

## **MANAGING FACULTY'S WORK-LIFE BALANCE IN INDIAN BUSINESS SCHOOLS**

*Abstract.* This paper examines the impact of organisation, family and social support on how faculty members working in business schools in national capital region (NCR) of India manage their work-life balance. The study is based on a survey that mainly used quantitative methods to collect the primary data. The study sample consists of 482 faculty members who work in different business schools in NCR of India. Factor analysis, reliability, a t-test and Anova were used to determine the effect of organisation, family and social support on demographic variables. The findings reveal that male faculty members are better able to manage their work-life balance than their female counterparts. Family support plays an important role in times of stress. This paper will help business schools in India in updating their policies to provide better lives for their employees and ensure an improved work culture.

**Keywords:** *work-life balance, organisation culture, family support, social support and subordinate support*

### **Introduction**

Work-life balance is a buzzword in every organisation today. With the increasing number of working women in every sector of the economy, it is becoming challenging for women as well as men to balance their work and family obligations. The changing patterns of the market economy and the Indian societal structure have in the past three decades altered the activities of men and women with regard to income-generation and family responsibilities.

Changes in the social, economic and educational status of Indian women have led to their greater participation in the organised sector of the economy by way of providing significant additional workforce. However, the flip side of the development is there has been a rise in divorce rates, leading to a large number of single parents, with increased workforce mobility isolating them from social support given by the joint family and the promotion

---

\* *Parameswar Nayak, PhD, Professor, Director, BIMTECH, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India; Neeti Sharma, Research Scholar, MLSU, Udaipur, Rajasthan, India.*

of nuclear families. On the other hand, women's demands and expectations concerning the organisation of work have grown in recent years. The lengthening of working hours, work pressure, extended evening and weekend work have imposed limits on the fulfilment of family and other social needs. As a result, men have struggled to adjust to the new lifestyles and role reversal to help their spouses or to outsource people to support them with household work. This has created problems in maintaining a harmonious relationship between the work and life of working men and women.

Jeffery H. Greenhaus, Karen M. Collins and Jason D. Shaw (2003) explain work-life balance as being the capability to equally manage one's job roles and family life. He states it has three components:

1. time balance: a proper division of time between work and the family;
2. involvement balance: uniformly and mentally present in work and family roles; and
3. satisfaction balance: uniformly satisfied with the roles performed at home and at work.

Work-life balance entails establishing and maintaining equilibrium with flow and time, the flow of handling managing time through the use of technology and setting priorities in life. Campbell Sue Clark (2000) defines work-life balance as a level of contentment and obtaining an accomplished result at both home and work with minimum role conflict. Not maintaining a balance between work and life can lead to conflict, even burnout. It is also described as one's capability to handle commitments for work and life alongside non-work commitments (Parkes and Langford, 2008). These commitments can also extend beyond work and family, like time for hobbies, social activities etc. Work-life balance programmes are offered by companies to show that organisations do acknowledge the problems their employees face in trying to strike a balance between work and life (Lockwood, 2003). Work-life programmes are termed a win-win situation for both organisation and staff. Gary Adams, Linda A. King and Daniel W. King (1996) believe it is necessary for organisations to design new policies which enable their employees to improve as an individual and become a high-yielding employee for the organisation.

In a report by Department of Labour in 2004, management support is considered essential for both employers and employees to maintain a proper balance between work and life. The attitude of one's supervisor and manager can play a prominent role in an employee's development.

Work-life balance is associated with lowering stress, thereby supporting well-being. This relationship strengthens with the passage of time. This is indicated in a study by Tammy D. Allen, David E. L. Herst, Carly S. Bruck and Martha Sutton (2000).

## Literature review

### *Work life and organisational culture*

According to Ioan Lazăr, Codruța Osoian and Patricia Ratiu (2010), organisational culture is very important for designing programmes and practices to reduce work–life conflict which helps employees establish a work–life balance by effectively fulfilling their obligations in the workplace and in other roles. In a study by Daniel R. Denison (1996), organisational culture is regarded as how employees perceive the set of beliefs and conduct in the workplace. In a few studies, it is named the internal socio-psychological environment. Ronald J. Burke (2002) reveals that these days both women and men desire to work for organisations which have a proper work–life balance policy. The findings of a study by Tammy D. Allen (2001) indicate that if employees perceive the organisation does not support by providing a family-supportive environment, there is increase in work–life conflict and turnover intention, a decrease in the level of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and gender-based turnover intention.

### *Organisation and supervisor support*

Allen (2001) states that an organisation with supportive supervisors and manages will probably help strengthen the employees' awareness which may result in increasing the employees' potential to manage the conflicts between work and family. Jeff Hyman and Juliette Summers (2004) assert that organisations with work–life balance strategies that cover flexible work arrangements, child and dependent care, family and paternal leave reveal the well-being associated with the provision of a work–life balance. Linda Thiede Thomas and Daniel C. Ganster (1995) add that if, supervisors support their employees, there are fewer chances of work–family conflict. Employees who find their bosses helpful are less stressed at work, leading to lower work–family conflict.

### *Working hours*

Research by B. Bharat (2008) shows that the normal pattern of working hours in India is 9 am to 5 pm, but is now changing. Michael R. Frone, John K. Yardley and Karen S. Markel (1997) and Saroj Parasuraman, Veronica M. Godshalk and Nicholas J. Beutell reveal that an organisation increasing its working hours can interfere with family responsibility. According to Liz Doherty and Simonetta Manfredi (2006), work–life balance and flexibility in supporting employees is related to the study of equal opportunities or diversity management.

### *Flexible working and child care*

In a study of a childcare centre by Ellen Ernst Kossek and Victor Nichol (1992), a positive relationship between managing work and the family was found with onsite childcare centres provided by the organisation. According to Tinuke Fapohunda (2014), onsite childcare centres help in raising output and motivating employees. Such programmes are helpful for working parents as they bolster job satisfaction. Similarly, employees can focus on non-work requirements, even without taking leave, if a flexi-time (non-work support) option is provided to them by the organisation. Another study by David B. Greenberger et al. (1989) showed that friendly support at work which includes flexibility, supervisor support and colleagues' support directly relate to less leave being taken for non-work activity.

### *Work life and role of the family and society*

Thomas and Ganster (1995), Greenberger, Stephen Strasser, Larry L. Cummings and Randall B. Dunham (1989) and Adams, King and King (1996) suggest that the stress caused by work-family conflicts can be reduced in a family-friendly environment. In a study by Laurent M. Lapierre and Tammy D. Allen (2006), an indirect relationship is shown between employees' well-being and family-supportive supervision. This helps strengthen the potential of family supportive supervision. Very little literature on such social support has been available. According to Adams, King and King (1996), the concept has room to develop and can be met by organisations as well as non-work sources. This support can be any type, either emotional support which includes understanding one's problem and providing sympathy or instrumental support in the form of physically providing help to solve a problem (Beehr and McGrath, 1992; Kaufmann and Beehr, 1986 and McIntosh, 1991).

Adams, King and King (1996) contended that support from the family, friends and society is directly related to the health and well-being of the employee. One study by Allen (2001) reveals that family-friendly benefits can assist in accomplishing and managing multiple work and non-work tasks. This can help in balancing career and family. Another study by Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1986) suggests that social support can lower work stress as it is one method of handling work stress.

This study covers three distinct components of organisational culture determined from the above-mentioned literature: flexible working (support for non-work activities), colleagues'/peers' support (to make the environment friendlier) and facilities relating to childcare. It is probable that to some extent these items are interdependent as they indicate an understanding of organisational culture for work and the families of employees.

Second, this study covers the special role of the family for enhancing the work-life balance. The focus is on how support from family members and society may support the contentment and reduce the stress of members of faculty of business schools in national capital region (NCR) of India for which no research has previously been conducted. Most of the earlier studies examined the level of job satisfaction and work-family conflict. Very few studies considered the system of support. The research work presented in this paper adds to the literature on the work-life balance of faculty members of business schools in India.

### *Objectives*

This article aims to understand how faculty members of business schools in NCR of India perceive the organisation, family and social support they receive in terms of maintaining a work-life balance.

The specific objectives of the study are to:

- (1) measure the work-life balance of members of faculty of business schools; and
- (2) analyse the effects of work-life balance issues on male and female faculty members.

### *Research methodology*

This paper is based on primary data collected through a survey using a structured questionnaire. The study is quantitative in nature as that helps in comparing and contrasting the results. A quantitative approach enables a relationship to be developed between the independent and dependent variables. The gender, marital status, family structure and job profile of the respondents are the independent variables, while organisational culture, family and social support are the dependent variables.

### *Research instrument*

A self-regulated structured questionnaire was prepared with the aim to collect data to determine the level of organisational, family and social support provided to the faculty of business schools in NCR for establishing a work-life balance. The questionnaire was divided into three constructs: demographic characteristics, organisational culture, and family and social support. A 5-point Likert scale was used, with 1 meaning "Strongly disagree", 2 "Disagree", 3 "Undecided", 4 "Agree" and 5 "Strongly agree". The variables considered in the work domain are organisational policies, organisational culture and the support of subordinates. The variables in the life domain include spouse support and social support.

### *The respondents*

Members of faculty working in the positions of assistant professor, associate professor and professor in business schools in the NCR of India were the study respondents. The criteria for selecting the respondents were: a) a faculty member who is a full-time employee of the business school; b) a minimum 2 years' experience with the business school(s); and c) being willing to complete the survey.

### *Sampling*

The population for the study comprises 3,017 faculty members working in 169 business schools in NCR approved by the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), a statutory body and the national-level council for technical education within the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India (as per the AICTE database for 2015–2016). The NCR included Delhi, places of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, and Rajasthan. The population of business school faculty from Delhi was 465, in Haryana it was 876, in Uttar Pradesh 1,638 and in Rajasthan 5. The cluster sampling technique was used in order to ensure geographical representation of the respondents from each of these sub-regions or clusters. A sample of 52 of 169 business schools (30.8%) was chosen from all of these clusters as per the technique of Joe F. Hair, William C. Black, Barry J. Babin and Rolph E. Anderson (2006) and a number of sample faculty from these business schools was determined using the Cochran sample size formula (i.e. sample size,  $n = [(t)^2 * (p)(q) / (d)^2]$ ). Thus, according to this formula the minimum sample size =  $\{(1.96)^2 (.5)^2 / (.05)^2\} = 384$ , where  $t = 1.96$  is the value of alpha,  $(p)(q) =$  estimate of variance = .25, and  $d =$  the acceptable margin of error for the mean}. However, a slightly larger sample, i.e. 500, was taken due to the possibility of some respondents being rejected on the grounds of incomplete data. The sample respondents were divided into male and female faculty members - 300 (60%) male and 200 (40%) female faculty members with the same male-female ratio of faculty in the population. A random sampling technique was applied to this population so that each member from both male and female groups had an equal opportunity to participate in the survey. After scrutinising all the questionnaires received, data collected from 482 respondents (282 males and 200 females) were found to be complete in all respects was hence used for analysis. Of these, 312 (64.73%) are assistant professors, 102 (21.16%) are associate professors and 68 (14.11%) are professors.

### *Measures and data analysis*

The instrument with an 11-item scale for measuring work–life balance developed by Thompson et al. (1999) was used. Each of the 11 items was evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly agree. Demographic characteristics include age, marital status, family structure and job title. Organisational culture comprises six items, the first three items regard a colleague’s role in maintaining the culture of the organisation and the next three items include ‘extended working hours’, i.e. working more than 48 hours a week, support for non-work commitment and the lack of childcare programmes. Family and social support was measured with five items selected with reference to the research studies by Carolyn E. Cutrona and Daniel Wayne Russel (1987). Sample items included “My spouse/family supports me at times of stress in my job”, “My family/spouse recognises and celebrates my job-related successes”, “There are other people I can depend on for help if I really need it”, “There is no one I can turn to for guidance in times of stress” and “There are people who depend on me for help”.

Demographic variables are analysed and presented in percentage terms. The factor analysis was made using the SPSS reliability test. Descriptive statistics are presented on sub-scales derived from a factor. An independent t-test and Anova measured the relationship between the variables.

### **Analysis and interpretation**

#### *Respondents’ profile*

Of the 482 respondents, 282 (58.5%) were male and 200 (41.5%) were female. With regard to marital status, 398 (82.57%) were married and 84 (17.43%) were unmarried; 160 (33.2%) belonged to a joint family (i.e. an undivided or extended family arrangement prevalent in India, consisting of many generations living in the same household, all bound by the common relationship) and 322 (66.8%) were from nuclear families. Table 1 presented in the appendix shows the distribution of the respondents based on demographic characteristics such as gender, marital status, family structure and job title.

Table 1: PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS

		Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	282	58.5
	Female	200	41.5
Marital Status	Married	398	82.57
	Unmarried	84	17.43
Family Structure	Joint	160	33.2
	Nuclear	322	66.8
Job title	Assistant Professor	312	64.73
	Associate Professor	102	21.16
	Professor	68	14.11

Source: Authors' survey data.

Table 2: KMO AND BARTLETT'S TEST

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.633
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1.0743
	Df	55
	Sig.	.000

Source: Authors' survey data.

### Factor analysis

Factor analysis was performed to identify the validity of the independent variables. To test the sampling efficacy of the data for the factor analysis, KMO and Bartlett's test was conducted. The value of KMO is .633 (Table 2), which is greater than 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974) that is recommended for acceptance in factor analysis.

The factor analysis was made using SPSS to explore the construct validity of the 11 work-life balance items. To examine the relationship between the variables, a rotated component matrix was measured. The result signified in the rotated component matrix that from the 11 variables 5 subscales were obtained, as shown in Table 3, ranging from .41 to .89, and were considered for subscales. The following five newly identified subscales were operationalised according to their common characteristic:

- (1) *Colleagues' Support (CS)*: including variables like discussing problems with colleagues, taking sound advice, celebrating family-related success;
- (2) *Family Support (FS)*: involving items like family support in the case of a stressful situation and the family celebrating job-related success;
- (3) *Organisational Support (OS)*: embracing support for non-work commitments and childcare facilities;



(4) *Social Support (SS)*: including the kind of help and support extended by others in the neighbourhood or community; and

(5) *Untended Support (US)*: This was an eye-opening factor. Such factors were neglected in the system of support for maintaining a proper work-life balance and need to be focused on. They include variables like extended working hours and the times when there is no one for help when needed.

Table 3: ROTATED COMPONENT MATRIX

	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Colleagues give advice	.892	.023	.061	.040	.081
Discuss prob colleagues	.880	-.060	.053	.001	.117
Colleagues celeb	.723	.169	.093	.123	-.194
Family celeb success	.059	.877	.087	.012	.014
Family support in stress	-.011	.872	.111	.068	.035
Childcaring	.035	.013	.827	.025	.151
Non-work commitments	.177	.173	.730	.074	-.254
People seek help	-.007	-.055	.028	.840	.103
Socially depend on help	.130	.175	.052	.725	-.150
Extended working hours	.096	.086	-.076	.021	.882
No one for help	-.194	-.411	.256	-.191	.416

Source: Authors' survey data.

The internal consistency of the scale was checked for its reliability. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to examine the reliability of the sub-scales or the newly formed factors. The reliability of subscale (1) - Colleagues' support (CS) was measured as .868, for subscale (2) - Family support (FS) it was .984, for subscale (3) - Organisational support (OS) it was .732, for subscale (4) - Social support (SS) it was .780 and for subscale (5) - Untended support (US) it was .830, which is acceptable as the coefficient alpha is greater than .07 (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4: RELIABILITY AND DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SUB-SCALES

Statistics	Subscales				
	CS	FS	OS	SS	US
No. of items	3	2	2	2	2
Mean	8.36	8.58	4.30	7.09	5.65
Standard deviation	2.98	1.16	1.99	1.61	1.85
Cronbach alpha	.868	.984	.732	.780	.830

Source: Authors' survey data.

Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for the subscales derived from the factor analysis which shows that it is the family (mean value of 8.58) that provides support at times of stress, followed by colleagues (mean value of 8.36) who help and give advice to maintain work–life balance and then social support (mean value of 7.09) which involves friends and neighbours who seek and render help. The untended support (mean value of 5.65) is what faculty members sought but failed to obtain. Finally, the organisational culture (mean value of 4.30) was found to be the least supportive in maintaining a work–life balance.

*Analysis of the subscales*

To analyse the work–life balance issues facing faculty members using the demographic parameters, an independent t-test and Anova were used. The dependent variables included Colleagues’ support (CS), Family support (FS), Organisational support (OS), Social support (SS) and Untended support (US). Gender, marital status, family structure and job profile were the independent variables.

Table 5: INDEPENDENT T-TEST ON GENDER

	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Colleagues support	male	282	8.11	2.97	-2.149	.032
	female	200	8.70	2.98		
Family support	male	282	8.65	1.54	1.28	.202
	female	200	8.46	1.72		
Org support	male	282	4.49	2.06	2.45	.015
	female	200	4.04	1.87		
Social support	male	282	7.29	1.56	3.18	.002
	female	200	6.82	1.65		
Untended support	male	282	5.67	1.91	.185	.853
	female	200	5.64	1.76		

Source: Authors’ survey data.

As shown in Table 5, the results of the independent t-test on gender show that in some cases like colleagues’ support, family support and social support ( $p < .05$ ) for male and female faculty members there is no significant difference between gender and work–life balance. Whereas in the case of untended support, the level ( $p > .05$ ) indicates a significant difference. The perception of male faculty of their family members being supportive and helpful in times of stress is better than of their female counterparts (mean for males 8.65 vs 8.46 for females). A similar perception of male faculty was found in OS (mean for males 4.49 vs 4.04 for females), SS (mean

for males 7.29 vs 6.82 for females) and US (mean for males 5.67 vs 5.64 for females), which reveals that male faculty members had more support in every aspect as their mean score was higher for family, organisational, social and untended support, except colleagues' support for which female faculty members had a higher mean.

While applying the independent t-test on work-life balance issues and marital status, the results revealed no significant difference between the perception of married and unmarried respondents on all sub-scales (CS, FS, OS, SS, US) at  $p > .05$  (as per Table 6). Married respondents (mean value of 8.37) perceive that their colleagues are more supportive than the unmarried (mean value of 8.29) respondents. There was no significant difference between family support for married and unmarried faculty members. Married (mean value of 8.64) respondents agreed more than unmarried (mean of 8.29) respondents. In the case of organisational support, more unmarried (mean value of 4.52) respondents perceived favourable assistance than married (mean value of 4.26) respondents. In the case of social support, both had same perception as their mean value is same. Regarding untended support, it was revealed that unmarried respondents (mean value of 5.75) agreed more than married ones (5.63).

*Table 6: INDEPENDENT T-TEST ON MARITAL STATUS*

	Marital	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Colleagues support	Married	398	8.37	3.01	.247	.805
	Single	84	8.29	2.92		
Family support	Married	398	8.64	1.51	1.743	.082
	Single	84	8.29	2.03		
Org support	Married	398	4.26	1.98	-1.119	.264
	Single	84	4.52	2.05		
Social support	Married	398	7.09	1.65	-0.73	.942
	Single	84	7.10	1.46		
Untended support	Married	398	5.63	1.89	-.525	.600
	Single	84	5.75	1.63		

Source: Authors' survey data.

In the independent test on work-life issues and family structure, no significant difference was found in the perception of respondents from joint and nuclear families as the p value is  $> .05$  for all (CS, FS, OS, SS, US as shown in Table 7). When comparing respondents from nuclear and joint families, most of them living in a joint family (mean value 8.43) agreed that colleagues offer support in times of stress contrary to those living in a nuclear family (mean value 8.32). Similarity was found in the perceptions of respondents from both joint and nuclear families (mean value 8.46 in the

case of both) as regards obtaining favourable support from family members. Meanwhile, nuclear-family (mean value 4.36) respondents agreed they obtain more organisational support than from the joint family (mean value 4.18) respondents. For the remaining two variables, again respondents from the joint family agreed there was favourable social support (mean value 7.12) and untended support (mean value 5.75). The overall result indicates that respondents living in the joint family found a more supportive environment for maintaining a work-life balance.

Table 7: INDEPENDENT T-TEST ON FAMILY STRUCTURE

	Family structure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	Sig
Colleagues support	nuclear	322	8.32	2.83	-.374	.708
	joint	160	8.43	3.29		
Family support	nuclear	322	8.63	1.62	1.093	.275
	joint	160	8.46	1.61		
Org support	nuclear	322	4.36	2.02	.994	.321
	joint	160	4.18	1.93		
Social support	nuclear	322	7.08	1.64	-.283	.777
	joint	160	7.12	1.57		
Untended support	nuclear	322	5.60	1.88	-.807	.420
	joint	160	5.75	1.79		

Source: Authors' survey data.

The results for the descriptive statistics (Table 8) and ANOVA (Table 9) reveal that at  $p > .05$  and  $f = 1.82$  there is no significant difference in the perceptions of assistant professor, associate professor and professor in terms of colleagues' support. The findings show that the professors' (mean score 7.78) responses were biased towards the support colleagues provided to the assistant professors (mean score 8.52) and associate professors (mean score 8.25). Meanwhile, in the case of family support the ANOVA results ( $f = 3.13$  and  $p < .05$ ) indicate a significant difference in the perceptions of the professors (mean value 9.03), assistant professors (mean score 8.51) and associate professors (mean score 8.48). The professors' responses are more favourable for family support than those of the assistant and associate professors.

The ANOVA test results ( $f = .32$  and  $p > .05$ ) show no significant difference in the perceptions of the assistant professors, associate professors and professors in terms of organisational support. The professors (mean value 4.37) are found to have received more favourable assistance from their organisations than the assistant professors (mean score of 4.25) and associate professors (mean score 4.42).

Table 8: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON JOB TITLE

	Job Title	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Colleagues support	Assistant Professor	312	8.52	3.01
	Associate Professor	102	8.25	2.84
	Professor	68	7.78	3.05
	Total	482	8.36	2.99
Family support	Assistant Professor	312	8.51	1.63
	Associate Professor	102	8.48	1.76
	Professor	68	9.03	1.27
	Total	482	8.58	1.62
Org support	Assistant Professor	312	4.25	2.02
	Associate Professor	102	4.42	1.85
	Professor	68	4.37	2.07
	Total	482	4.31	1.99
Social support	Assistant Professor	312	7.04	1.50
	Associate Professor	102	7.25	1.72
	Professor	68	7.12	1.92
	Total	482	7.10	1.62
Untended support	Assistant Professor	312	5.65	1.76
	Associate Professor	102	5.48	1.95
	Professor	68	5.91	2.09
	Total	482	5.65	1.85

Source: Authors' survey data.

Table 9: ANOVA TEST RESULTS

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Colleagues support	Between Groups	32.500	2	16.250	1.826	.162
	Within Groups	4262.407	479	8.899		
	Total	4294.907	481			
Family support	Between Groups	16.287	2	8.143	3.137	.044
	Within Groups	1243.373	479	2.596		
	Total	1259.660	481			
Org support	Between Groups	2.595	2	1.297	.326	.722
	Within Groups	1905.181	479	3.977		
	Total	1907.776	481			
Social support	Between Groups	3.640	2	1.820	.696	.499
	Within Groups	1251.970	479	2.614		
	Total	1255.610	481			
Untended support	Between Groups	7.592	2	3.796	1.109	.331
	Within Groups	1639.547	479	3.423		
	Total	1647.139	481			

Source: Authors' survey data.

While there is no significant difference (at  $f = .696$  and  $p > .05$ ) in the perceptions of the assistant professors (mean score 7.04), associate professors (mean score 7.25) and professors (mean score 7.12) as regards social support, the associate professors were found to have received greater support from society in maintaining a work-life balance. Similarly, there is no significant difference ( $f = 1.109$  and  $p > .05$ ) in the perceptions of the assistant professors (mean value 5.65), associate professors (mean value 5.48) and professors (mean value 5.91) regarding untended support. The professors suggest that more action is required with respect to untended support. The overall results indicate the professors were receiving more support from the family and organisation than the assistant professors and associate professors.

## **Discussion**

The study was designed to examine the perceptions of faculty members of business schools in NCR of India regarding the system of support offered by the organisation, family and society to help manage the work-life balance. Factor analysis framed five sub-factors, i.e. Colleagues' support (CS), Family support (FS), Organisational support (OS), Social support (SS) and Untended support (US). Gender, marital status, family structure and job profile were the independent variables. The dimensionalities of the scale and reliability aspects are understood through factor analysis. Further, a comparative analysis was made by using a t-test and ANOVA on the subscales of work-life balance. A new and eye-opening subscale of 'untended support', that needs to be considered for the betterment of faculty working in business schools, emerged from the factor analysis. It includes variables like extended working hours and situations when there is no one available for help needed. Such factors are often neglected in the support system for maintaining a proper work-life balance.

The descriptive statistics strongly indicate the family is the most supportive factor in balancing work and life of business school faculty members in NCR in India. Organisations need to formulate better policies to promote an improved work-life balance among their employees, as it currently scores lowest. However, there are anecdotal stories showing state work and family programmes lacking cultural support do not work well (Hammonds, 1997). After family support, support of one's colleagues and supervisors is found to be the second highest variable for balancing work and life, especially for female faculty, those who are professors, those living in extended families and married faculty.

As revealed through the t-test for making a comparison with respect to gender aspects, a significant difference was found in the male and female

perceptions with regard to factors like colleagues' support (CS), organisational support (OS) and social support (SS), whereas there was no significant difference for family support (FS) and untended support (US). Quite similar to the findings of a few previous studies (Burke, 2002; Noor, 2003; Cinamon, 2006; Burk and Kot, 2011; Sharma and Nayak, 2016), this study points, with a high mean score, to the better work-life balance of male members of faculty than the female members. Although the family was found to be supportive of both male and female faculty at times of stress, there is a need for the organisations to work on policies to promote flexi-work hours, support for social and personal commitments, and better relationships with colleagues. These findings are similar to those in the study by Allen (2001).

This study finds no significant difference in the perceptions of married and unmarried faculty in contrast with previous studies (Thomas et al., 1999; Hammonds, 1997) which state that single respondents can more easily balance their work and life than married ones. When it comes to family structure, faculty who live in a joint family can more easily manage work and life than those living in a nuclear family. The ANOVA results indicate that, except in the case of family support, there is no significant difference in the perceptions of assistant professors, associate professors and professors. Professors are found to be better at managing work and life than either the assistant professors or associate professors. The main reasons for this difference include the longer experience held by the professors and the lower dependence of their grown-up children on them than their younger faculty colleagues.

Thus, this study had a special focus on the factors of that support system that may balance the work and life of business school faculty members. Not much research work has been done on this aspect of the work-life balance (Adams et al., 1996).

## **Conclusion**

This research adds to the literature by extending the improved perception of faculty members of Indian business schools regarding the work-life balance. A better understanding is developed between various demographic factors and the support system offered to establish a work-life balance. The study advances research on the factors related to the support system. The article discusses in depth five factors of the support system for the work-life balance of business school faculty, viz. colleagues' support (CS), family support (FS), organisational support (OS), social support (SS) and a new factor 'untended support' (US). Among these factors, the role of the family dominates other factors when it comes to balancing work and life. The study shows a significant relationship between male and female faculty on

the factors related to colleagues' support, organisation support and social support. Considering the significant positive association of all three factors with gender, the organisations can try to enhance the quality of their faculty by improving the work-family benefits. The study suggests that male faculty members of business schools can more easily embrace the work-life relationship with family support than their female counterparts. The new factor 'untended support' could be an area for further research. The faculty members' marital status and family system show a non-significant relationship with all five factors.

The study reveals that professors were better at managing their work and life than the assistant professors as well as the associate professors. Those faculty who are in senior positions like professors receive more support from their family, organisation and society in managing their work-life balance. The results indicate that the family, society and colleagues of Indian business school faculty members act favourably to help establish a balance between work and life and to avoid conflict. The study also indicates there is need for business schools to devise and implement good strategies and policies for favourable organisational support to improve the work-life balance of their faculty members. The article also highlights the importance of assessing the impact of the support system on various demographic factors as part of helping manage the work and life of members of faculty at Indian business schools.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Gary, Linda A. King and Daniel W. King (1996): Relationship of Job and Family Involvement, Family Social Support, and Work-Family Conflict with Job and Life Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81 (4): 411-420.
- Allen, Tammy D. (2001): Family-supportive Work Environments: The Role of Organizational Perceptions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 58 (3): 414-435.
- Allen, Tammy D., David E. L. Herst, Carly S. Bruck and Martha Sutton (2000): Consequences Associated with Work-to-Family Conflict: A Review and Agenda for Future Research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5 (1): 119.
- Beehr, Terry A. and Joseph E. McGrath (1992): Social Support, Occupational Stress and Anxiety. *Anxiety Stress, and Coping* 5 (1): 119.
- Bharat, B. (2008): Longer Working Hours for Computer Software Engineers, India. Accessible at <http://www.saching.com/Article/Longer-working-hours-for-Computer-Software-Engineers-India/1088>.
- Burke, Ronald J. (2002): Organizational Values, Job Experiences and Satisfaction Among Managerial and Professional Women and Men: Advantage Men? *Women in Management Review* 17 (5): 5-6.
- Burke J. Ronald and Kot EI Ghada (2011): Gender Similarities in Work and Well-Being Outcomes Among Managers and Professionals in Egypt. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 3 (1): 56-74.



- Cinamon, Gali Rachel (2006): Anticipated Work-family Conflict: Effects of Gender, Self-Efficacy and Family Background. *The Career Development* 54 (3): 202–215.
- Clark, Campbell Sue (2000): Work/Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work/Family Balance. *Human Relation* 53 (6): 747–770.
- Cutrona, Carolyn E. and Daniel Wayne Russel (1987): The Provisions of Social Relationships and Adaptation to Stress. *Advances in Personal Relationships* 1 (1): 37–67.
- Denison, Daniel R. (1996): What is the Difference Between Organizational Culture and Organizational Climate? A Native's Point of View on a Decade of Paradigm Wars. *Academy of Management Review* 21 (3): 619–654.
- Doherty, Liz and Simonetta Manfredi (2006): Action Research to Develop Work-life Balance in a UK University. *Women in Management Review* 21 (3): 241–259.
- Fapohunda, Tinueke (2014): An Exploration of the Effects of Work Life Balance on Productivity. *Journal of Human Resource Management and Labour Studies* 2 (2): 71–89.
- Frone, Michael R., John K. Yardley and Karen S. Markel (1997): Developing and Testing an Integrative Model of the Work Family Interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 50 (2):145–167.
- Greenberger, B. David, Stephen Strasser, Larry L. Cummings and Randall B. Dunham (1989): The Impact of Personal Control on Performance and Satisfaction. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 43 (1): 29–51.
- Greenhaus, Jeffery H., Karen M. Collins and Jason D. Shaw (2003): The Relationship Between work-Life Balance and Quality of Life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 63: 510–531.
- Hair, Joe F., William C. Black, Barry J. Babin, Rolph E. Anderson (2010): *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hammonds, Keith H. (1997): Work and Family: Business Week's Second Survey of Family-Friendly Corporate Policies. *Business Week* (96–99): 102–104.
- Hyman, Jeff and Juliette Summers (2004): Lacking Balance? Work Life Employment Practices in the Modern Economy. *Personnel Review* 33 (4): 418–429.
- Kaiser, Henry F. (1974): An Index of Factorial Simplicity. *Psychometrika* 39: 31–36.
- Kaufmann, Gary M. and Terry A. Beehr (1989): Occupational Stressors, Individual Strains, and Social Supports Among Police Officers. *Human Relations* 42 (2): 185–197.
- Kossek, Ellen Ernst and Victor Nichol (1992): The Effects of On-Site Child Care on Employee Attitudes and Performance. *Personnel Psychology* 45 (3): 485–509.
- Lapierre M. Laurent and Allen D. Tammy (2006): Work-Supportive Family, Family-Supportive Supervision, Use of Organizational Benefits, and Problem-Focused Coping: Implications for Work-Family Conflict and Employee Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 11 (2): 169–181.
- Lazăr, Ioan, Codruța Osoian and Patricia Ratiu (2010): The Role of Work-life Balance Practices in Order to Improve Organizational Performance. *European Research Studies* 8 (1): 201–213.
- Lockwood, Nancy R. (2003): *Work/Life Balance: Challenges and Solutions*. Alexandria, Virginia: Society for Human Research Management.

- Madipelli, Saritha, Veluri Sharma and Y. Chinnappaiah (2013): Factors Causing Work Life Imbalance among Working Women – A Study on School Teachers. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 48 (4): 621-633.
- McIntosh, Nancy J. (1991): Identification and Investigation of Properties of Social Support. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 12 (3): 201-217.
- Morris, M. L. and E. K. Atchley (2011): Constructs of the Work/ Life Interface: A Synthesis of the Literature and Introduction of the Concept of Work/Life Harmony. *Human Resource Development Review* 10: 6-25.
- Nelson, S. Katherine and Sonja Lyubomirsky (2015): Juggling Family and Career: Parents Pathways to a Balanced and Happy Life. *Flourishing in Life, Work and Careers: Individual Wellbeing and Career Experiences*, 100.
- Ng, Eddy S. W., Linda Schweitzer and Sean Lyons (2010): New Generation, Great Expectations: A Field Study of the Millennial Generation. *Journal of Business Psychology* 25 (2): 281-292.
- Noor, Noraini M. (2003): Work-and Family-Related Variables, Work-Family Conflict and Women's Well-Being: Some Observations. *Community, Work and Family* 6 (3): 297-319.
- Nunnally, Jim C. (1978): *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parasuraman, Saroj , Yasmin S. Purohit, Veronica M. Godshalk and Nicholas J. Beutell (1996): Work and Family Variables, Entrepreneurial Career Success, and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 48: 275-300.
- Parkes Louise P. and Peter H. Langford (2008): Work-life Balance or work-life alignment? A test of the importance of work-life balance for employee engagement and intention to stay in organizations. *Journal of Management and Organization* 14 (3): 267-284.
- Senthilkumar, Kalimuthu, S. Chandrakumaramangalam and L. Manivannan (2012): An Empirical Study on Teaching Professionals' Work-life Balance in Higher Learning Institutions with Special Reference to Namakkal District. *Tamilnadu Bonfring International Journal of Industrial Engineering and Management Science* 2 (3): 38-41.
- Sharma, Neeti and Parameswar Nayak (2016): Study on Work Life Balance and Organisation Policy in IT Sector in NCR. *Amity Global Business Review*: 115-112.
- Thomas, Linda Thiede and Daniel C. Ganster (1995): Impact of Family-Supportive Work Variables on Work-Family Conflict and Strain: A Control Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 80 (1): 6-15.
- Wolf-Wendel, Lisa, Kelly Ward and Susan B. Twombly (2007): Faculty Life at Community Colleges: The Perspective of Women with Children. *Community College Review* 34 (4): 255-281.

#### SOURCES

- Department of Labour (2004): *Achieving Balanced Lives and Employment. What New Zealand Are Saying about the Work Life Balance*, 217-220.