

# A Study on Work Life Balance of Faculty Member with Reference to Chengalpattu District

**Nikitha Sencha.O<sup>1</sup>, S.Hemalatha<sup>2\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*M.Com. Student, Department of Commerce, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Padur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu*

<sup>2</sup>*Professor, Department of Commerce, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science, Padur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu*

*\*Corresponding Author Email: [hemalathas@hindustanuni.ac.in](mailto:hemalathas@hindustanuni.ac.in)*

## **Abstract**

*Work–life balance has become an important concern among faculty members due to increasing workload and professional responsibilities. The present study aims to analyse the factors influencing work–life balance among faculty members in Chengalpattu District. It also examines the level of satisfaction with working hours and workload, and identifies the challenges faced in maintaining balance between personal and professional life. The study is based on primary data collected through a structured questionnaire from faculty members. Statistical tools such as percentage analysis were used for interpretation. The findings reveal that long working hours, heavy workload, lack of institutional support, and work-related stress significantly affect work–life balance. The study concludes that improving institutional support and adopting flexible work policies can enhance faculty satisfaction and performance.*

*Keywords: Work–Life Balance, Faculty Members, Work Stress, Job Satisfaction, Workload*

## **Introduction**

Work–life balance has become an important topic in today’s fast-changing professional environment, especially in the field of education. Faculty members play a crucial role in shaping students’ future, but they often face challenges in managing their professional responsibilities along with personal life. Increasing academic workload, administrative duties, research expectations, and extended working hours have made it difficult for faculty members to maintain a healthy balance between work and personal commitments.

In higher education institutions, faculty members are not only responsible for teaching but also involved in activities such as student mentoring, curriculum development, examinations, and institutional responsibilities. These multiple roles increase pressure and can

lead to stress, reduced job satisfaction, and decreased performance if not managed properly. At the same time, personal responsibilities such as family care and social commitments also demand attention, making balance even more challenging.

Work–life balance is essential for the overall well-being of faculty members as it directly affects their mental health, job satisfaction, productivity, and quality of teaching. A proper balance helps individuals stay motivated, reduces stress, and improves both personal and professional life. On the other hand, poor balance can lead to burnout, dissatisfaction, and health-related issues.

In recent years, organizations and educational institutions have started recognizing the importance of supporting employees in achieving work–life balance. Providing flexible working hours, supportive work environments, and reducing excessive workload are some of the measures that can improve balance and enhance job performance.

This study focuses on analysing the work–life balance of faculty members in Chengalpattu District. It aims to identify the key factors affecting balance, examine the level of satisfaction with working conditions, understand the challenges faced, and suggest suitable measures to improve their overall well-being and professional effectiveness.

## Literature Review

**Kossek, E. E. & Ozeki, C. (1998)** examined the relationship between work–family conflict and job outcomes. Their study found that higher conflict leads to lower job satisfaction and increased stress levels. They emphasized the importance of organizational support in reducing imbalance. The study highlights how workplace flexibility can improve employee well-being.

**Burke, R. J. (2000)** analysed work–life balance among professionals and found that long working hours significantly affect personal life satisfaction. The study concluded that excessive workload leads to burnout and reduced productivity. It also stressed the need for better time management practices. Supportive work environments were found to improve balance.

**Aryee, S. *et al.* (1999)** studied the impact of work–family conflict on employees' performance and well-being. The findings revealed that conflict negatively influences both job and life satisfaction. The study highlighted the role of family support in managing stress. It also suggested that organizations should adopt family-friendly policies.

**Michel, J. S. et al. (2011)** conducted a meta-analysis on work–family conflict and enrichment. The study found that conflict reduces job satisfaction, while enrichment improves performance. It emphasized the dual nature of work–life interactions. Proper balance can lead to positive outcomes in both domains.

**Allen, T. D. (2001)** explored family-supportive work environments and their effects on employee outcomes. The study showed that supportive supervisors help reduce work–family conflict. Employees in supportive environments reported higher satisfaction. It also highlighted the importance of organizational culture.

**Thomas, L. T. & Ganster, D. C. (1995)** examined the role of family-supportive supervisors. Their findings indicated that support reduces stress and improves work–life balance. Employees experienced lower levels of burnout. The study emphasized managerial support as a key factor.

**Netemeyer, R. G. et al. (1996)** developed measures to assess work–family conflict. Their study confirmed that conflict significantly affects job satisfaction and performance. It also impacts mental health and overall well-being. The research is widely used in work–life balance studies.

**Byron, K. (2005)** conducted a meta-analysis on antecedents of work–family conflict. The study found that workload, role stress, and family demands are major contributors. It also showed gender differences in experiencing conflict. The study emphasized managing both work and family pressures.

**Wayne, J. H. et al. (2007)** examined work–family facilitation and its positive effects. The study found that supportive work environments improve job satisfaction. It highlighted the importance of balancing both domains. Positive spillover enhances overall well-being.

**Lapierre, L. M. & Allen, T. D. (2006)** studied work–family conflict across cultures. The findings showed that conflict negatively affects job and life satisfaction globally. It emphasized cultural differences in managing balance. Organizations must consider cultural aspects.

### **Objective of the Study**

- To analyse the factors influencing work–life balance of faculty members in Chengalpattu District.
- To study the level of satisfaction of faculty members with their working hours and workload.

- To examine the impact of work–life balance on job satisfaction and performance of faculty members.
- To identify the problems faced by faculty members in maintaining work–life balance.
- To suggest suitable measures to improve work–life balance among faculty members.

### **Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, the role of faculty members in higher education institutions has become more demanding and multifaceted. Apart from classroom teaching, faculty members are expected to engage in research activities, administrative duties, student mentoring, evaluation work, and participation in institutional development programs. These increasing responsibilities often extend beyond regular working hours and may interfere with their personal and family life.

In Chengalpattu District, the rapid growth of educational institutions and rising academic expectations have added further pressure on faculty members. Long working hours, heavy workload, technological demands, and family commitments may create difficulties in maintaining a proper balance between professional and personal life. When faculty members fail to achieve work–life balance, it may lead to stress, reduced job satisfaction, lower performance, and decreased overall well-being.

Although work–life balance has become an important issue in human resource management, limited research has been conducted specifically focusing on faculty members in Chengalpattu District. Therefore, there is a need to analyse the factors influencing work–life balance, examine the level of satisfaction with working hours and workload, identify the problems faced by faculty members, and understand how work–life balance affects their job satisfaction and performance. Hence, the present study attempts to address these issues and suggest suitable measures to improve work–life balance among faculty members in Chengalpattu District.

### **Research Design**

The study is empirical in nature, focusing on real-time data collected from respondents. Both primary and secondary data were used for the purpose of analysis. Primary data was collected through a well-structured questionnaire distributed among faculty members in Chengalpattu District. The questionnaire included relevant questions to understand factors affecting work–life balance, satisfaction levels, and related issues. Secondary data was gathered from journals, books, and previous research studies to support the analysis. A sample size of 147 respondents

was considered for the study. The sampling technique adopted was convenient sampling due to ease of access. Percentage analysis and simple statistical tools were used for interpreting the collected data and drawing meaningful conclusions.

### Analysis of Data and Interpretation

**Table 1: Classification Based on Gender**

Gender	Percentage	Approx. No. of Respondents
Male	54.4%	81
Female	45%	67
Other	0.6%	1
	100%	149

*Source: Primary Data*

The data shows that a majority of respondents are male, accounting for 54.4% (81 respondents). Female respondents make up 45% (67 respondents), indicating a slightly lower but still significant participation. The “Other” category represents a very small proportion with about 0.6% (1 respondent). Overall, the distribution suggests a fairly balanced representation of gender, though males slightly dominate the sample.

**Table 2: Classification Based on Age Group**

Age group	Percentage	Approx. No of Respondents
Below 30	61.5%	91
31-40	21.6%	32
41-50	11.5%	17
Above 50	5.4%	8
Total	100%	142

*Source: Primary Data*

The data shows that the majority of respondents (61.5%) are below 30 years, indicating strong participation from younger individuals. The age group 31–40 years contributes 21.6%, showing moderate representation. Respondents aged 41–50 years account for 11.5%, which is comparatively lower. Only 5.4% of respondents are above 50 years, making it the least

represented group. Overall, the sample is dominated by younger age groups, which may influence the study results.

**Table 3: Classification Based on Marital Status**

Marital status	Percentage	Approx. No. of Respondents
Married	40.5%	60
Unmarried	59.5%	88
Total	100	148

*Source: Primary Data*

The table shows the marital status of the respondents. A majority of the faculty members are unmarried, accounting for 59.5% (88 respondents), while 40.5% (60 respondents) are married. This indicates that a larger proportion of the sample consists of unmarried individuals. The higher number of unmarried respondents may influence the perception of work–life balance, as they may have fewer family responsibilities compared to married faculty. On the other hand, married respondents might experience more challenges in balancing personal and professional life. Hence, marital status plays an important role in analysing work–life balance among faculty members.

**Table 4: Classification of Spouse Employment**

Response	Percentage	Approx. No of Respondents
Yes	44.3%	62
No	55.7%	78
Total	100%	140

*Source: Primary Data*

The table presents the responses of faculty members to the given statement. It is observed that a majority of the respondents, 55.7% (78 respondents), have answered “No”, while 44.3% (62 respondents) have responded “Yes”. This indicates that more than half of the faculty members do not agree with the statement. The higher percentage of negative responses suggests a possible area of concern that needs attention. However, a considerable proportion has responded positively, showing mixed opinions among the respondents. Hence, the results reflect a divided perception among faculty members regarding the issue.

**Table 5: Classification of no. of children**

Children	Percentage	Approx. No of Respondent
Nil	57.6%	83
One	12.5%	18
Two	18.8%	27
More than two	11.1%	16
Total	100	144

**Source: Primary Data**

The table shows the number of children among the respondents. A majority of the faculty members, 57.6% (83 respondents), have no children. Among those with children, 12.5% (18 respondents) have one child, while 18.8% (27 respondents) have two children. A smaller proportion, 11.1% (16 respondents), have more than two children. This indicates that most respondents have fewer or no family responsibilities related to children. The variation in number of children may influence the work–life balance of faculty members, as those with more children may face greater challenges in managing both personal and professional responsibilities.

**Table 6: Classification Based on Type of Institution**

Type of institution	Percentage	Approx. No. of Respondents
Government	31.1%	46
Private	51.4%	76
Aided	17.6%	26
Total	100%	148

**Source: Primary Data**

The table shows the type of institution of the respondents. A majority of faculty members, 51.4% (76 respondents), are working in private institutions. This is followed by 31.1% (46 respondents) from government institutions, while 17.6% (26 respondents) belong to aided institutions. This indicates that private institution faculty form the largest group in the study. The type of

institution may influence work–life balance due to differences in workload, policies, and job security. Hence, institutional type plays a significant role in the analysis.

**Table 7: Classification Based on Income per Month**

Income level	Percentage	Approx. No. of Respondent
Below ₹20,000	35.4%	52
₹20,001–₹40,000	34%	50
₹40,001–₹60,000	19%	28
Above ₹60,000	11.6%	17
Total	100%	147

*Source: Primary Data*

The table presents the monthly income of respondents. A majority, 35.4% (52 respondents), earn below ₹20,000, closely followed by 34% (50 respondents) earning between ₹20,001–₹40,000. About 19% (28 respondents) earn ₹40,001–₹60,000, while only 11.6% (17 respondents) earn above ₹60,000. This indicates that most faculty members fall under lower to middle income groups. Income level can affect job satisfaction and work–life balance. Lower income may increase stress, impacting overall well-being and performance.

**Table 8: Classification Based On Respondents Opinion on Support from Institution**

Response	Percentage	Approx. No of Respondents
Strongly Disagree	13%	19
Disagree	15.1%	22
Neutral	34.9%	51
Agree	28.1%	41
Strongly agree	8.9%	13
Total	100%	146

*Source: Primary Data*

The table shows respondents' opinion on workload manageability. A majority, 34.9% (51 respondents), remain neutral. About 28.1% (41 respondents) agree that their workload is

manageable, while 15.1% (22 respondents) disagree. Additionally, 13% (19 respondents) strongly disagree and only 8.9% (13 respondents) strongly agree. This indicates mixed opinions among faculty members. A considerable number feel workload is not fully manageable, suggesting stress and pressure in their job roles.

**Table 9: Classification Based On Respondents Opinion on Support from Institution**

Response	Percentage	Approx. No of Respondents
Strongly Disagree	17.8%	26
Disagree	13%	19
Neutral	29.5%	43
Agree	30.8%	45
Strongly Agree	8.9%	13
Total	100%	146

**Source: Primary Data**

The table shows whether faculty receive institutional support for balancing work and personal life. About 30.8% (45 respondents) agree that they receive support, while 29.5% (43 respondents) remain neutral. However, 17.8% (26 respondents) strongly disagree and 13% (19 respondents) disagree. Only 8.9% (13 respondents) strongly agree. This indicates that while some support exists, many respondents feel it is insufficient. Institutional support is crucial for improving work–life balance.

### Findings

1. Workload, long working hours, and lack of institutional support are the major factors affecting work–life balance among faculty members.
2. Faculty members show moderate satisfaction with working hours, but many feel that workload disturbs their personal life.
3. Work–life balance has a positive impact on job satisfaction, motivation, and performance, while imbalance leads to stress and reduced efficiency.
4. The main problems include work-related stress, difficulty in managing personal and professional life, and lack of flexibility, indicating the need for better policies and support.
5. Faculty members prefer flexible work arrangements to improve balance.
6. Many respondents believe that work–life balance directly affects productivity.
7. There is a clear link between job satisfaction and work–life balance.

8. Overall, the study indicates that improving work conditions can enhance both personal well-being and professional performance.
9. Administrative workload adds to the overall pressure on faculty members.
10. A portion of respondents feel that institutional support is insufficient.

### **Suggestion**

- ❖ Institutions should introduce flexible working hours to help faculty manage personal and professional life effectively.
- ❖ The workload should be properly distributed among faculty members to avoid excessive pressure
- ❖ Management should reduce unnecessary administrative tasks assigned to faculty.
- ❖ Institutions must provide a supportive and friendly work environment.
- ❖ Proper leave policies should be implemented and encouraged.

### **Conclusion**

The study concludes that work–life balance is an important aspect affecting the well-being of faculty members in Chengalpattu District. It is observed that factors such as long working hours, heavy workload, and administrative responsibilities create imbalance. Many faculty members are not fully satisfied with their working hours and workload. This dissatisfaction leads to stress and affects their personal life and overall performance. Family responsibilities further add to the challenges of maintaining balance. The study also highlights that lack of flexibility and institutional support makes it difficult for faculty members to manage their roles effectively. Proper work–life balance is essential for improving job satisfaction and productivity. Institutions should focus on reducing workload and ensuring fair distribution of work. Providing flexible working hours can help faculty manage both personal and professional life. A supportive work environment is necessary for improving well-being. Overall, better work–life balance leads to improved performance, satisfaction, and quality of life.

### **References**

- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2000). Consequences associated with work–family conflict. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(2), 278–308.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work–life balance. *Human Relations*, 53(6), 747–770.

Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328.

## Author Biography



**Nikitha Sencha. O** is an entry-level commerce professional with enthusiasm and a growth mindset. She has completed her Bachelor's degree in B.Com (Computer Applications) and is currently pursuing a Master's degree in M.Com. She has a strong academic background with an interest in accounting, finance, and business management. She has gained practical exposure through an internship at Indian Overseas Bank (IOB), where she developed basic knowledge of banking operations and customer handling.

With a keen interest in the commerce field, she aspires to build a successful career in finance and accounting. She also has an interest in research-oriented work and enjoys exploring data, financial processes, and business-related insights. She is a hardworking, responsible, and enthusiastic fresher, eager to learn, contribute, and grow professionally in her chosen field.



**Dr.S.Hemalatha**, Professor, Department of Commerce has been serving as an educationist for the past 24 years. She obtained her Ph.D Degree from University of Madras. Her Doctoral research is about determinants enhancing Online Share Trading. Her qualification is M.com, M.B.A., M.Phil (Com), M.Phil (Management), Ph.D. She cleared National Eligibility Test for Lectureship in Commerce e in June 2006. She secured University second rank in M.Com. She has more than two decade of teaching experience in Commerce. She worked in various colleges, Universities and B School. Her Specialisations are Accounting, Finance, Banking, Law. She has participated, and presented almost 54 conferences (International, National and State level). She published more than 27 paper in several Journal (Scopus, Web of Science, peer reviewed, UGC Listed). She participated 62 workshop/FDP. She has undertaken Seed Money Project, Consultancy and Industry project. She was awarded as Preminent Educator Award (2019) by IRSD Green Thinker Z Society, Best Teacher Award (2019) by ESN Journal and Research Excellence Award (2023) by ASET Journal of Management Studies. She was awarded as Course Topper in NPTEL Exam. She is an External examiner / Doctoral Committee member of various other Universities. She is a member in various professional bodies like Indian Accounting Association. She has good experience in organising various Seminars, Conferences, Inter collegiate competitions, Exhibitions, Awareness campaign, Educational field trip, Faculty development programmes. She has experienced as a coordinators for several clubs and committees.