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| 1.    | Workload                     | 510   | 18.61                | 1     |
| 2.    | Flexibility in Work Schedule | 502   | 18.31                | 2     |
| 3.    | Managerial Support           | 438   | 15.98                | 5     |
| 4.    | Family Responsibilities      | 366   | 13.35                | 6     |
| 5.    | Commute Time                 | 449   | 16.38                | 4     |
| 6.    | Technology Impact            | 476   | 17.37                | 3     |

Table 3 shows that the factors that impact work life balance. Workload was secured first Rank with a Score of 18.61 followed by Flexibility in work schedule with a Score of 18.31. Managerial Support was secured Third Rank with a Score of 15.98, and the Family responsibilities were secured Fourth Rank with a Score of 13.35.

**TABLE 4 : EMPLOYEES CONTRIBUTION TO THE GROWTH OF THE COMPANY**

| Factors                        | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Cross Functional Collaboration | 66                 | 19.76%     |
| Employee Recognition Programs  | 48                 | 14.37%     |
| Employee Training Programs     | 76                 | 22.75%     |
| Feedback Mechanism             | 62                 | 18.56%     |
| Idea Sharing Sessions          | 82                 | 24.55%     |

Table 4 shows the respondents of employee contribution to the growth of the company. Out of that 66 respondents select (Cross functional collaboration) with (19.76%), 48 respondents select (Employee recognition programs) with (14.37%), 76 respondents select (Employee training programs) with (22.75%), 62 respondents select (Feedback mechanism) with (18.56%) and 82 respondents select (Idea sharing sessions) with (24.55%). (Idea sharing sessions) comprise a larger percentage (24.55%) compared to other options.

**TABLE 5 : WELLNESS OR WELL-BEING INITIATIVES YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE IMPLEMENTED IN THE WORKPLACE**

| Particulars                    | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Fitness and exercise programs  | 74                 | 26.24%     |
| Flexible wellness programs     | 60                 | 21.28%     |
| Mental health support services | 96                 | 34.04%     |
| Workshops on stress management | 52                 | 18.44%     |

Table 5 shows the respondents of initiatives implemented in the workplace. Out of that 74 respondents select (Fitness and exercise) with (26.24%), 60 respondents select (Flexible wellness programs) with (21.28%), 96 respondents select (Mental health support services) with

(34.04%), 52 respondents select (Workshops on stress management) with (18.44%). (Mental health support services) comprise a larger percentage (34.04%) compared to other options.

**CHI-SQUARE TEST**

**TABLE 6 : RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE**

| Variables      | P Value   | Significant        |
|----------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Age            | 0.0421312 | Non-significant    |
| Gender         | 0.198114  | Non-significant    |
| Monthly income | 0.0095036 | Highly significant |
| Type of family | 0.05369   | Significant        |
| Marital status | 0.0467738 | Non-significant    |

The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is more than 0.000-0.001, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is a highly significant difference between the demographic variable of monthly income and years of experience. The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is between 0.01-0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of age, marital status and years of experience. The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of gender, type of family and years of experience.

**TABLE 7 : RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND STRESS IN WORK-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

| VARIABLES      | P-VALUE     | SIGNIFICANT        |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| Age            | 0.00265     | Highly significant |
| Gender         | 0.01011467  | Significant        |
| Monthly income | 0.559352393 | Non-significant    |
| Type of family | 0.150020673 | Non-significant    |
| Marital status | 0.000627641 | Highly significant |

The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is more than 0.000-0.001, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is a highly significant difference between the demographic variable of age, marital status and stress in work-related activities. The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is between 0.01-0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of gender and stress in work-related activities. The P Value if  $\chi^2$  test is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of monthly income, type of family and stress in work-related activities.

**ANOVA**

**TABLE 8 : HOURS SPENT ON WORK-RELATED ACTIVITIES AND DEMOGRAPHIC VALUES**

| Demographic Variables |                | SS      | F     | P-Value | Significant     |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------|-------|---------|-----------------|
| Age                   | Between groups | 54.667  | 0.466 | 0.049   | Significant     |
|                       | Within groups  | 205.333 |       |         |                 |
|                       | Total          | 260     |       |         |                 |
| Gender                | Between groups | 52.375  | 0.313 | 0.034   | Significant     |
|                       | Within groups  | 125.5   |       |         |                 |
|                       | Total          | 177.875 |       |         |                 |
| Monthly income        | Between groups | 82.6    | 3.331 | 0.109   | Non-Significant |
|                       | Within groups  | 31      |       |         |                 |
|                       | Total          | 113.6   |       |         |                 |
| Type of family        | Between groups | 10.5    | 0.126 | 0.9653  | Non-Significant |
|                       | Within groups  | 83.5    |       |         |                 |
|                       | Total          | 94      |       |         |                 |
| Marital status        | Between groups | 9.125   | 16.11 | 0.013   | significant     |
|                       | Within groups  | 164.1   |       |         |                 |
|                       | Total          | 173.31  |       |         |                 |

The P Value of Anova is between 0.01-0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is significant difference between demographic variables of age, gender, marital status and hours spent on work-related activities. The P Value of Anova is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted is, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of monthly income, type of family and hours spent on work-related activities.

**TABLE 9 : WELL-BEING INITIATIVES IMPLEMENTED AND DEMOGRAPHIC VALUES**

| Demographic Values |                | SS     | F     | P-Value | Significant |
|--------------------|----------------|--------|-------|---------|-------------|
| Age                | Between Groups | 212.83 | 0.862 | 0.018   | Significant |
|                    | Within Groups  | 411.17 |       |         |             |

|                |                |        |       |        |                 |
|----------------|----------------|--------|-------|--------|-----------------|
|                | Total          | 624    |       |        |                 |
| Gender         | Between Groups | 38.7   | 0.116 | 0.938  | Non-Significant |
|                | Within Groups  | 110.5  |       |        |                 |
|                | Total          | 149.2  |       |        |                 |
| Monthly Income | Between Groups | 139.21 | 1.647 | 0.054  | Significant     |
|                | Within Groups  | 84.50  |       |        |                 |
|                | Total          | 223.71 |       |        |                 |
| Type Of Family | Between Groups | 103    | 0.372 | 0.785  | Non-Significant |
|                | Within Groups  | 184.5  |       |        |                 |
|                | Total          | 287.5  |       |        |                 |
| Marital Status | Between Groups | 10.5   | 0.126 | 0.9653 | Non-Significant |
|                | Within Groups  | 83.5   |       |        |                 |
|                | Total          | 94     |       |        |                 |

The P Value of Anova is between 0.01-0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected, so there is significant difference between demographic variables of age, monthly income and well-being initiatives implemented. The P Value of Anova is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted is, so there is significant difference between the demographic variables of gender, type of family, marital status.

## VI. FINDINGS

1. The majority of 68.53% of the respondents are aged between 20-30 years.
2. The majority of 60.81% of the respondents are female.
3. The majority of 50.68% of the respondent's monthly income is below 20000.
4. The majority of 62.16% of the respondents belong to the nuclear family
5. The majority of 72.97% of the respondents are unmarried.
6. The majority of 62.16% of the respondents belong to the 2-4 number of family members.
7. The majority of 67.57% of the respondents have no children.
8. The majority of 51.39% of the respondents have 2-5 years of experience.
9. The majority of 44.62% of the respondents are teaching faculty.
10. The majority of 34.72% of the respondents spend 20-30 hours in work-related activities.

11. The majority of 45.07% of the respondents occasionally face stress issues due to work-related activities.
12. The majority of 18.61% of the respondents have workload factors that impact work- life balance.
13. The majority of 15.62% of the respondents face low working hours problems.
14. The majority of 18.04% of the respondents have high stress level on job security.
15. The majority of 24.55% of the respondents contribute idea sharing sessions to the growth of the company.

## VII. SUGGESTIONS

- On the basis of the study conducted among the employees working in the self- financed colleges the following suggestion has been given.
- Most of the respondents are suggesting idea sharing sessions to the growth of the company.
- Most of the respondents are suggesting to reduce high stress level on job security.
- Most of the respondents are suggesting to provide them with high working hours.
- Most of the respondents are suggesting making work space environmentally friendly to balance work-life without any stress issues.
- Most of the respondents are suggesting to spend time with their family members to balance work-life.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the work-life balance of employees in self- financed colleges in Coimbatore. Through comprehensive analysis, it becomes evident that while many employees strive to achieve equilibrium between their professional responsibilities and personal lives, significant challenges persist. Factors such as workload, institutional policies, and societal expectations impact employees' ability to maintain a satisfactory work-life balance. Recognizing the importance of addressing these challenges, interventions focused on flexible work arrangements, supportive organizational cultures, and holistic well-being initiatives are recommended. By prioritizing the enhancement of work-life balance, self-financed colleges in Coimbatore can cultivate a healthier and more productive workforce, ultimately fostering greater satisfaction and fulfilment among employees.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Agarwal, R. 2000. Stress in Life and at Work, Delhi: Sage Publications, Delhi

- [2] Ahmad-Nia, S. (2002). Women's work and health in Iran: A comparison of working and non-working mothers. *Social Science and Medicine*, 54, 753-765.
- [3] Allport, G.W. (1955). *Becoming: Basic considerations for a psychology of personality*. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press.
- [4] Back, K.W. 1969. *The Ambiguity of Retirement*, Boston: Little Brown.
- [5] Bailyn, Lotte, Fletcher, Joyce K. and Kolb, Deborah (1997) —Unexpected Connections: Considering Employee's Personal Lives Can Revitalize Your Business! *Sloan Management Review*, 38(4), 11-19.
- [6] Bandura, A. 1977. *Self-efficacy: Towards a Unifying Theory of Behavioural*
- [6] Barnett, R. C. & Baruch, G. K. (1985). Women's involvement in multiple roles and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 135-145.
- [7] Baron, R.A. (2001). *Psychology*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- [8] Bhushan, B. (2005). Are mental health and social anxiety related to the working status of the women? *A Journal of Women's Studies and Research in Iran and Muslim Countries*; 6: 11
- [9] Bond, James T, Galinsky, Ellen and Swanber, Jennifer E. (1998) *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce – Executive Summary*. New York: Families and Work Institute  
<http://familiesandwork.org/summary/nscw.pdf>