

# *The Influence of Work-life Balance to Job Performance of State University Employees*

**Author: Candy Elizabeth Gil-Salapi**

Affiliation: Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus

*E-mail: salapicandy@gmail.com*

## **ABSTRACT**

*This study examined the work-life balance and job performance of state university employees. To measure work-life balance, three components were examined: time balance, involvement balance, and satisfaction balance using adapted measures from the study of Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw (2003). Job performance was measured according to four component: task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and counterproductive work behavior. The study found out that state university employees experienced a work imbalance in terms of time balance; family imbalance in terms of involvement balance and a balance in terms of satisfaction balance. Results show that involvement balance and satisfaction balance are moderately associated with adaptive performance. Furthermore, satisfaction balance is moderately associated with contextual performance.*

**Keywords: time balance; involvement balance; satisfaction balance; task performance; contextual performance; adaptive performance; counterproductive work behavior**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The issues relating to maintaining and obtaining a work-life balance have received substantial attention over recent years (Deery, 2008) but less attention, however, has been given to find the reality of work-life balance satisfaction in the higher educational sector (Doherty & Manfredi, 2006; Mohd Noor, Stanton & Young, 2009). The complexity of work in higher education institutions has been highlighted in the study of Lakkoju & Jeyalakshmi (2015) and the pressure of work is insurmountable and this is viewed as one of the

reasons why teachers find it hard to achieve a balance between work and life. In addition, compared to other professions, teaching is reported to have positive and negative experiences about work-life balance (Nayeem & Tripathy, 2012). Lakkoju & Jeyalakshmi (2015) further emphasized that if there will be no interventions then employees will have a hard time achieving work-life balance. This has been supported by the findings of the study of Miryala & Chiluka (2012) among 100 teachers working for government and private schools, colleges and universities. The study found out that there is a need for designing work-life balance (WLB) policies and programs for the teaching community to enable them to balance their work and life needs.

It is in this end that the researcher pursued a study on work-life balance in a higher educational institution such as a state university. Upon entering an organization, one has a job description to serve as a binding contract to perform the stipulated tasks. However, there is a provision of “other tasks” which may be assigned and in an educational institution’s setting, these are in the form of designations. This results to an individual employee facing multiple tasks both in work and at home. As there are many basic functions, this situation may affect the balance between work and life of the individual employee which may lead to the inability of the employee to function to his fullest potential.

As the researcher is part of an organization and has been an active observer and participant of the above scenario, she aimed to establish, through this study, that there is a relationship between work-life balance and employee performance and presented human resource interventions that organizations

may employ to improve work-life balance of employees which will benefit not only the employees but also the organization.

Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw (2003) defined work-life balance as the degree to which a person devotes equal time and attachment to both work and family and is experiencing equal satisfaction from both aspects. This gives rise to the three components of work-life balance: the time balance, involvement balance, and satisfaction balance (Omran, 2016). This is considered to be one of the most remarkable topic of interest in various industries (Benito-Osorio, Muñoz-Aguado, & Villar, 2010).

The Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022 acknowledged that there is still no legal framework promoting work-life balance in the Philippines. This is particularly true among developing countries, particularly Asian countries, where there are only limited studies in this field (Ji Sung & Sangyub, 2017). Moreover, WLB is considered to be innovative HRM in developing countries and that it is likely to focus on those which supplement income insufficiency such as childcare, medical care and housing support (Berman, 2015).

## **2. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The study measured the influence of work-life balance of state university employees with their job performance. Specifically, this measured the work-life balance of employees in terms of time balance, involvement balance, and satisfaction balance; and job performance in terms of task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance, and counterproductive work behavior.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

Respondents of the study were 53 tenured full-time faculty members of a state university. The questionnaires were given to all regular faculty members. The researcher also made use of Google docs for those faculty members who are not in the campus during the administration of the questionnaires. The answered questionnaires were collected personally while those answered through Google docs are automatically recorded once answered. Forty-three (43) questionnaires were returned. The response rate is 81%.

Of the respondents, 41.7% are 31-41 years old; 27.9% are 41-50 years old; and 25.6% are aged 21-30. Only 4.7% are aged 51 years old and above.

Majority of the employees (74.4%) are female while only 25.6% are male. Most of the employees (65.1%) are married while 32.6% are single. Only 2.3% are widowed. 46.5% (20 out of 43) of the employees have no children; 25.6% (11 out of 43) have 2 children; 18.6% (8 out of 43) have 1 child; 7% (3 out of 43) have 3 children; and 2.3% (1 out of 43) have 4 children. Thus, more than half of the population of SLSU employees, that is 53.5% (23 out of 43), have children. More than half of the number of employees (56.8%) belong to the rank of Instructor; 27% are assistant professors; 13.5% are associate professors; and 2.7% are professors. 35% (21 out of 43) of the employees have no designation. 22 employees out of the 43 have designations. Designations are administrative positions given to appointed members of the faculty who are found to have leadership potential or have specialized skills or abilities. Some of the designations given are program chairs/department heads, campus dean, associate dean and even head of the human resource. Each designation has corresponding number of units deducted from the regular teaching load of the faculty member. Most of the employees, 51.2% (16.3% + 34.9%), have been in the university for 5 years or less. 8 out of 43 employees (18.6%) have been with university for six to ten years; 11.6% of the employees are there for 16-20 years.

The study made use of an adapted questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire asked questions on the profile of the respondents such as age, gender, civil status, number of children, position held in the university, years in the university and other tasks assigned or designations.

The second part of the questionnaire measured work-life balance in terms of the three components: time balance, involvement balance and satisfaction balance. In terms of time balance, four questions were asked from the respondents. These questions sought information as to: the amount of time spent working every week during the busy season as well as outside of the busy season, the number of hours per week spent doing household chores and the number of hours per week spent doing childcare activities. With involvement balance, three items were used from Lodahl and Kejner (1965) job involvement scale with the word 'career' substituted for 'job'. Responses to these three items are assessed using a 5-point scale from strongly

disagree to strongly agree. A parallel set of three items, with the word ‘family’ substituted for ‘career’ are added to measure family involvement. Responses to this set are useful in the calculation of the involvement balance. Satisfaction balance, on the other hand, is assessed through a 5-item scale developed by Greenhaus, Parasuraman, and Wormley (1990). Each item was measured on a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. In addition, family satisfaction is assessed with two items from the same set. These are measured on a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The reliability of the questionnaire, specifically with involvement balance and satisfaction balance, was ascertained through Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. A pilot testing of the questionnaire was conducted. The questionnaires were administered to those working in the state university (part-time instructors and administrative staff) who were not included in the actual study. In the case of time balance, since the questions require the respondents to ascertain the number of hours each of them spent at work and with their families, the test-retest correlation is computed through Pearson’s correlation to test its reliability. In general, correlation coefficient (r) values are considered good if  $r \geq 0.70$ . As with time balance, the computed value of r is 0.825. Conversely, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of the other two variables, involvement balance and satisfaction balance, were assessed and produced coefficients of .768 and .812 respectively.

The responses of the respondents were used by the researcher to compute for the balance coefficients of each component of work life balance. To measure work-life balance, each component was measured. This is with the use of the data gathered through the survey conducted using the research instrument. The responses from the survey were used for the calculation of balance coefficients that determined whether the employees of the state university are experiencing balance, work imbalance or family imbalance in each of the components of work-life balance.

To calculate time balance, a balance coefficient was computed through the use of the formula of Deephouse (1996). The coefficient, which can range from -1 to +1, has a meaningful zero point when an individual spends exactly the same

amount of time on work and family. The formula to get the balance coefficient is as follows (Deephouse, 1996):

$$\text{Coefficient equals } \frac{(w^2 - wf)}{t^2} \text{ if } w > f,$$

$$\text{Coefficient equals } \frac{(wf - f^2)}{t^2} \text{ if } f > w,$$

$$\text{Coefficient equals } 0 \text{ if } w = f,$$

where w is work hours per week; f is the family hours per week;  $t = w + f$ . In calculating involvement balance, w, career involvement and f, family involvement; in calculating satisfaction balance, w, career satisfaction and f, family satisfaction.

A score of zero represents balance because it signifies an equal amount of time devoted to work and family. Positive scores represent work imbalance because they indicate increasingly greater time that is devoted to work rather than family. Conversely, negative scores represent family imbalance because they indicate increasingly greater time that is devoted to family rather than work (Greenhaus, et al, 2003).

Using the same procedure, as described above, involvement balance coefficient and satisfaction balance coefficient were calculated. The description of the coefficient of each component is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Description of Balance Coefficients**

| <b>Balance Coefficient</b>        | <b>Description</b> | <b>Qualitative Description</b>  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---|
| <b>0</b>                          | Balance            | The employee experienced equal amount of time, involvement and satisfaction in both work and life domains.  |
| <b>+ 1 (positive coefficient)</b> | Work imbalance     | The employee perceives that he is spending more time at work than with family; is more involved at work; and is experiencing more satisfaction with work. |
| <b>- 1 (negative coefficient)</b> | Family imbalance   | The employee perceives that he  |

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>coefficient</b><br>) | is spending more time with family than at work; is more involved with family; and is experiencing more satisfaction with family. |
|-------------------------|--|

After the calculation of the coefficients, frequency counts and percentages were used to determine the number of those who experienced an imbalance (work or family) and balance.

The results of the performance evaluation of the employees were used as measures of job performance classified into the four components as espoused by Koopmans, et al (2011) namely: task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance and counterproductive work behavior. The performance evaluation results of the employees were secured from the Human Resource Management Office. Prior to this, a letter was sent by the researcher to the Campus Dean asking for permission to use the performance evaluation results for research purposes. Each dimension of job performance is measured in a scale of 1-5 where the scale is considered to be scores: 5 points for outstanding; 4 points for very satisfactory; 3 points for satisfactory; 2 points for fair; and 1 point for poor performance. The scale of 1-5 is interpreted as scores. Weighted mean is computed for each dimension of performance.

**Table 2. Weighted Mean Interpretation**

| Points    | Descriptive Rating | Qualitative Description   |
|-----------|--------------------|---|
| 4.21-5    | Outstanding        | The performance almost always exceeds the job requirements. The Faculty is an exceptional role model. |
| 3.41-4.20 | Very Satisfactory  | The performance meets and often exceeds the job requirements.   |

|                  |              |  |
|------------------|--------------|--|
| <b>2.61-3.40</b> | Satisfactory | The performance meets job requirements.                          |
| <b>1.81-2.60</b> | Fair         | The performance needs some development to meet job requirements. |
| <b>1.0-1.80</b>  | Poor         | The faculty fails to meet job requirements.                      |

Eta correlation is used to determine the relationship between work-life balance and performance. Each component of work-life balance (time, involvement, and satisfaction) is correlated with each dimension of job performance (task, contextual, adaptive and counterproductive work behavior).

**4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS**

Respondents spent considerably more hours per week on work (44.3) than family (28.43). The difference is reflected in an average balance coefficient of .15. Results show that 42 out of 43 employees experienced a work imbalance.

**Table 3. Current state of WLB of SLSU employees in terms of time balance**

| Time Balance     | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Balance          | 0         | 0          |
| Family imbalance | 1         | 2.3        |
| Work imbalance   | 42        | 97.7       |
| Total            | 43        | 100.0      |

The employees experienced a work imbalance, spending more time at work than attending to their families. The nature of today’s workforce as according to Kim (2014) is characterized by high rates of labor market, women participating in the workforce, long working hours, work intensification, emerging technology, global competitive market and the renewed interest in work, personal lives and family values. This observation of Kim (2014) can be observed in a higher education institution. Similarly, work has

intensified in a way that academic standards have leveled up in a way that programs need to be accredited and processes need to be at par with international standards. This kind of work intensification is paralleled with long working hours and high academic standards which brought employees to pursue post-graduate studies to be more competitive and not be left behind with current trends in the academe. This could further result to more time spent on work than with family. In addition, with the increasing number of enrollees in a state university which could be brought about by free tuition, there are additional classes/sections resulting to additional classes for the faculty members. Additional faculty members are not easily hired since plantilla positions are not readily available as needed.

**Table 4. Current state of WLB of SLSU employees in terms of Involvement balance**

| Involvement Balance | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Balance             | 10        | 23.3       |
| Family imbalance    | 24        | 55.8       |
| Work imbalance      | 9         | 20.9       |
| Total               | 43        | 100.0      |

On the other hand, they are more involved with their family than their work. Results show 55.8% of the employees (24 out of 43) experienced a family imbalance.

Conversely, state university employees experienced more involvement with their family than with their work. Involvement balance is experienced when one domain does not interfere with the other domain. The result that most of the employees experienced a family imbalance (in terms of involvement balance) despite of the fact that most of them perceived a work imbalance (in terms of time balance), suggests that the employees may spend most of their time at work but experienced that family domain interferes with work domain. If there are problems or issues at home, this interferes with the way they do their work. In the study of Greenhaus & Beutell (1985) on the concept suggested that conflict exists when time allotted to perform one role hinders one to perform what the

other role requires. The same conflict will occur if strain from participation in one role will make the performance of another role difficult. Another scenario that will exhibit this conflict is when specific behaviors required by one role will make it difficult to perform the requirements of the other role. This mentioned conflict can happen in two directions: family-to-work and work-to-family. The former takes place when family responsibilities interfere with work responsibilities. The latter, on the other hand, pertains to inability to fully accomplish family responsibilities due to overwhelming work responsibilities. Another study on involvement conducted by Amazue (2013) found out that when the employees are highly involved in both domains, they experience a lower level of work-family conflict than when they are highly involved in the family with less involvement in work responsibilities. Conversely, work-family conflict is at its lowest when the employees have low involvement in both domains.

There are those who perceived to have equal involvement between work and family indicating involvement balance. Greenhaus and Beutell considered that there is balance if there is no role conflict. These are those who experienced no interference between domains. The study of Amazue (2013) shows that an equal involvement in both domains minimizes conflict between work and family, hence, increasing work-family balance. On the other hand, those that experienced a work imbalance, indicate more involvement with work than with family. These employees experience work interfering with family.

**Table 5. Current state of WLB of SLSU employees in terms of Satisfaction balance**

| Satisfaction Balance | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Balance              | 17        | 39.6       |
| Family imbalance     | 13        | 30.2       |
| Work imbalance       | 13        | 30.2       |
| Total                | 43        | 100.0      |

Moreover, respondents experience satisfaction balance in work and family. The table shows that 39.6% (17 out of 43) experienced an equal

satisfaction both in work and in life. Conversely 30.2% (13 out of 43) experienced a work imbalance (more satisfied with work than with family) and 30.2% experienced more satisfaction with family than with work.

Satisfaction balance refers to the individual experiencing equal level of satisfaction in work and life domains. Those who perceived more satisfaction with work than with family may have experienced more conflict with family domain than with the work domain. This may indicate that they have already achieved the goals that they have set in their careers while they are still not satisfied with the progress that they have made in meeting their goals for their family or their present family situation. On the other hand, those who perceived more satisfaction with family than with work may have experienced more conflict in the work domain than in the family domain. This may mean that they are not yet satisfied with the progress of their careers or they still want to accomplish more in their careers.

A high level of job satisfaction is reported among employees who are experiencing low levels of work-family conflict (Hajar et al, 2011). Also, a high level of family satisfaction is associated with low family-work conflict and work-family conflict. This goes to show that satisfaction in life and in job results from a low level of work-family conflict and a low level of work-family conflict is associated with work-family balance. This is reinforced by the results of the study of Qu (2012) that those employees who experience less conflict between work and life domains often carry positive aspects from daily life to the workplace, thus resulting to job satisfaction.

**Table 6. Influence of Work-life Balance to Job Performance**

| Job Performance  | Work-life Balance |                |                     |                |                      |                |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|
|                  | Time Balance      |                | Involvement Balance |                | Satisfaction Balance |                |
|                  | <i>p-value</i>    | <i>p-value</i> | <i>p-value</i>      | <i>p-value</i> | <i>p-value</i>       | <i>p-value</i> |
| Task performance | .052              | .741           | .229                | .339           | .229                 | .341           |
| Contextual       | .026              | .868           | .208                | .414           | <b>.320</b>          | .116           |

| performance                     |      |      |             |      |             |      |
|---------------------------------|------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|
| Adaptive performance            | .052 | .742 | <b>.284</b> | .185 | <b>.263</b> | .238 |
| Counterproductive work behavior | .048 | .758 | .119        | .752 | .161        | .592 |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Legend: Interpretation of correlation coefficients by Kurtz (1983)**

$\pm 0.00 - \pm 0.24$  =Low Association;

$\pm 0.25 - \pm 0.49$  =Moderate Association

$\pm 0.50 - \pm 0.74$  =High Association;

$\pm 0.75 - \pm 1.00$  =Very High Association

Concerning the influence of work-life balance to job performance, results show that time balance is highly associated with task performance and adaptive performance; and moderately associated with contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior. Conversely, involvement balance is moderately associated with adaptive performance and satisfaction balance is also moderately associated with adaptive performance. Furthermore, satisfaction balance is moderately associated with contextual performance. However, the relationship is found to be not significant.

Involvement balance refers to the individual being equally involved to both work and life domains (Omran, 2016). This is the component of work-life balance that is experienced by the employee when work does not interfere with personal life and vice versa. Alternatively, satisfaction balance refers to the state where there is equal satisfaction from both work and life domains. It happens when the employee experiences fulfillment in both his family life and work. Adaptive performance, on the other hand, is defined as ‘the extent to which an individual adapts to changes in a work system or work roles’. This is reflected in the management of learning indicator. Management of learning refers to the faculty member’s ability to create and manage a learning environment that is conducive

and at the same time guide, monitor, and evaluate student learning. The results suggest a neither strong nor weak relationship between involvement balance and satisfaction balance to adaptive performance of the employees. The results further suggest that the employees' ability to create a learning environment for the students is related to the amount of conflict that they experience at home or at work that interferes with the other domain (may it also be at home or at work) and with the fulfillment that they experience with either of the domains.

Furthermore, satisfaction balance is moderately associated with contextual performance; contextual performance is defined as 'individual behaviors that support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function'. This reflects to the commitment indicator. Commitment refers to a faculty member's deep sense of responsibility to render service for the development of the student's well-being and for the advancement of his/her discipline. The results indicate that employees' sense of responsibility to go out of their usual way for the good of the students and of their work relates to the fulfillment that they feel towards their job or towards their family situation.

The results mirror the findings of the study of Mendis and Weerakkody (2014) on the relationship between work-life balance and employee performance in the telecommunications industry. These academic scholars stressed that poor work-life balance leads to poor employee performance. The results of the study of Aslam (2015) on the influence of work-life balance on employee performance in the education sector of Pakistan reveal that work-life balance has a significant and positive effect on employee performance. In addition, a study among commercial banks in Lagos State conducted by Obiageli, O. et al (2015) concluded that work-life balance practice is important to increase employee performance.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

In terms of time balance, most of the employees experience a work imbalance which suggests that they spend more time at work. In terms of involvement balance, the employees experience a family imbalance which could mean that the family domain interferes with the work domain. Spending

more time at work does not mean more involvement at work. For the employees in the state university, the demanding nature of work made them spend more time at work, however, the family domain still interferes with the work domain indicating a family imbalance in terms of involvement balance. In terms of the third component of work-life balance, satisfaction balance, most of the employees experience a balance. This could indicate that most of the employees experience that they have already achieved the goals that they have set both for their family and careers. In addition, this may further point out that they are already satisfied with the progress that they have made in their careers and in their respective families. However, still a significant number perceive otherwise which suggests that they have not yet achieved the goals that they have set for their careers and still struggles to work hard for the realization of these career goals. Conversely, an equal portion perceive a family imbalance suggesting that they are yet to realize their goals for their family, may it be goals for more income or others, and will continue towards its achievement.

The study found out that time balance is highly associated with task performance and adaptive performance; and moderately associated with contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior. In addition, involvement balance is moderately associated with adaptive performance; and that satisfaction balance is also moderately associated with adaptive performance and contextual performance. However, the relationship is found to be not significant. For the state university employees, their perception on work-life balance influenced their job performance; more so in performing the tasks central to their job (task performance). The implementation of work-life balance programs allows employees to work more effectively (Ichniowski et al, 1996), while facilitating the retention of valuable employees for companies, improving the return on investments in human capital (Konrad & Managel, 2000; Yamamoto & Matsuura, 2012). Moreover, work-life effectiveness is one way, besides compensation, viewed by human resource management as a tool for effective talent management. As there is an evident talent war, compensation is seen to be inadequate to handcuff

talented people and therefore introducing means to promote work-life effectiveness is seen to be a positive reinforcement. When employees have the perception that the organization is thinking about their welfare through providing them opportunities to strengthen their work-life balance, then in exchange, employees will contribute positively to the company through performing better for its benefit.

Previous studies showed that work-life balance affects performance (Obiageli, 2015; Mendis & Weerakkody, 2014). The present study gave specific insights as to what components of work-life balance are associated with what aspect of job performance.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends her heartfelt gratitude to Southern Leyte State University-Tomas Oppus and to her family for the support.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1]. Benito-Osorio, D., Muñoz-Aguado, L., & Villar, C. (2014). The impact of family and work-life balance policies on the performance of spanish listed companies. *Management*, 17(4), 214-236.
- [2]. Berman, EM. (2015). HRM in development: Lessons and frontiers. *Public Administration and Development*, 35(2), 113–127.
- [3]. Deephouse, D. (1996). Does isomorphism legitimate? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 1024-1039.
- [4]. Deery, M. (2008). Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(7), 792-806, doi: 10.1108/09596110810897619
- [5]. Doherty, L. & Manfredi, S. (2006). Action research to develop work-life balance in a UK university. *Women in Management Review*, 21(3), 241-259.
- [6]. Greenhaus, J., Parasuraman, S. & Wormley, W. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 33(1), 64-86. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/256352>
- [7]. Greenhaus, J.H., & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76–88. doi: 10.2307/258214
- [8]. Greenhaus, J.H., Collins, K.M., & Shaw, J.D. (2003). The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 510-531.
- [9]. Hajar, N., Rumaya, J. & Yaacob, S. (2011). The effect of job satisfaction and family satisfaction on work-family conflict (W-FC) and family-work conflict (F-WC) among married female nurses in Shiraz-Iran. *Asian Social Science*, 7(2), 88-85. doi: 10.5539/ass.v7n2p88
- [10]. Ji Sung, K. & Sangyub, R. (2017). Employee satisfaction with work-life balance policies and organizational commitment: A Philippine study. *Public Administration and Development*, 37, 260-276. doi: 10.1002/pad.1794
- [11]. Ichiniowski, C., Kochan, T., Levine, D., Olson, C., & Strauss, G. (1996). What works at work: Overview and assessment. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 35(3), 299-333.
- [12]. Kim, H.K. (2014). Work-life balance and employees' performance: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal*, 6(1), 37-51.
- [13]. Konrad, A., & Mangel, R. (2000). The impact of work-life programs on firm productivity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(12), 1225-1237.
- [14]. Koopmans, et al (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856-866. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763
- [15]. Lakkoju, S. & Jeyalakshmi, R. (2015, October). Factors influencing work-life balance of women educators: A case study. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, (51)2, 267-284.
- [16]. Lodahl, K. & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49(1), 24-33.

- [17]. Mendis, M. D. V. S., & Weerakkody, W. A. S. (2014). The Relationship between Work Life Balance and Employee Performance: With Reference to Telecommunication Industry of Sri Lanka. *Kelaniya Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(1-2).
- [18]. Miryala, R.K. & Chiluka, N. (2012). Work-life balance amongst teachers. *The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, (11)1, 37-50.
- [19]. Mohd Noor, K, Stanton, P. & Young, S. (2009). Work-life balance and job satisfaction: A study among academics in Malaysian higher education institutions, Paper presented to *The 14<sup>th</sup> Asia Pacific Management Conference 2009*, Surabaya, Indonesia
- [20]. Obiageli, O. L., Uzochukwu, O. C., & Ngozi, C. D. (2015). Work life balance and employee performance in selected commercial banks in Lagos State. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Management Sciences Vol*, 3(4).
- [21]. Omran, A. (2016). Work-family balance dilemma among employed parents (An empirical study ). *International Journal of Business and Economic Development*, 4(1), 31–47.
- [22]. Qu, H. & Zhao, X. (2012). Employees' work-family conflict moderating life and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 22-28. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.010
- [23]. Yamamoto, I., & Matsuura, T. (2012). Effect of work-life balance practices on firm productivity: Evidence from Japanese firm-level panel data. *The Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry*.