

A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE AMONG WORKING WOMEN IN TIRUCHIRAPPALLI DISTRICT

V. P. T. DHEVIKA & O. T. V. LATASRI

Shrimati Indira Gandhi College Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

The main objectives of the study are to determine the factors affecting work-life balance and to find out the relationship between work-life balance and personal factors.. This study focuses on factors affecting the QWL of working women like stress, physical problem, relational problem, hangover, disturbed families decreased performance, physical problem and unethical practices. The sample consists of 150 respondents. Chi-square test, t-test and one-way ANNOVA were used to analyse the data.

KEYWORDS: Quality of Work Life, Working Women, Factors

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of globalization, the demands of workplace are ever-increasing and highly dynamic. Employees spend more time at the workplace rather than at home. Work-life balance can be defined as the perfect integration between work and life both not interfering with each other. In the current business world, people and organizations are working round the clock to meet the ever-growing demands. A slight delay in meeting the schedules or expectations is considered to be an organizational failure. To avoid delays and failures, employees are working hard and giving their heart and soul to achieve work-life balance which is creating an enormous pressure on them and hence they are forced to finish their jobs irrespective of time limit.

With the global labour market becoming highly competitive and companies outsourcing to reduce labour costs, employees feel compelled to put in longer hours to achieve, and preferably exceed, expectations to protect their jobs. As a result of this, the boundaries between work and home tend to get blurred. It is easy for work to invade the personal life making both work-life and personal life go out of balance. Thus, finding Work-Life Balance (WLB) in today's fast-paced world presents a major challenge to both employers and employees.

Statement of the Problem

The concept of work-life balance has gained considerable importance due to the demographic and sociological trends-changing employee perceptions of work, workforce diversity, changing role of men and women, and skill shortages. There has also been a considerable need felt for the introduction of the work-life practices by the organizations due to a shift in the interest of the employees from the extrinsic to intrinsic rewards. The demand for these practices is definitely increasing at an unprecedented rate.

With globalization being the buzzword, the employees are literally working 24*7 hours, particularly so in the BPOs, IT and other high-tech corporate, and this fact has steered the work-life balance issue into the forefront of the minds of many. The

growth in technology has also made the implementation of work-life balance practices much easier by making the work accessible, anytime and anywhere. The place and time of work is becoming more omnipresent as facilities like emails, voicemail, mobile phones and laptops have taken hold and have virtually made it possible for the employees to carry the work home. We are moving into a service-oriented economy that creates an ever-increasing demand and pressure on the workforce.

Though the work-life balance is an issue to be considered for both men and women, with the increasing participation of women workforce and with their domestic responsibilities towards child and elderly dependants, a major burden is placed on the employers' shoulders to take care of this section of the workforce. The working women are assuming more responsibilities than their male counterparts and with their participation in work increasing: there is a need for the organizations to come out with better work-life balance practices. This is one of the prime reasons why the organizations like IBM and Deloitte, the pioneering organizations in the work-life balance practices, introduced options like maternity leave, flexitime, and child-care facilities.

A trend which can be observed at the same point of time is the emergence of nuclear families and dual-career couples, which has made the focus of these practices been shifted to the men workforce as well. Interestingly, men are also talking about these issues in ways that were unimaginable less than 10 years ago and this is reflected in the way the companies are responding to their needs. Hence the study is made.

Objectives of the Study

- To determine the factors affecting work-life balance.

Hypothesis

- There is no significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.
- There is no significant difference between occupation of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.
- There is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.
- There is no significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.
- There is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Methodology

Pilot studies are conducted with a sample of 20 respondents. Both primary and secondary data are collected. Primary data are collected through questionnaire method and secondary data are collected through magazines, journal and internet. Convenient sampling methods are used based on the convenience of the respondents. Sample size consists of 150 respondents in Srirangam. Collected data are tabulated through SPSS and tools like t-test and f test are used in the study.

Table 1: Factors Influencing Quality of Work Life

| Particulars | No. of respondents (n=150) | Percentage (%) |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|
| 1.Stress | | |
| Low | 84 | 56.0 |
| High | 66 | 44.0 |
| <i>Mean: 7.06 / Median: 7.00 / S.D.: 1.453 / Min.: 3 / Max.: 9</i> | | |
| 2.Physical Problem | | |
| Low | 78 | 52.0 |
| High | 72 | 48.0 |
| <i>Mean: 19.52 / Median: 19.00 / S.D.: 6.871 / Min.:6 / Max.: 30</i> | | |
| 3.Relational Problem | | |
| Low | 63 | 42.0 |
| High | 87 | 58.0 |
| <i>Mean: 9.20 / Median: 10.00 / S.D.: 2.773 / Min.:3 / Max.: 15</i> | | |
| 4.Hangover | | |
| Low | 45 | 30.0 |
| High | 105 | 70.0 |
| <i>Mean: 8.74 / Median: 9.00 / S.D.: 1.859 / Min.:5 / Max.: 12</i> | | |
| 5.Unethical Practices | | |
| Low | 93 | 62.0 |
| High | 57 | 38.0 |
| <i>Mean: 4.38 / Median: 4.00 / S.D.: 1.701 / Min.:2 / Max.: 9</i> | | |
| 6.Disturbed Families | | |
| Low | 60 | 40.0 |
| High | 90 | 60.0 |
| <i>Mean: 5.88 / Median: 6.00 / S.D.: 1.687 / Min.:2 / Max.: 10</i> | | |
| 7.Decreased Performance | | |
| Low | 84 | 56.0 |
| High | 66 | 44.0 |
| <i>Mean: 42.80 / Median: 42.00 / S.D.: 5.683 / Min.:34 / Max.: 55</i> | | |
| Overall QWL | | |
| Low | 66 | 44.0 |
| High | 84 | 56.0 |
| <i>Mean: 97.58 / Median: 99.00 / S.D.: 12.521 / Min.:70 / Max.: 124</i> | | |

Table 1 shows that the most important factor influencing quality of work life is-“decreased performance” (mean = 42.80) followed by “physical problem”(mean=9.52) and “relational problem” (mean=9.20). The overall quality of work life is high with a mean value of 97.58

Table 2: T - Test Showing the Difference between Marital Status of the Respondents and Their Overall Quality of Work Life

| Marital Status | Mean | S.D | Statistical Inference |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|---|
| 1.Stress | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 7.11 | 1.225 | T=.690 Df=148 .491>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 6.93 | 1.930 | |
| 2.Physical Problem | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 19.72 | 6.663 | T=.577 Df=148 .565>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 19.00 | 7.438 | |
| 3.Relational Problem | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 9.53 | 2.856 | T=2.356 Df=148 .020<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 8.36 | 2.377 | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------|---|
| 4. Hangover | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 8.83 | 1.827 | T=986 Df=148 .326>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 8.50 | 1.941 | |
| 5. Unethical Practices | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 4.42 | 1.870 | T=.422 Df=148 .674>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 4.29 | 1.175 | |
| 6. Disturbed Families | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 6.17 | 1.732 | T=3.459 Df=148 .001<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 5.14 | 1.317 | |
| 7. Decreased Performance | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 43.89 | 5.971 | T=3.942 Df=148 .000<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 40.00 | 3.629 | |
| Overall QWL | | | |
| <i>Married (n=108)</i> | 99.67 | 12.407 | T=3.386 Df=148 .001<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Unmarried (n=42)</i> | 92.21 | 11.272 | |

Table-2 shows that there is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is less than table value (.001<0.05). So null hypothesis is rejected Table also shows that factors influencing QWL is high for married respondents than unmarried respondents.

There is a significant difference between marital status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Table 3: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Occupation of the Respondents and Their Overall Quality of Work Life

| Occupation | Mean | S.D | SS | Df | MS | Statistical Inference |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------|----------|-----|--------|--|
| .Stress | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 1.736 | 2 | .868 | F=.408 .666>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 7.15 | .779 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 7.06 | 1.501 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 6.67 | 2.784 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 312.724 | 147 | 2.127 | |
| .Physical Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 22.121 | 2 | 11.060 | F=.232 .793>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 19.62 | 4.875 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 19.02 | 7.206 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 18.00 | 10.392 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 7011.319 | 147 | 47.696 | |
| Relational Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 46.781 | 2 | 23.390 | F=3.128 .047<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 9.31 | 2.764 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 8.97 | 2.719 | | | | |
| <i>Others (n=9)</i> | 11.33 | 2.784 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 1099.219 | 147 | 7.478 | |
| .Hangover | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 3.376 | 2 | 1.688 | F=.485 .617>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 8.69 | 2.226 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 8.71 | 1.783 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 9.33 | .500 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 511.484 | 147 | 3.479 | |
| Unethical Practices | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 3.005 | 2 | 1.503 | F=.516 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----------|-----|---------|---|
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 4.23 | 2.071 | | | | .598>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 4.47 | 1.603 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 4.00 | .866 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 428.335 | 147 | 2.914 | |
| Disturbed Families | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 12.093 | 2 | 6.047 | F=2.159 .119>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 6.23 | 1.327 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 5.82 | 1.799 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 5.00 | 1.500 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 411.747 | 147 | 2.801 | |
| .Decreased Performance | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 84.455 | 2 | 42.227 | F=1.313 .272>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 41.54 | 5.529 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 43.26 | 5.565 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 43.00 | 7.399 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 4727.545 | 147 | 32.160 | |
| Overall QWL | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 37.411 | 2 | 18.706 | F=.118 .889>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Govt. Employee (n=39)</i> | 96.77 | 10.589 | | | | |
| <i>Private Employee (n=102)</i> | 97.91 | 13.691 | | | | |
| <i>Part-time employees (n=9)</i> | 97.33 | 4.000 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 23321.129 | 147 | 158.647 | |

Table-3 shows that there is no significant difference between occupation of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value ($p = .889 > 0.05$). So the null hypothesis accepted. Table also shows that for government employee, stress (mean=7.15), physical problem (mean=19.62) and disturbed families (mean=6.23) are high. Whereas unethical practices (mean=4.47) and decreased performance are high for private employees. Relational problem (mean=11.33) hangover (mean=9.33) are high for part-time employees.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Income of the Respondents and Their Overall Quality of Work Life

| Income | Mean | S.D | SS | Df | MS | Statistical Inference |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|-----|--------|--|
| Stress | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | .460 | 3 | .153 | F=.071 .975>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 7.00 | 1.530 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 7.08 | 1.461 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 7.00 | 1.532 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 7.13 | 1.378 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 314.000 | 146 | 2.151 | |
| Physical Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 35.842 | 3 | 11.947 | F=.249 .862>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 20.07 | 8.455 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 19.33 | 5.889 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 20.00 | 7.661 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 18.94 | 5.655 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 6997.598 | 146 | 47.929 | |
| .Relational Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 21.589 | 3 | 7.196 | F=.934 .426>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 8.93 | 2.278 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 9.00 | 2.414 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 8.88 | 3.768 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 9.75 | 2.847 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 1124.411 | 146 | 7.701 | |
| Hangover | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-----|---------|---|
| Between Groups | | | 3.476 | 3 | 1.159 | F=.331 .803>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 8.71 | 1.812 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 8.67 | 1.821 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 8.50 | 1.615 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 8.94 | 2.067 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 511.384 | 146 | 3.503 | |
| Unethical Practices | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 5.831 | 3 | 1.944 | F=.667 .574>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 4.21 | 1.279 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 4.67 | 1.724 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 4.13 | 1.650 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 4.44 | 2.020 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 425.509 | 146 | 2.914 | |
| Disturbed Families | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 23.644 | 3 | 7.881 | F=2.875 .038<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 5.29 | 1.852 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 5.92 | 1.273 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 6.38 | 2.163 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 6.13 | 1.424 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 400.196 | 146 | 2.741 | |
| Decreased Performance | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 439.054 | 3 | 146.351 | F=4.886 .003<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 41.21 | 4.902 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 43.17 | 5.824 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 46.38 | 5.686 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 42.13 | 5.568 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 4372.946 | 146 | 29.952 | |
| Overall QWL | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 520.942 | 3 | 173.647 | F=1.110 .347>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below Rs.5000 (n=42)</i> | 95.43 | 12.651 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.5001 to 10000 (n=36)</i> | 97.83 | 12.344 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.10001 to 15000 (n=24)</i> | 101.25 | 16.596 | | | | |
| <i>Rs.15001 & above (n=48)</i> | 97.44 | 9.901 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 22837.598 | 146 | 156.422 | |

Table -4 shows that there is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value ($p=.347>0.05$). So the null hypothesis is accepted. Table also shows that stress (mean=7.13), relational problem (9.75) and hangover (8.94) are high for the respondents earning an income of above 15000. Decreased performance (mean=6.38) and unethical practices (mean= 4.67) are high for the income group earning between 5001-10000

There is no significant difference between income of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Table 5: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Experience of the Respondents and Their Overall Quality of Work Life

| Experience | Mean | S.D | SS | Df | MS | Statistical Inference |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|---------|-----|--------|---|
| Stress | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 8.428 | 2 | 4.214 | F=2.024 .136>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 7.19 | 1.621 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 6.56 | 1.739 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 7.14 | .647 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 306.032 | 147 | 2.082 | |
| Physical Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 45.575 | 2 | 22.787 | F=.479 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-----|---------|--|
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 19.81 | 7.520 | | | | .620>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 20.00 | 6.373 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 18.64 | 5.859 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 6987.865 | 147 | 47.536 | |
| Relational Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 43.278 | 2 | 21.639 | F=2.885 .059<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 8.74 | 2.060 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 10.11 | 3.446 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 9.50 | 3.329 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 1102.722 | 147 | 7.502 | |
| Hangover | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 2.328 | 2 | 1.164 | F=.334 .717>0.05 Not Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 8.85 | 1.636 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 8.56 | 1.672 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 8.64 | 2.346 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 512.532 | 147 | 3.487 | |
| Unethical Practices | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 40.332 | 2 | 20.166 | F=7.581 .001<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 4.26 | 1.243 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 5.44 | 2.207 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 3.93 | 1.853 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 391.008 | 147 | 2.660 | |
| Disturbed families | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 22.388 | 2 | 11.194 | F=4.099 .019<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 5.56 | 1.696 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 6.56 | 1.450 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 6.07 | 1.688 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 401.452 | 147 | 2.731 | |
| Decreased Performance | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 801.968 | 2 | 400.984 | F=14.699 .000<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 42.04 | 5.515 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 47.67 | 5.218 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 41.14 | 4.604 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 4010.032 | 147 | 27.279 | |
| Overall QWL | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 1811.088 | 2 | 905.544 | F=6.178 .003<0.05 Significant |
| <i>Below 5yrs (n=81)</i> | 96.44 | 12.395 | | | | |
| <i>6 to 10yrs (n=27)</i> | 104.89 | 11.484 | | | | |
| <i>11yrs & above (n=42)</i> | 95.07 | 11.923 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 21547.452 | 147 | 146.581 | |

Table-5 shows that there is a significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is less than table value ($p=.003<0.05$). So the null hypothesis is rejected. Table also shows that Physical Problem (mean=20.00), Unethical Practices (mean=5.44), Disturbed families (mean=6.56) and decreased performance (mean=47.67) are high for respondents having an experience of between 6-10 years.

Stress (mean=7.19) and hangover (mean=8.85) are high for the respondents having an experience of below five years.

There is a significant difference between experience of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life.

Table 6: One-Way ANOVA Showing the Difference between Educational Qualification and Overall Quality of Work Life

| Educational Qualification | Mean | S.D | SS | Df | MS | Statistical Inference |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|-----|---------|---|
| 1.Stress | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 54.078 | 4 | 13.520 | F=7.529 .000<0.05 Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 6.75 | .866 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 6.33 | 1.847 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 7.74 | 1.027 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 6.84 | 1.544 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 5.50 | .548 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 260.382 | 145 | 1.796 | |
| 2.Physical Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 295.466 | 4 | 73.867 | F=1.590 .180>0.05 Not Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 18.00 | 8.863 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 16.17 | 9.269 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 19.84 | 5.240 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 20.42 | 6.533 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 21.00 | 9.859 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 6737.974 | 145 | 46.469 | |
| 3.Relational Problem | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 35.987 | 4 | 8.997 | F=1.175 .324>0.05 Not Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 10.25 | .866 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 8.83 | 2.995 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 8.74 | 2.595 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 9.47 | 3.197 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 10.00 | .000 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 1110.013 | 145 | 7.655 | |
| 4.Hangover | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 22.057 | 4 | 5.514 | F=1.623 .172>0.05 Not Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 9.75 | .866 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 8.33 | 1.847 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 8.95 | 1.777 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 8.47 | 2.105 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 8.50 | .548 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 492.803 | 145 | 3.399 | |
| 5.Unethical Practices | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 17.814 | 4 | 4.453 | F=1.562 .188>0.05 Not Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 4.50 | .905 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 4.00 | 1.029 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 4.63 | 1.829 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 4.37 | 1.858 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 3.00 | 1.095 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 413.526 | 145 | 2.852 | |
| 6.Disturbed Families | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 48.287 | 4 | 12.072 | F=4.661 .001<0.05 Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 6.00 | 1.044 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 4.50 | 1.757 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 6.00 | 1.464 | | | | |
| Professional (n=57) | 6.26 | 1.847 | | | | |
| Diploma / ITI (n=6) | 5.00 | .000 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 375.553 | 145 | 2.590 | |
| 7.Decreased Performance | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 704.908 | 4 | 176.227 | F=6.222 .000<0.05 Significant |
| HSC (n=12) | 38.75 | 4.070 | | | | |
| Under Graduate (n=18) | 43.83 | 5.491 | | | | |
| Post Graduate (n=57) | 40.95 | 4.470 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-----|---------|--|
| <i>Professional (n=57)</i> | 45.00 | 6.141 | | | | |
| <i>Diploma / ITI (n=6)</i> | 44.50 | 6.025 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 4107.092 | 145 | 28.325 | |
| Overall QWL | | | | | | |
| Between Groups | | | 1351.882 | 4 | 337.971 | |
| <i>HSC (n=12)</i> | 94.00 | 11.465 | | | | |
| <i>Under Graduate (n=18)</i> | 92.00 | 14.935 | | | | |
| <i>Post Graduate (n=57)</i> | 96.84 | 10.196 | | | | |
| <i>Professional (n=57)</i> | 100.84 | 13.151 | | | | |
| <i>Diploma / ITI (n=6)</i> | 97.50 | 15.884 | | | | |
| Within Groups | | | 22006.658 | 145 | 151.770 | |

F=2.227
.069>0.05
Not Significant

Table -6 shows that there is no significant difference between educational qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Work Life. The calculated value is greater than table value ($p=.069>0.05$). So the null hypothesis is accepted. Table also shows that stress (mean=7.74) and unethical practices (mean= 4.43) are high for post graduate holders. Relational problem (mean=10.25) and hangover (mean=9.75) are high for HSC holders. Whereas unethical practices (4.63), disturbed families (mean=6.26) and decreased performance (mean=45.00) are high for professional.

There is no significant difference between educational qualification and overall Quality of Work Life.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

- Stress level of working woman is low in the study which shows that working women are able to handle stress and are relaxed and can understand the problem.
- Yoga and Meditation can be followed to be both mentally and physically fit.
- Working women to spend time to look after the spouse, parents and children's
- Hangover is high for the working woman. Working for long hours in the office, increases employee interaction. So they tend to stay in their professional world though they are physically at home. Professional anger is carried to their personal life.
- Working women should balance both work place and personal issues.

Work and personal life conflict occurs when the burden, obligations and responsibilities of work and family roles become incompatible. Therefore, it is important for employees to maintain a healthy balance between personal and their professional lives. This will help them achieve their personal and professional goals as well the organization they are working for. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the modern organizations, especially educational institutions, should address the Work Life Balance related issues and problems among their staff, specifically women & take a holistic approach to design and implement policies to support the teaching staff to manage their work life balance which would add to the performance of these staff members.

Work-life balance is tool that companies need to use for increasing productivity and bringing out a balance in the work and individual life.

CONCLUSIONS

Work-life balance is an issue of great importance that has to be addressed by the organizations at the earliest. After all employees are the greatest asset and the organization performance is affected by employee performance. The HR

department of the organization and the employees together must work out strategies to help attain work-life balance which makes the organization the happiest place to work in.

An effective work-life balance is essential for ensuring high productivity in the corporate world. Companies need to focus on well-organized programs so as to bring a balance in the work and individual life. To cope with the coming changes, an organization should adopt a strategic approach. Proper planning is to be made to identify the tasks and the risk involved in achieving the desired goals. Further, programs are to be implemented as per the plans adopted. One should have the knowledge of basic elements which leads to better work-life balance. An organization should follow systematic process keeping in view the vision and mission for smooth flow of work-life balance. On the whole,

REFERENCES

1. Ford, R. (1973), Job Enrichment Lessons from AT&T. *Harvard Business Review*, 51(1), pp. 96-106.
2. Ballou, Brian and Dan Heitger, (2007) *Coordinating Risk Management and Performance Measurement*. A Bureau of National Affairs Research Portfolio. Monograph Forthcoming Fall 2007.
3. Hertz & Marshall, N.L. (2001), "Working Families: The Transformation of the American home", Berkeley, a: *University of California Press*.
4. Walton, R.E. (1975), "Criteria for Quality Work Life", *New York Press*
5. Roy, Rishu (1975), "Impact of Quality Work Life on Job Performance: A Study of Print Media Employees", *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, pp.26-32. Roy, Rishu (2006), "Quality of Work Life as Determinant of Mental Health – A Study of Print Media Employees", *SCMS journal of Indian Management*, April-June pp. 90-94.
6. Shamir, B. & Salomon, J. (1985), "Working at Home and Quality of Working Life," *Academy of Management*, Vol.10, pp.455-464.
7. Syeed and Shina (1981), "Measuring QWL in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Performance in Two Organization", *Managerial Psychology*, Vol.2, pp. 15-30.
8. Craig Demmer, (2002), "Stress and Satisfaction among Employees in AIDS Service Organization", in *New York, Evaluation and Health Professions*, Vol.25 (2), pp.225-235.
9. Peter L Cruise and Kuotsai Tom Liou (1994) Assessing Employee Attitudes in a Community-Based Aids Service Organization *September 1994 17: 273-289*,
10. A.K.M. Mominul Haque Talukder (2011), "A shifting paradigm of work life balance in service context – an empirical study", *Industrial journal of management and social sciences*, vol.5(1), pp.10-23.
11. Anna Beninger (2010), "women in Academia: A cross cultural prospective on work life balance", A research report, pp. 1-40.
12. A.G.V. Narayanan & R. Lakshmi Narayanan (2012), "An empirical study on factors affecting work life balance of IT professionals", *European Journal of Social sciences*, vol 31(3) , pp. 302-313.
13. Duxbury, L. (2004), "Dealing with work-life issues in the workplace: Standing still is not an option" The 2004

Don Wood Lecture in Industrial Relations.

14. Fisher, G.G. (2001), Work/Personal Life Balance: A Construct Development Study (Doctoral Dissertation, Bowling Green State University, USA), Retrieved February 7, 2008, from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No.3038411)
15. Haruko Noguchi (2009), "Do work life balance measures and work place flexibility matter? An empirical analysis for female reinstatement choice after the child birth", *The Japanese Journal of Social Security policy*, vol 8(1), pp 1-15.
16. Hill et al (2001) Final Results from the *Hubble Space Telescope* Key Project to Measure the Hubble Constant.
17. Rana Zehra Masood & Seema Mahalwat (2012), "Impact of demographic variables on the critical factors of work life balance: An empirical study", *Journal of organizational management*, vol 1(1), pp. 1-13.
18. Santha lakshmi. k & Dr. N. Santhosh kumar, "work life balance of women employees-with reference to teaching faculties", *e-proceedings for International research conference and colloquium*, pp. 202-211.
19. Suchet, M., & Barling, J. (1986). Employed mothers: Interrole conflict, spouse support and marital functioning. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, pp.7.167-178.
20. Zimmerman. T.S. (2003), "Intimate partnership: Foundation to the successful balance of family and work", *The American journal of family therapy*, vol 31(2), pp.107-124.
21. Mirvis, P.H and Lawler, E.E. (1984) Accounting for the Quality of work life. *Journal of occupational Behaviour* pp. 5.197-212
22. Baba, VV and Jamal. m (1991) Reutilization of job context and job content and job content as related to employees quality of working life: A study of Psychiatric nurses. *Journal of organizational behaviour* pp. 12.379 - 386
23. Ellis N & Pompli a (2002) Quality of working life for nurses. Common wealth Dept of Health and Ageing Canberra.
24. Sirgy et al.'s (2001) measure of community Quality of life misirgy and Terri Cornwell. *Social indicators Research*, Vol.2
25. Hackman J & Oldham G (1974). The Job Diagnostic Survey. *New Haven: Yale University*.

