THINK INDIA JOURNAL

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

Reflection Of Differences In Educational Status On Work Lifebalance- An Empirical Study.

Dr. Rincy V.Mathew , Associate Professor. Department of Business Administration, Annamalai university ,Tamilnadu Ph: 9486283154 e-mail: rincy1020@gmail.com,

ABSTRACT

Work life balance as satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home, with a minimum of role conflict. The study aimed to understand whether there is any significant variations existing in the work life balance and its dimensions (WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE) of the respondents in relation to their level of educationof service sector employees in Ernakulam . The various service sector organizations covered in this study were pharmaceutical industry, bio technology lab and hospitals . Stratified random sampling method was used to collect the data from the sample population. it was found from the study that WLB, WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE differed significantly among the five groups of respondents based on their level of education

Key words: work life balance , Work interference with personal life ,Personal life interference with work life ,work/personal life enhancement

INTRODUCTION

Today work and family life is thought to be considerably different in comparison with pre-industrial economies where all family members excluding infants, contributed for the production of goods and services for the household (Blaue *et al.*, 2002). In the early cottage industry era, the domain of work and family were probably fused and almost inseparable as family members lived and worked alongside one another pursuing economic activity within the family unit (Near *et al.*, 1980; Howard, 1992; Lewis, 1992). However, the bond between work and family began to change during industrialization as organization recruited men, women and children for factory employment, resulting in separation of economic and familial roles (Probert, 1989). Consequently, work becomes spatially and socially distinct from the family. Therefore the early life domain analysis considered work and family as separate and

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

independent of one another (Dubin, 1956). For many years researchers preserved this separation as investigators studied work and family as independent domains of one another (Dubin, 1956). Clark (2000) defined WLB as satisfaction and good functioning at work and at home, with a minimum of role conflict. Kirchmeyer (2000), in her chapter on "work life initiatives", defined balanced life as "achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains". Kirchmeyer went on to be more prescriptive, stating that to achieve satisfying experiences in all life domains "require personal resources like energy, time and commitment to be well distributed across domains". Therefore this study is an attempt to understand the influence of educational status on work life balance of service sector employees in Ernakulam ,Kerala.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kanter (1977) originally identified two opposing types of responses that employees and organizations have to deal with, that is, work and non-work spheres (i.e., integrated or separated). Separation implies that there is no interaction between the two domains, whereas integration acknowledges that interaction does take place. A more recent and specific proposition of how these boundaries can be integrated or separated is the work-life border theory (Clark, 2000). This theory seeks to predict and explain how ''border-crossers'' manage work and life domains in order to obtain balance. Clark (2000) contends that individuals are proactive rather than reactive when it comes to their work and life domains. Borders can be physical, temporal, and or psychological. Two important components that serve to determine a border's strength are flexibility and permeability. These components help to determine the degree to which domains are integrated or separated (Hall and Richter, 1988).

OBJCTIVES

To know whether there is any significant variations existing in the WLB and its dimensions (WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE) of the respondents in relation to their level of education .

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The sample population comprised various service sector employees working in Ernakulam ,Kerala .The various service sector organizations covered in this study were pharmaceutical

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

industry, bio technology lab and hospitals . Stratified random sampling method was used to collect the data from the sample population. The minimum sample size needed for the study was found to be 364 with a margin of error of 5% at 95% confidence level and 50% response distribution. As disproportionate stratified random sampling is followed, the sample size taken was 400.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

significant variations existing in the WLB and its dimensions (WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE) based on the educational status of the service sector employees

Table .1 One way analysis of variance between WLB issues along with its dimensions and level of education of the respondents followed by Scheffe's test (N = 400)

D.V	Groups	Education	f	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	F	p	Scheffe's test
WLB	1	Below graduation	78	42.27	4.35	367.53	.05	1v/s 3,4,5. 2v/s 3,4,5.
	2	Graduation	159	41.04	3.93			
	3	Professional graduation	31	53.91	4.20			
	4	Post graduation and above	102	56.78	3.90			
	5	Professional post graduation and above	30	59.01	2.36			
WIPL	1	Below graduation	78	14.67	4.09	390.60	.05	1v/s 3,4,5. 2v/s 3,4,5.
	2	Graduation	159	14.73	2.47			
	3	Professional graduation	31	24.17	2.34			
	4	Post graduation and above	102	25.52	1.23			
	5	Professional post graduation and above	30	25.73	2.51			
PLIW	1	Below graduation	78	13.62	1.46	1384.98	.05	1v/s 3,4,5.
	2	Graduation	159	13.80	1.40			

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

	3	Professional graduation	31	24.09	1.92			2v/s 3,4,5.
	4	Post graduation and above	102	26.25	1.88			
	5	Professional post graduation and above	30	28.00	2.18			
WE/PE	1	Below graduation	78	13.98	2.00	403.75	.05	1v/s 3,4,5. 2v/s 3,4,5.
	2	Graduation	159	12.51	2.30			
	3	Professional graduation	31	5.65	1.90			
	4	Post graduation and above	102	5.01	1.30			
	5	Professional post graduation and above	30	5.28	1.00			

Note: D.V = dependent variables; f = frequency, WLB = work life balance; WIPL = work interference with personal life; PLIW = personal life interference with work; WE/PE = work/personal life enhancements.

Source: Primary data computed.

One way analysis of variance followed by Scheffe's test was conducted to confirm whether there were significant variations existing in the WLB and its dimensions (WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE) of the respondents in relation to their level of education (Table 1). The proposed null hypotheses were as follows.

H0 : 1. There is no significant difference in the mean WLB based on the level of education of respondents.

H0 : 2. There is no significant difference in the mean WIPL based on the level of education of respondents.

H0 : 3. There is no significant difference in the mean PLIW based on the level of education of respondents.

H0 : 4. There is no significant difference in the mean WE/PE based on the level of education of respondents.

In contrast to the proposed null hypotheses, it was found that WLB, WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE differed significantly among the five groups of respondents based on their level of education (Table 1). The WLB mean value of the below graduation group was 41.04 indicating

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

that they experienced maximum WLB among the respondents (Table 1, F=367.53, P<.05). The Scheffe's test confirmed that while there was no significant difference in the WLB of below graduation and graduation groups, they differed (Table 1) significantly from other groups. Regarding the WIPL maximum interference are experienced by professional post graduation, post graduation and above group (Table 5.16). On the other hand, below graduation and graduation groups experienced a significantly reduced WIPL when compared to those of the other groups (Table 5.16, F=390.60, P<.05). The Scheffe's test also confirmed that there were significant variations in the WIPL of below graduation and graduation groups in comparison to those of professional graduation, post graduation and above, and professional post graduation and above education level groups (Tabe.1).

PLIW mean values based on level of education of the respondents also followed the trend of WIPL with minimum for below graduation and graduation (Table 1) and maximum interferences among professional post graduation and above group followed by post graduation and above and professional graduation group (Table 5.16, F=1384, P<.001). Scheffe's test confirmed that group one and two differed significantly from the remaining groups (Table 1) in their PLIW. On the contrary, below graduation and graduation groups experienced maximum WE/PE than all other groups (Table 1). ANOVA test (F=403.75, P<.05) and Scheffe's test also confirmed that group one and two differed significantly from the remaining three groups in their WE/PE (Table 5.16) based on the level of education of the employees.

While Gunavathy (2009) is of the view that level of education is quiet independent of WLB and its dimensions, the present study has clearly demarketed that WLB and its dimensions are significantly impacted by the level of education of the respondents. Even though proper reasons are not given Sirajnisa (2009) has just mentioned that the level of education of respondents significantly influenced WLB and its dimensions among the women professionals. While studying alternate work schedules and (WLB), Tausig and Fenwick (2001) also reported that WLB is decreased with increase in the level of education. This finding is agreement with that of the present study. Similarly Mathew and Panchanatham (2010, 2011a,b) have also reported that in situations where subordinates or coworkers are under qualified, the supervisors and other co-workers have to work overtime to educate or

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

supervise the former leading to WLB issues. In contrast to the present investigation some studies investigating WIPL based on education level reported no significant differences between possession of different educational qualifications and experiencing WIPL (Pieterse and Mostert, 2005; Rost, 2006).

In contrast to the results of the present study Grzywacz and Marks (2000) also found that having a lower level of education was robustly associated with experiencing a lower level of positive spillover from work to home. Van Tonder (2005) and Marais and Mostert (2008) found that employees with higher level of education tended to experience more severe interference from WIPL, which is in agreement with the results of the present study. The report of Mostert and Oldfield (2009) that those employees with higher levels of education tended to experience significantly higher levels WIPL and PLIW also substantiate the present study.

CONCLUSION

Work life balance as achieving satisfying experiences in all life domains an individual and it was found from this study that WLB, WIPL, PLIW and WE/PE differed significantly among the five groups of service sector employees based on their level of education (Table 1). Level of education is quiet independent of WLB and its dimensions, the present study has clearly demarketed that WLB and its dimensions are significantly impacted by the level of education of the respondents. Those employees with higher levels of education tended to experience significantly higher levels WIPL and PLIW along with WE/PE.

REFERENCE

Blau, F. D., Ferber, M. A. & Winkler, A. E. (2002). *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work-life balance. *Human Relations*, *53*(6), 7470-7770

Dubin, R. (1956). 'Industrial workers' worlds: A study of the "central life interests" of industrial workers', *Social Problems, 5,* 138-42.

Howard, A. (1992). Work and family crossroads spanning the career. In: S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Work, families and organizations* (pp. 70-137). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

ISSN:0971-1260

Vol-22-Issue-10-November-2019

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kirchmeyer, C. (2000). Work-life initiatives: Greed or benevolence regarding workers' time? In: C. L. Cooper & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in organizational behavior* (pp. 79-93). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Lewis, S., Izraeli, D. N. & Hootsmans, H. (Eds.) (1992). *Dual-earner families: International perspectives*. London: Sage Publications

Mathew, R. V & Panchanatham, N. (2011a). Work-life balance challenges of indigenous health management employees in the medical tourism sector - Kerala-India. *Journal of Business Management and Accounting, 1*(1), 99-140.

Mathew, R. V & Panchanatham, N. (2011b). An exploratory study on work-life balance of women entrepreneurs in south india. *Asian Academy of Management Journal, 6*(2), 77-105.

Mathew, R. V. & Panchanatham, N. (2010). Development of a psychometric instrument to measure work life balance. *Continental Journal of Social Sciences, 3*, 50-58.

Near, J. P., Rice, R. W. & Hunt, R. G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: A review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 415-429.

Probert, B. (1989). *Working Life*. Ringwood: McPhee Gribble.

Tausig, M. & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding time: Alternative work schedules and worklife balance, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 22*(2), 101-119.

