

**A STUDY ON WORK-LIFE BALANCE AND ITS IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE
PRODUCTIVITY AND JOB SATISFACTION L&T INFRASTRUCTURE
ENGINEERING**

Soundarya. M

Assistant Professor

School of Management Studies

Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology Chennai- 600119

Soundaryamuthu90@gmail.com

NITHARSHANA M

MBA Final year student School of Management Studies

Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology Chennai- 600119

Shanamanju03714@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of work-life balance on employee productivity and job satisfaction with reference to L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited. In today's competitive environment, employees face increasing work pressure, long hours, and stress, which often disrupt their personal life. The study adopts a descriptive research design and uses a quantitative approach. Primary data was collected from 100 employees using structured questionnaires, while secondary data was gathered from journals, books, and websites. Statistical tools such as percentage analysis, chi-square test, ANOVA, and correlation were applied. The results indicate that work-life balance has a significant relationship with job satisfaction and productivity. Factors such as workload, long working hours, and stress were identified as major contributors to imbalance. The study suggests that organizations should implement flexible working hours, reduce workload, and promote employee well-being to improve productivity and satisfaction.

KEYWORDS

Work-Life Balance, Employee Productivity, Job Satisfaction, Work Stress, Organizational Support, Employee Well-being.

INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance is the ability of employees to effectively manage professional responsibilities along with personal life commitments. With globalization and technological advancements, employees are increasingly required to work beyond standard hours, leading to stress and imbalance. In sectors like infrastructure engineering, employees face strict deadlines and high workloads, making work-life balance more critical. A healthy balance not only improves employee satisfaction but also enhances productivity, reduces turnover, and supports organizational success.

PROBLEM OF STATEMENT

Employees in infrastructure organizations often experience excessive workload, long working hours, and job stress, which negatively affect their personal life and job satisfaction. This imbalance reduces productivity and overall efficiency. Therefore, it is essential to study the relationship between work-life balance and employee performance.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature highlights that work-life balance is a key determinant of employee well-being and performance.

- Kofodimos (1993) states that imbalance leads to stress and reduced efficiency.
- Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) explain work-family conflict as a major issue affecting employees.
- Clark (2000) introduced Work-Family Border Theory emphasizing balance management.

- Robbins & Judge (2013) found that balanced employees are more satisfied and committed.
- Haar et al. (2014) confirmed a positive relationship between work-life balance and productivity.
- Allen et al. (2000) highlighted the importance of organizational support.

These studies collectively emphasize that organizations must focus on employee well-being.

OBJECTIVES

Primary Objective

- To analyze the impact of work-life balance on employee productivity and job satisfaction

Secondary Objectives

- To evaluate employee work-life balance levels
- To identify key factors affecting work-life balance
- To analyze stress levels among employees
- To study job satisfaction levels
- To examine the role of organizational support

HYPOTHESIS

- **H₀:** No significant relationship between work-life balance and job satisfaction
- **H₁:** Significant relationship exists between work-life balance and job satisfaction

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

- The study focuses on analyzing work-life balance among employees of L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited.
- It examines the impact of work-life balance on employee productivity and job satisfaction.
- The study covers factors such as working hours, workload, stress levels, and organizational support.
- It includes employees from different age groups, income levels, and work experience to get diverse opinions.
- The research is limited to employees working in the Chennai location of the organization.
- The study uses statistical tools like percentage analysis, chi-square, and ANOVA for analysis.

LIMITATIONS

- Limited to one organization
- Sample size restricted to 100 respondents
- Time constraints
- Possibility of biased responses
- Findings may not be applicable to all industries

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a descriptive research design with a quantitative approach. Data was collected systematically using structured questionnaires. The collected data was classified, tabulated, and analyzed using statistical tools to draw meaningful conclusions.

POPULATION SIZE

All employees working in L&T Infrastructure Engineering Limited

SAMPLE SIZE

- 100 employees

SAMPLE DESIGN

- Convenience sampling method was used to select respondents based on availability

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Primary Data

Collected through questionnaires focusing on working hours, stress, job satisfaction, and work-life balance

Secondary Data

Collected from books, research journals, company reports, and online sources

STATISTICAL TOOLS

- Percentage Analysis (to understand distribution)
- Chi-Square Test (to find relationships)
- ANOVA (to compare groups)
- Correlation Analysis (to measure strength of relationships)

DATA ANALYSIS & INTERPRETATION

Table 1: Gender of Respondents

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|----------|----|----|
| 1 | Male | 61 | 60 |
| 2 | Female | 39 | 39 |

Interpretation: Majority of respondents are male, but female participation is also significant.

Table 2: Age of Respondents

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|----------|----|----|
| 1 | 18-25 | 25 | 25 |
| 2 | 26-35 | 35 | 35 |
| 3 | 36-45 | 25 | 25 |
| 4 | 45+ | 15 | 15 |

Interpretation: Most respondents belong to the 26–33 age group, indicating a young workforce.

Table 3: Work in Shifts

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|----------|----|----|
| 1 | Yes | 65 | 65 |
| 2 | No | 35 | 35 |

Interpretation: Majority of employees work in shifts, which may affect work-life balance.

Table 4: Work on Week-offs

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|----------|----|----|
| 1 | Yes | 55 | 55 |
| 2 | No | 45 | 45 |

Interpretation: More than half of employees work on week-offs, indicating high workload.

Table 5: Working Hours per Day

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|----------------|----|----|
| 1 | Less Than 8Hrs | 15 | 15 |
| 2 | 8-10 Hrs | 45 | 45 |
| 3 | 10-11 Hrs | 25 | 25 |
| 4 | 10-15 Hrs | 15 | 15 |

Interpretation: Most employees work standard hours, but many exceed limits.

Table 6: Stress Due to Workload

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|-------------------|----|----|
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 30 | 30 |
| 2 | Agree | 35 | 35 |
| 3 | Neutral | 15 | 15 |
| 4 | Disagree | 12 | 12 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 8 |

Interpretation: Majority of employees experience stress due to workload.

Table 7: Productivity Affected by Work-Life Imbalance

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|-------------------|----|----|
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 28 | 28 |
| 2 | Agree | 32 | 32 |
| 3 | Neutral | 16 | 16 |
| 4 | Disagree | 14 | 14 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 10 |

Interpretation: Work-life imbalance negatively affects productivity.

Table 8: Factors Affecting Work-Life Balance

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|------------|----|----|
| 1 | Workload | 28 | 28 |
| 2 | Long Hrs | 26 | 26 |
| 3 | Stress | 24 | 24 |
| 4 | Management | 22 | 22 |

Interpretation: Workload and long working hours are the main factors affecting work-life balance.

Table 9: Satisfaction with Working Hours

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|-------------------|----|----|
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 20 | 20 |
| 2 | Agree | 35 | 35 |
| 3 | Neutral | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | Disagree | 15 | 15 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 12 | 12 |

Interpretation: Employees show moderate satisfaction with working hours, but a notable portion is dissatisfied.

Table 10: Flexible Working Hours

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|-------------------|----|----|
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 22 | 22 |
| 2 | Agree | 34 | 34 |
| 3 | Neutral | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | Disagree | 16 | 16 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 10 |

Interpretation: Flexibility is available to some extent, but not all employees benefit equally.

Table 11: Organizational Support for Work-Life Balance

| S.No | Category | No | % |
|------|-------------------|----|----|
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 24 | 24 |
| 2 | Agree | 30 | 30 |
| 3 | Neutral | 18 | 18 |
| 4 | Disagree | 16 | 16 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 12 | 12 |

Interpretation: Organizational support is moderate, indicating scope for improvement in employee well-being initiatives.

FINDINGS

- Work-life balance directly affects employee productivity and satisfaction
- High workload and long working hours create stress
- Shift work and working on holidays reduce personal time
- Organizational support is moderate but needs improvement
- Employees demand flexible working conditions

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that work-life balance is a crucial factor influencing employee productivity and job satisfaction. Employees experiencing imbalance tend to face stress, reduced efficiency, and dissatisfaction. Organizations must focus on flexible policies, workload management, and employee wellness programs. Improving work-life balance will lead to better performance, higher satisfaction, and long-term organizational success.

REFERENCES

Books:

- Kothari, C.R. (2004) – Research Methodology
- Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2013) – Organizational Behaviour
- Dessler, G. (2017) – Human Resource Management

Journals:

- Greenhaus & Beutell (1985)
- Haar et al. (2014)
- Allen et al. (2000)
- Lockwood (2003)

Websites:

- www.larsentoubro.com
- www.researchgate.net
- www.investopedia.com