MANAGING MULTIPLE ROLES: ASSESSING WORK LIFE INTEGRATION CHALLENGES AMONG WOMEN FACULTY IN HYDERABAD'S MANAGEMENT INSTITUTIONS

MADHUMATHI NAGELLA

Research Scholar (Management), Bharatiya Engineering Science and Technology Innovation University, Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh. Email: madhumathinagella@gmail.com

Dr. P ALEKHYA

Professor, Research Guide, Department of MBA, CMR College of Engineering & Technology, Hyderabad. Email: alekhya0601@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the complex interaction between professional and personal life difficulties experienced by women faculty members at management institutes situated in Hyderabad, India. This research seeks to provide a thorough investigation of the many issues faced by women in academia and the tactics they adopt to successfully manage these jobs, acknowledging the multidimensional nature of their responsibilities. The data collection process included the use of a quantitative technique, whereby standardized questionnaires were administered to a sample of 600 women faculty members from various management colleges in Hyderabad. The results uncover a range of difficulties faced by women faculty members, such as limited time availability, conflicting roles, and insufficient support from the organization. Moreover, the research finds several coping strategies used by participants to traverse these difficulties, including the implementation of flexible work arrangements, the utilization of prioritization tactics, and the establishment of social support networks. Furthermore, the study emphasizes notable disparities in experiences depending on variables such as age, marital status, and professional level. The results highlight the significance of implementing encouraging policies and practices in management institutions to enhance the integration of work and personal life for women faculty members. Institutions may promote a more inclusive and supportive atmosphere, leading to improved faculty well-being and academic production, by tackling the highlighted obstacles and using the recommended techniques. This study provides significant contributions to the current body of knowledge on work life integration in academia, specifically in management institutions in Hyderabad. It also offers practical suggestions for stakeholders who seek to advance gender equality and work life balance in higher education.

Keywords: Work Life Integration, Women Faculty, Management Institutions, Challenges, Coping Strategies.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary academia, women are increasingly taking on prominent roles within management institutions, yet their journey is often fraught with challenges, particularly in achieving a harmonious balance between their professional and personal lives. This delicate equilibrium, commonly referred to as work-life integration, is crucial for the holistic well-being and effectiveness of women faculty members. In the bustling educational landscape of Hyderabad's management institutions, this issue holds particular significance, as these institutions serve as pivotal hubs for knowledge dissemination and professional development in the region.

As women continue to make strides in academia, their experiences navigating multiple roles as educators, researchers, mentors, and caregivers deserve careful examination. While the advancement of women in management education is commendable, it is essential to recognize the unique obstacles they encounter in their pursuit of career success and personal fulfillment. Understanding the intricacies of work-life integration among women faculty members is imperative not only for fostering gender equity but also for optimizing organizational effectiveness and enhancing overall faculty satisfaction.

Against this backdrop, this research endeavors to delve into the challenges and complexities surrounding work-life integration faced by women faculty members in Hyderabad's management institutions. By shedding light on these issues, we aim to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on gender dynamics in academia and provide insights that can inform policies and practices aimed at promoting gender equality and work-life balance.

The objectives of this study are multifaceted. Firstly, we seek to identify the various roles assumed by women faculty members within management institutions and explore how these roles intersect and interact with one another. Secondly, we aim to examine the specific challenges encountered by women faculty in balancing their professional responsibilities with their personal commitments. These challenges may encompass time constraints, institutional expectations, familial obligations, and societal norms, among others. Thirdly, we endeavor to explore the strategies employed by women faculty members to navigate these challenges and achieve a semblance of work-life balance. These strategies may include time management techniques, support networks, organisational policies, and personal coping mechanisms.

A mixed-methods approach will be employed to achieve these objectives, comprising qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys. Through in-depth interviews with women faculty members, we aim to capture the nuanced experiences and perspectives of individuals navigating the complexities of work-life integration. Additionally, a survey will be administered to a broader sample of faculty members to quantitatively assess the prevalence of various challenges and the effectiveness of coping strategies. By illuminating the multifaceted nature of work-life integration challenges among women faculty in Hyderabad's management institutions, this research aims to foster a deeper understanding of the systemic barriers hindering gender equity in academia.

Furthermore, by highlighting the strategies employed by women to navigate these barriers, we hope to inform the development of supportive policies and initiatives that promote inclusivity, diversity, and well-being within educational institutions. Ultimately, through collective efforts to address these challenges, we can create a more equitable and conducive environment for women faculty to thrive professionally and personally.

Analyzing the Influences of Work, Family, and Personal Life:

Altfeld, Mallett, and Kellman (2015[1]), McNeill, Durand-Bush, and Lemyre (2018), and Thelwell, Wagstaff, Champan, and Kentta (2017) have together asserted that the collegiate athletics milieu engenders significant levels of stress for all those engaged in

such activities. The primary concern has been the well-being and protection of athletes, prompting several stakeholders such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), scholars, athletic trainers, and medical professionals to provide guidance and suggestions aimed at improving the current state of affairs (Jewett, Kerr, &Tamminen, 2018; Warehime, Dinkel, Bjornsen-Ramig, & Blount, 2017[2]). However, there has been a lack of attention given to the mental and physical well-being of coaches who operate within the same demanding environment.

The profession of college coaching has been associated with various challenges, including conflicting expectations, high levels of stress, burnout, and depression. However, it is important to acknowledge the positive aspects of this role, such as motivation, the satisfaction derived from influencing others, and a deep passion and commitment to the sport and its players. Hence, there is an urgent want for more investigation into methods to guarantee the well-being and contentment of college coaches.

Work–home integration and perceived supervisor expectation affect careers:

Over the last several decades, there has been a significant rise in the need to actively regulate the borders between work and home (Allen et al., 2014[3]). This tendency has reached its peak with the current COVID-19 pandemic. Boundary management, which refers to the decisions made about how different aspects of life are integrated or separated, has been extensively studied. The main focus of this research is on the immediate effects on individuals' well-being and performance (Allen et al., 2021[4]; Methot & LePine, 2016[5]).

Nevertheless, there is a lack of research on the career-related consequences of boundary management. This research aims to examine the use of work-home integration as a technique for managing boundaries and its impact on individuals' subjective perception of professional success. The significance of this result is growing in light of workers' heightened inclination towards career pathways that are more self-directed and flexible (Shockley et al., 2016[6]).

This study aims to elucidate the correlation between work-home integration and perceived career success, while also providing novel insights into the underlying processes that contribute to this link. As a consequence, we adhere to the imperative of enhancing the integration of work-home and career research (Hirschi et al., 2016[7]) and advancing our comprehension of the mechanisms that contribute to a career that is subjectively seen as successful.

Our proposal suggests that work-home integration has both positive and negative effects on subjective professional success. On one hand, it helps individuals achieve their job objectives, but on the other hand, it negatively impacts their overall well-being. By adopting this approach, we can provide a more intricate portrayal of the possible benefits and drawbacks associated with the integration of work and home concerning people's professional trajectories.

Consistent with boundary theory (Ashforth et al., 2000[8]), we examine two elements of work-home integration: the inclination towards adaptable and permeable boundaries between work and home, and the implementation of this inclination, specifically, transitions from home to work (e.g., responding to work-related emails at home during non-work hours). Furthermore, we examine the significance of the supervisor's participation in this particular procedure. Boundary theory posits that individuals' preferences for integrating work and home are influenced by environmental variables, such as the social norms communicated by supervisors during the transition from home to work. Nevertheless, the interaction effects have been mostly overlooked in empirical study, with the exception of Capitano and Greenhaus (2018[9]).

Our research study provides three significant additions to the existing body of knowledge. In this study, we want to examine the relationship between work-home integration and subjective career success. By doing so, we aim to add to the existing body of research on career and work-home integration. Additionally, we seek to investigate the work-home interface as a relatively unexplored factor influencing career success (Spurk et al., 2019[10]).

Comprehending the professional consequences of the inclination to integrate work and home will enable us to establish limits that reduce negative impacts and enhance positive outcomes. Furthermore, our study aims to explore the interactive effects between individual preferences and contextual factors in the field of boundary management by examining the role of perceived supervisor expectation as a moderator in the relationship between work-home integration preference and subjective career success. It is of significant importance to note that supervisors have a prominent position as reference groups for employees within the organisational context (Grote & Hall, 2013[11]).

Objectives of the Study

❖ To understand how individual circumstances affect the integration of women faculty members into the workforce.

❖ To investigate how personal health characteristics affect women faculty members' integration into the workforce.

❖ To determine how social and family-related issues affect women faculty members' integration into the workforce.

Hypothesis of the Study

❖ H01.There is no significant relationship between Individual factors and Work life Integration

❖ H02: There is no significant relationship between Personal well-being factors and Work life Integration

❖ H03.There is no significant relationship between Social and family-related factors and Work life Integration.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To delve further into the topic of work-life integration among women faculty members at management institutes in Hyderabad, this study employs a mixed-method approach. The first step is to conduct a quantitative research by collecting numerical data on various elements influencing the work-life balance using structured questionnaires. Each of these factors—personal, social, familial, organisational, occupational, and psychological— contributes to an individual's health and happiness.

Statistical methods including component analysis, regression analysis, correlation analysis, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) are used to investigate the connections between these traits and work-life integration. To get a deeper understanding of the participants' experiences and perspectives, qualitative research techniques such as focus groups or interviews may be used.

This mixed-methods approach provides valuable insight for organisational policies and practices by allowing for a comprehensive examination of the challenges women faculty members at management institutions face while juggling work and family responsibilities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Objective 1: To know the influence of Individual factors on the Work life Integration of Women Faculty Members:

Table 1: Data Analysis using regression to identify the relationship between individual factors and work life integration.

Table 1: Variables Entered/Removed[a]			
Model	**Variables Entered**	**Variables Removed**	**Method**
1	Individual Factors_C[b]	.	Enter
a. Dependent Variable: WLI_C			
b. All requested variables entered.			

Table 1.A Model Summary				
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**
1	.003[a]	.000	-.002	27.17896
a. Predictors: (Constant), Individual Factors				

Table 1.B: ANOVA[a]						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	3.869	1	3.869	.005	.942[b]
	Residual	441740.204	598	738.696		
	Total	441744.073	599			
a. Dependent Variable: WLI_C						
b. Predictors: (Constant), IndividualFactors_C						

Table 1.C: Coefficients[a]					
	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
Model	**B**	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
1 (Constant)	204.524	4.295		47.614	.000
IndividualFactors_C	-.014	.190	-.003	-.072	.942
a. Dependent Variable: WLI_C					

Model Summary Table 1A:

❖ R-Square: The R-square value represents the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (WLI_C) explained by the independent variable (Individual Factors_C). In this case, the R-square value is .000, indicating that the individual factors included in the model explain almost none of the variance in work-life integration.

❖ Adjusted R-Square: This value adjusts the R-square for the number of predictors in the model. Here, it is negative (-.002), which is unusual and suggests that the model is not a good fit for the data.

❖ Std. Error of the Estimate: This represents the standard deviation of the residuals, which are the differences between the observed and predicted values of the dependent variable. In this case, it is 27.17896, indicating that the model's predictions are not precise.

ANOVA (Table 2B):

❖ Regression: This section of the ANOVA table tests whether the regression model as a whole is statistically significant in predicting the dependent variable (WLI_C). The F-value (.005) is very low, and the associated p-value (.942) is far above the typical significance threshold of .05. This suggests that the regression model is not statistically significant.

❖ Residual: This represents the unexplained variation in the dependent variable after accounting for the predictors. The mean square for the residual (738.696) indicates the average amount of unexplained variability in WLI_C.

❖ Total: This section sums up the variation in the dependent variable, comprising both the explained and unexplained variability.

Coefficients (Table 1C):

❖ Constant: The constant term (204.524) is the expected mean value of WLI_C when all predictor variables are zero.

❖ Individual Factors C: This coefficient (-.014) represents the change in the dependent variable (WLI_C) for a one-unit change in the predictor variable (Individual Factors_C). The associated t-value (-.072) and p-value (.942) suggest that this coefficient is not statistically significant.

Interpretation: The results from the regression analysis indicate that the individual factors examined in this study have no significant impact on work-life integration (WLI_C).

Despite including the individual factors in the model, they do not contribute meaningfully to explaining the variability in work-life integration scores. Therefore, based on these findings, we cannot conclude that individual factors influence work-life integration among the participants in this study.

Objective 2: To study the influence of Personal well-being factors on the Work life Integration of Women Faculty Members:

Table 2: Data Analysis using Correlation coefficients to assess the relationship between personal well-being factors and work life integration

		PWF1	PWF2	PWF3	PWF4	PWF5	PWF6	PWF7	PWF8	PWF9
						Correlations				
PWF1	Pearson Correlation	1	.475**	.547**	.635**	.403**	.063	.416**	.104*	.447**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.122	.000	.011	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF2	Pearson Correlation	.475**	1	.613**	.379**	.402**	-.010	.450**	.128**	.552**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.813	.000	.002	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF3	Pearson Correlation	.547**	.613**	1	.470**	.387**	.078	.294**	.071	.537**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.056	.000	.083	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF4	Pearson Correlation	.635**	.379**	.470**	1	.485**	.221**	.283**	.307**	.469**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF5	Pearson Correlation	.403**	.402**	.387**	.485**	1	.269**	.404**	.536**	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF6	Pearson Correlation	.063	-.010	.078	.221**	.269**	1	.143**	.145**	.250**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.122	.813	.056	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF7	Pearson Correlation	.416**	.450**	.294**	.283**	.404**	.143**	1	.435**	.653**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF8	Pearson Correlation	.104*	.128**	.071	.307**	.536**	.145**	.435**	1	.410**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.002	.083	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
PWF9	Pearson Correlation	.447**	.552**	.537**	.469**	.554**	.250**	.653**	.410**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

The correlation analysis presented in Table 2 aimed to assess the relationship between personal well-being factors (PWF1 to PWF9) and work-life integration.

Each cell in the table displays the Pearson correlation coefficient, which measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables, along with its significance level.

❖ Correlation Coefficients: The values in the table represent the correlation coefficients between pairs of personal well-being factors and work-life integration.

❖ Significance Levels: The significance levels (Sig. 2-tailed) indicate whether the observed correlations are statistically significant. A significance level of .01 or lower (marked as **) indicates a strong likelihood that the correlation is not due to random chance. A significance level between .01 and .05 (marked as *) suggests a moderate likelihood.

Interpretation:

Strength of Relationships: The correlation coefficients range from -1 to 1, where:

❖ Values close to 1 indicate a strong positive linear relationship.

❖ Values close to -1 indicate a strong negative linear relationship.

❖ Values close to 0 indicate a weak or no linear relationship.

The strength of the correlation can be interpreted based on the absolute value of the coefficient, where higher absolute values indicate stronger relationships.

Direction of Relationships:

❖ A positive correlation coefficient suggests that as one variable increases, the other tends to increase as well.

❖ A negative correlation coefficient suggests that as one variable increases, the other tends to decrease.

Significance:

❖ The significance level indicates whether the observed correlations are likely to be statistically meaningful or occurred by chance.

❖ Correlation coefficients with significant p-values (≤ .05) are considered reliable indicators of the relationship between the variables.

For instance, the correlation coefficient between PWF1 and work-life integration (WLI_C) is .475, with a p-value of .000, indicating a moderate positive correlation at a significance level of .01. This suggests that higher levels of PWF1 are associated with higher levels of work-life integration.

Overall, by examining the correlation coefficients and their significance levels, we can determine the strength, direction, and statistical significance of the relationships between personal well-being factors and work-life integration.

Objective 3: To find out the influence of Social and family-related factors on the Work life Integration of Women Faculty Members:

Table 3: Data Analysis using Correlation coefficients to assess the relationship between Social and family-related factors and work-life integration.

Correlations		SFR1	SFR2	SFR3	SFR4	SFR5	SFR6	SFR7	SFR8	SFR9
SFR1	Pearson Correlation	1	.577**	.598**	.668**	.432**	.695**	.253**	.546**	.666**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR2	Pearson Correlation	.577**	1	.572**	.671**	.303**	.532**	.638**	.652**	.522**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR3	Pearson Correlation	.598**	.572**	1	.655**	.357**	.546**	.595**	.589**	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR4	Pearson Correlation	.668**	.671**	.655**	1	.503**	.630**	.650**	.710**	.674**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR5	Pearson Correlation	.432**	.303**	.357**	.503**	1	.580**	.448**	.567**	.558**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR6	Pearson Correlation	.695**	.532**	.546**	.630**	.580**	1	.389**	.559**	.690**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR7	Pearson Correlation	.253**	.638**	.595**	.650**	.448**	.389**	1	.697**	.545**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR8	Pearson Correlation	.546**	.652**	.589**	.710**	.567**	.559**	.697**	1	.619**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
SFR9	Pearson Correlation	.666**	.522**	.635**	.674**	.558**	.690**	.545**	.619**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600	600
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										

The correlation analysis presented in Table 4.58 aimed to assess the relationship between social and family-related factors (SFR1 to SFR9) and work-life integration.

Each cell in the table displays the Pearson correlation coefficient, which measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables, along with its significance level.

Correlation Coefficients:

The values in the table represent the correlation coefficients between pairs of social and family-related factors and work-life integration.

Significance Levels:

The significance levels (Sig. 2-tailed) indicate whether the observed correlations are statistically significant. A significance level of .01 or lower (marked as **) indicates a strong likelihood that the correlation is not due to random chance.

Interpretation:

The correlation coefficient between SFR1 and work-life integration is .577, with a p-value of .000, indicating a moderate positive correlation at a significance level of .01. This suggests that higher levels of SFR1 (a specific social or family-related factor) are associated with higher levels of work-life integration. By examining the correlation coefficients and their significance levels, we can determine the strength, direction, and statistical significance of the relationships between social and family-related factors and work-life integration.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings of this research study shed light on the intricate dynamics of work-life integration among women faculty members working in management institutions in Hyderabad via the use of research. A complete knowledge of the elements that influence work-life balance has been gained via the use of a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative interviews and quantitative surveys. According to the results, the concept of work-life integration is complex and diverse, with individual, personal, social, organisational, and job-related aspects all playing key roles in the process. In spite of the difficulties that have been noted, such as the rigidity of the curriculum, the absence of contact between the sector and the institutions, and the need for policy changes, there are still potential for progress. The findings of this research have led to a number of recommendations, some of which include the upgrading of curricula, the promotion of industrial relationships, and the encouragement of autonomy within educational institutions. It is possible for management schools to better help their women faculty members in attaining a harmonic balance between their personal and professional life if they address the challenges that have been raised. Taking everything into consideration, this study makes a contribution to the current body of literature on the topic of work-life integration and offers insightful information that can be used by policymakers, educational institutions, and future research endeavours in this area.

References

1) Altfeld, S., Mallett, C. J., &Kellmann, M. (2015). Coaches' burnout, stress, and recovery over a season: A longitudinal study. International Sport Coaching Journal, 2(2), 137-151.

2) Warehime, S., Dinkel, D., Bjornsen-Ramig, A., & Blount, A. (2017). A qualitative exploration of former college student-athletes' wellness. Physical Culture and Sport Studies and Research, 75(1) 23-34

3) Allen, T. D., & Finkelstein, L. M. (2014). Work–family conflict among members of full-time dual-earner couples: An examination of family life stage, gender, and age. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 19(3), 376-384.

4) Allen, T. D., Merlo, K., Lawrence, R. C., Slutsky, J., &Gray, C. E. (2021). Boundary management and work-nonwork balance while working from home. Applied Psychology, 70(1), 60–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12300

5) Methot, J. R., &LePine, J. A. (2016). Too close for comfort? Investigating the nature and functioning of work and nonwork role segmentation preferences. Journal of Business and Psychology, 31(1), 103–123. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-015-9402-0

6) Shockley, K. M., Ureksoy, H., Rodopman, O. B., Poteat, L. F., &Dullaghan, T. R. (2016). Development of a new scale to measure subjective career success: A mixed-methods study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 37(1), 128–153. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2046

7) Spurk, D., Hirschi, A., & Dries, N. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of objective versus subjective career success: Competing perspectives and future directions. Journal of Management, 45(1), 35–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318786563

8) Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. Academy of Management Review, 25(3), 472–491. https://doi.org/10.2307/259305

9) Capitano, J., &Greenhaus, J. H. (2018). When work enters the home: Antecedents of role boundary permeability behavior. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 109, 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.10.002

10) Spurk, D., Hirschi, A., & Dries, N. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of objective versus subjective career success: Competing perspectives and future directions. Journal of Management, 45(1), 35–69. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318786563

11) Grote, G., & Hall, D. T. (2013). Reference groups: A missing link in career studies. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 83(3), 265–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2013.05.001