

## “Work Life Balance among Teachers: An Empirical Study”

Adeeba Irfan\* & Dr. Feza Tabassum Azmi\*\*

\*Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration AMU, Aligarh

\*\*Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration AMU, Aligarh

---

### **Abstract:**

**Purpose:** Work Life Balance (WLB) has gained attention in corporate sector. However, there is a need to explore the subject vis-à-vis teachers, keeping in mind the increasing cases of work life problems among teachers. Thus, the purpose of this study is to map the dimensions of WLB among teachers.

**Design/methodology/approach:** This study is based on the responses of teachers both from university and school. Research instrument designed on the basis of literature survey and then data was collected. In all 112 responses were generated. In this scale refinement was done using factor analysis. Reliability, validity and correlation etc were calculated.

**Findings:** No significant difference was found among teachers on the any WLB dimensions. Inter item Convergent validity was high. For all constructs loadings were more than 0.5 that is a good indicator of convergent validity. Discriminant validity also exists between constructs.

**Managerial implications:** This study may give insight regarding the problem that teachers usually face. Balance should be established between workload distribution, time and extra-curricular activities so as to inculcate efficiency among teachers.

**Research Limitations:** The study is based on a limited sample size. There is a need to carry out studies with a larger sample size to make results more generalizable.

**Keywords:** Work-life Balance, work load distribution.

---

### I. Introduction

There is a complex relationship between work and personal life of individuals. In the present context, the concept of Work-Life Balance (WLB) has gained immense significance. Clark (2000) defined Work-life balance as satisfaction and smooth functioning at work and home without any role conflict. Work-life balance can be defined as a measure of proper control as to how, when and where people work. Proper work life balance can be achieved when an individual is able to fulfill all his/her needs in respect of family, work and society. Within the social sciences there is much contemporary concern regarding work-life balance (Warren, 2004).

With increasing demands and pressures of work-life, conflicts between work and personal roles seem to be increasing. Changed demographics of the workforce have been the primary force for the increased focus on family-work issues. Organizations where there is sound work-life balance practices and policies experience better financial outcomes (Fleetwood, 2007). These benefits include: lower rates of absenteeism, increased productivity; improved customer experience; improved recruitment and retention; reduced overheads; more motivated, satisfied and equitable workforce (Employers for Work Life Balance, 2006). Work-life balance is a term that is always used in context of employees in general, but nowadays teachers are found to be overburdened due to their academic work load and career issues (Hakanen et al., 2006). All this adds to the stress among teachers leading to imbalanced work- life equations. Thus, there is a need to study work-life balance issues vis-à-vis teachers.

### II. Literature Review

Near and Sorcinelli (1989) find out that nowadays there is increase in dual earning couple, less commuter couples, women academicians who marry and bear children, and male teachers who find themselves likely to take on family commitments. In spite of all this there is little such research on the above mentioned area. Teaching is stressful (Borg & Riding, 1991) it has been found that 5% to 20% of all U.S. teachers/ academicians are burned out or stressed (Farber, 1991). In comparison with other professions, teachers show high levels of fatigue and pessimism, which are said to be the core dimensions of burnout/ work life conflict (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Kalimo and Hakanen (2000) conducted a study in Finland where educators have the highest burnout levels when they are compared to workers in all other human services and white collar/executive jobs. Hakanen et al., (2006) has used the job demand model which proposes that there are two processes one was said to be energetical process and motivational process, where energetical process can lead to ill health, later can lead to organization commitment.

Much of the previous research on faculty work life has included such issues as faculty members' behavior, productivity and motivation (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995).

Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) conducted a study on faculty members in their study; they proposed and tested a multilevel structural equation model (SEM). The purpose of their model was to determine the impact of faculty morale and work life on their intent to leave and determine whether the impact is a function of institutional or individual perception. The results indicated that the perceptions faculty members have of their work life had a direct and powerful impact on their morale, and subsequently on their intentions to leave at both the individual and group or institutional levels. There was modest or no direct consequence of work life and demographic variables on faculty members' intentions to leave. Thus, the eminence of faculty members' work life affects their level of morale, and in turn, morale affects their intentions to leave their career or position. Smyth (1991) concluded that widespread economic recession seems to have shaped conditions where schools come under escalating pressures to provide measurable results by tight controls over teachers' work. Even liberal-sounding actions introduced in the name of modification, such as teacher reflection and collegiality, can be argued to drive mainly for control purpose.

Glass and Camarigg (1992) suggested that among the major benefit of academic employment is the flexibility of these jobs, this indicates that workplace flexibility is a key factor in reducing work-family conflict. A key problem, on the other hand, is that academic jobs are very challenging/demanding. Professors often criticize that the demands of their jobs never finish. Furthermore, a long, full-time commitment is estimated for successful entry into the ranks of tenured faculty. Jacob (2004) concluded that how Professors put in very long hours. It has been found that full-time male faculty work 54.8 hours per week on an average; their female counterparts report working almost 52.8 hours per week. Faculty members work more hours per week than in most other occupations. Indeed, professors account for longer work week than do most of their counterparts in white collar occupations. Garrett and Ssesanger (2005) conducted a study that illuminates factors contributing to academic satisfaction and dissatisfaction in higher education in the developing world. They used a sample of 182 respondents from two universities in Uganda, and concluded that while tenure, rank, and age predict academic job satisfaction; there was no evidence to support gender influence job satisfaction among academicians.

Rosner (2005) had targeted two hundred three teachers and find out the impact of work-family confliction job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). He indicated that OCB was associated negatively to work-family conflict, and positively to job satisfaction, work-family culture and organizational commitment. The study indicated that work-family culture predicts work-family conflict, and that various forms of work-family conflict predict OCB. Analyses also showed that work-family culture predicts both OCB and organizational commitment, and that organizational commitment does not intercede or mediate the relationship between OCB and work family culture and. The findings support the importance for schools to promote a positive work-family culture.

Ward and Wendel (2006) explored the boundary between work and family at different types of institutions from the viewpoint of women faculty who are on the tenure track (on verge of promotion and who are mothers of young children. Such a view provides insight into institutional disparity on academic life in general, and for any new female faculty as mothers in particular.

### **Work Life Balance Among Teachers**

Ample researches were conducted on teachers Work life balance as it has been found that teaching is a stressful profession (Rosser, 2004). Another most important reason for studying teachers on the aspect of Work life balance is that, this is the profession that has overwhelmingly female than in any other profession (Acker 1996). Clark (1989) concluded that it is the teaching profession that has different dimensions such as pattern of work, authority, identification and career etc, and most important thing is that all these dimensions differ with different institutes and subjects that is why this field is most preferred for Work family conflict. Near (1989) studied the feasible ways in which work and life away from work are connected among university faculty members. This study identifies differences on the basis of rank and gender, and also suggests implication of family friendly policies for institutions of higher education. Winslow and Jacobs (2004) find out relationship between faculty workload and their dissatisfaction. The authors find proof that how many professors are discontented because of their workload. In addition, dissatisfaction enhances among those working the longest hours. The data also point out that extended hours on the job really contribute to research efficiency. The extended hours demanded by faculty jobs therefore pretense a problem for those parents (professors) who want to splurge time with their families and their children.

### **Work Life Balance In India**

Studies on work-life balance in the Indian context are still few and far between. Sandeep (2012) carried out a study on work life balance initiatives and how these initiatives impact employee's personal and

professional performance. It also investigates the relationship between work-life balance initiatives and employees attitude towards work life conflicts. Mathew and Panchanathan (2010) examined the relationship of various facets of work-family balance with organization commitment (OC) and its different dimensions among employees in the service sector in India.

Babu et, al: (2009) had conducted a study in an Indian IT industries. The study was all about including flexi time and then its impact on work life balance. The study showed positive relationship and significant relationship between flexi-time and employee stress. It has been found that administrative personnel are able to trim down their stress levels with the help of flexi-time as one the main work-life balance practice.

### **Research Gap And Objectives**

From the review of literature it was found that there exist a number of researches on stress among students but very few have focused on specific dimensions of work life balance of teachers (Lewis et. al. 2009, Clark 1989). Most of the studies on teacher’s work life balance have been conducted in western countries (e.g. Rosner et.al 2005; Robotham 2001; Jacob 2004; Hakanenet.al 2005). Thus, this concept is under explored in the Indian context.

Based on the literature, following objectives were considered for the study:

- To identify the dimensions of work life balance among University and School teachers.
- To assess the differences on the basis of gender vis-à-vis dimensions of work-life balance.
- To assess the differences on the basis of marital status vis-à-vis dimensions of work-life balance.
- To assess the differences on the basis of occupation of spouse vis-à-vis dimensions of work-life balance.
- To assess the differences on the basis of number of dependents vis-à-vis dimensions of work-life balance
- To assess the differences on the basis of age vis-à-vis dimensions of work-life balance.

### **III. Research Design**

The present research is conclusive, descriptive and based on single-cross sectional design. Quantitative data was generated to test the research hypothesis. In order to collect data on the dimensions of the study, a research instrument was designed.

The study was conducted on University and school teachers in Aligarh. At University level data was collected from professional courses, as University faculty at professional level has more work pressure (e.g.: dissertation, summer training, project report and sectionals etc). School teachers of the same University affiliated schools were selected as they also share the same policies and contextual environment same as university professors, along with the work pressure and time bound duties. All aspects of the research design are such that which leads to Learning how teachers balance work, life and study in a socially constructed, multifaceted and ever changing environment makes a qualitative research all the more suitable for this study. Appropriate design gain an insight into the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of teachers of both school as well as university attain work-life balance. The level of detail obtained through the design reinforces the credibility of this strategy.

A research instrument designed for the purpose was personally administered to the teachers. The list of teachers was obtained from the concerned institutes. In all 112 completely filled questionnaires were received.

### **Research Constructs and Instrument**

The research instrument was based on dimensions of work-life balance. Dex and Bond (2005) find out different covariates of Work Life balance and measures include work flexibility, health, relationship etc. Pichler (2008) segregated different work and home related dimension to measure work life balance. Scale in the present study was adapted from the psychometric assessment 19 items containing tool as suggested by Hayman (2005). The constructs/dimensions for the study were adapted from Hayman (2005), the dimensions considered in the present study are-

**1-Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL):** This construct measures the impact of work on personal life; it include items like; “My job make personal life difficult”.

**2-Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW):** This construct measures the impact of personal life on work; it include items like; “I am tired to be effective at work”.

**3-Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE):** This construct shows that how personal life and work support each other; it include items like, “I have a better mood because of my job”.

Teaching satisfaction (TS) and Job satisfaction (JS) are dependent variable in this study. TS scale was adapted from the study of Ho and Au (2006), as their scale the level of satisfaction that a person derives in selecting teaching as their profession. It contains items like, “I am satisfied with being a teacher”. Job satisfaction scale used in this study has been adapted from Oshagbemi (1997), it helps to measure the elements that support in the profession of teaching, and it contains items like, “Present salary”.

4- **Job Satisfaction (JS):** All dimensions related to job satisfaction.

5- **Teaching Satisfaction (TS):** All dimensions related to teaching satisfaction that whether a person is satisfied by selecting teaching as profession.

The instrument was based a 5-point Likert Scale anchored with end points labeled as strongly agree (5) and strongly disagree (1).

### **Hypotheses**

Various researches have been done related to the theme of WLB on teachers of different streams such as medical sciences (Dahlin et al., 2005), law teachers (Clarke et al. 1986) etc. It was found that differences exist because of the academic and extracurricular workload that they experience. Kai-wen (2003) explored differences on the basis of gender. He suggested that male teachers feel stronger stress related to family factor in comparison to the females. Kalimo and Hakanen (2000) conducted a study that measures that how marital status has an impact on person's work life. Rosner (2005) found out that teachers from school have less pressure when they are compared to university faculty members.

Based on the above findings, following hypotheses were framed:

#### **Category I**

The hypothesis in the category 1 deals with differences between university and school teachers on each dimension of work life balance.

**H1- There is no significant differences between teachers of University and school on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H2- There is no significant differences between teachers of University and school on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H3- There is no significant differences between teachers of University and school on the dimension of work personal life enhancement.**

#### **Category II**

Simpson and Simpson (1969) find out that women's main attachment to family roles left them less committed to work; lesser commitment meant that more supervision was required. Glass and Camarigg (1992) concluded that Female academicians who have full-time employed husbands have the potential to add to the time pressures that they experience.

The hypothesis in the category II deals with differences between male and female teachers on each dimension of work life balance.

**H4- There is no significant differences between male and female teachers on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H5- There is no significant differences between male and female teachers on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H6- There is no significant differences between male and female teachers on the dimension of work personal life enhancement.**

#### **Category III**

The hypothesis in the category III deals with differences marital status of teachers on each dimension of work life balance.

**H7- There is no significant differences between marital status of teachers on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H8- There is no significant differences between marital status of teachers on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H9- There is no significant differences between marital status of teachers on the dimension of work personal life enhancement.**

#### **Category IV**

The hypothesis in the category IV deals with differences between occupation of spouse of teachers on each dimension of work life balance.

**H10- There is no significant differences between occupation of spouse on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H11- There is no significant differences between occupation of spouse on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H12- There is no significant differences between occupation of spouse on the dimension of work personal life enhancement.**

#### **Category V**

The hypothesis in the category V deals with differences between numbers of dependents that teachers have on each dimension of work life balance.

**H13- There is no significant differences between numbers of dependents on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H14- There is no significant differences between numbers of dependents on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H15- There is no significant differences between numbers of dependents on the dimension of work personal life enhancement**

#### **Category VI**

The hypothesis in the category VI deals with differences between age of teachers on each dimension of work life balance.

**H16- There is no significant differences between age on the dimension of work interference with personal life.**

**H17- There is no significant differences between age on the dimension of personal life interference with work.**

**H18- There is no significant differences between age on the dimension of work personal life enhancement.**

#### **ANALYSIS**

Analysis was conducted using SPSS. The results were evaluated on each dimension of teachers work-life balance to test the hypotheses of the study. An independent-sample T-test was used to examine differences between respondents from University and school teacher from the same Aligarh campus.

#### **Results of Independent-sample T-test**

Based on the analysis following results were generated

##### **Category I: University and School Teachers**

Significant differences were observed between University and School Teachers on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ( $t [110] = 2.340, p < .05$ ) between University Teachers (mean = 3.23, SD = .804) and School Teachers (mean = 2.90, SD = .633). Thus, the null hypothesis H1 was Not Accepted.

Significant differences were observed between University and School Teachers on the dimension of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ( $t [110] = 2.094, p < .05$ ) between University Teachers (mean = 3.69, SD = .797) and School Teachers (mean = 3.38, SD = .702). Thus, the null hypothesis H2 was Not Accepted.

Significant differences were observed between University and School Teachers on the dimension of Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ( $t [110] = 2.160, p < .05$ ) between University Teachers (mean = 2.19, SD = .709) and School Teachers (mean = 2.50, SD = .798). Thus, the null hypothesis H3 was Not Accepted.

The results of T-test on University and School teachers are given in Tables 1(a) and 2 (a)

**Take in Tables 1 (a) and 2(a)**

##### **Category II: Gender**

No significant differences were observed between Male and Female Teachers on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ( $t [110] = -0.227, p > .05$ ) between Males (mean = 3.07, SD = .679) and Females (mean = 3.11, SD = .783). Thus, the null hypothesis H4 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Males and Females Teachers on the dimension of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ( $t [110] = .477, p > .05$ ) between Males (mean = 3.61, SD = .704) and Females (mean = 3.54, SD = .798). Thus, the null hypothesis H5 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Males and Females Teachers on the dimension of Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ( $t [110] = .431, p > .05$ ) between Males (mean = 2.38, SD = .773) and Females (mean = 2.31, SD = .759). Thus, the null hypothesis H6 was Accepted.

The results of T-test on Gender are given in Tables 1(b) and 2 (b)

**Take in Tables 1 (b) and 2(b)**

### **Category III: Marital Status**

No significant differences were observed between Married and Single Teachers on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ( $t [110] = -0.261, p > .05$ ) between Single Teachers (mean = 3.07, SD = .639) and Married Teachers (mean = 3.11, SD = .810). Thus, the null hypothesis H7 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Married and Single Teachers on the dimension of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ( $t [110] = 0.131, p > .05$ ) between Single Teachers (mean = 3.57, SD = .765) and Married Teachers (mean = 3.55, SD = .778). Thus, the null hypothesis H8 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Married and Single Teachers on the dimension of Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ( $t [110] = 0.661, p > .05$ ) between Single Teachers (mean = 2.39, SD = .656) and Married Teachers (mean = 2.29, SD = .812). Thus, the null hypothesis H9 was Accepted.

The results of T-test on Marital Status are given in Tables 1(c) and 2 (c)

**Take in Tables 1 (c) and 2(c)**

### **Category IV: Occupation of Spouse**

No significant differences were observed between Occupation of Spouse on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ( $t [69] = 0.152, p > .05$ ) between Working Spouse (mean = 3.11, SD = .836) and Non Working Spouse (mean = 3.08, SD = .778). Thus, the null hypothesis H10 was Accepted.

No Significant differences were observed between Occupation of Spouse on the dimension of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ( $t [69] = -0.338, p > .05$ ) between Working Spouse (mean = 3.53, SD = .798) and Non Working Spouse (mean = 3.60, SD = .777). Thus, the null hypothesis H11 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Occupation of Spouse on the dimension of Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ( $t [69] = -0.808, p > .05$ ) between Working Spouse (mean = 2.26, SD = .780) and Non Working Spouse (mean = 2.44, SD = .884). Thus, the null hypothesis H12 was Accepted.

The results of T-test on Occupation of Spouse are given in Tables 1(d) and 2 (d)

**Take in Tables 1 (d) and 2(d)**

### **Category V: Numbers of Dependents**

No significant differences were observed between Numbers of Dependents on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) ( $t [110] = 1.244, p > .05$ ) between less than three dependents (mean = 3.16, SD = .748) and four and above dependents (mean = 2.98, SD = .754). Thus, the null hypothesis H13 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Numbers of Dependents on the dimension of Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) ( $t [110] = -0.210, p > .05$ ) between less than three dependents (mean = 3.55, SD = .774) and four and above dependents (mean = 3.58, SD = .772). Thus, the null hypothesis H14 was Accepted.

No significant differences were observed between Numbers of Dependents on the dimension of Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) ( $t [110] = -0.400, p > .05$ ) between less than three dependents (mean = 2.30, SD = .790) and four and above dependents (mean = 2.36, SD = .714). Thus, the null hypothesis H15 was Accepted.

The results of T-test on Number of Dependents are given in Tables 1(e) and 2 (e)

**Take in Tables 1 (e) and 2(e)**

### **Category VI: Age**

In category V, **One-way analysis of variance** (abbreviated **one-way ANOVA**) is used to compare means of two or more samples (using the F distribution). This technique can be used only for numerical data.

The ANOVA tests the null hypothesis that samples in two or more groups are drawn from populations with the same mean values.

Since  $0.835 > 0.05$ , it can be interpreted that there is a No significant difference between Age of Teachers on the dimension Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL), so null hypothesis H16 was Accepted.

Since  $0.156 > 0.05$ , it can be interpreted that there is a No significant difference between Age of Teachers on the Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW), so null hypothesis H17 was Accepted.

Since  $0.072 > 0.05$ , it can be interpreted that there is a No significant difference between Age of Teachers on the dimension Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE), so null hypothesis H18 was Accepted.

**Result of ANOVA for Age is given in table 3**

#### **Reliability & Validity**

Reliability means the extent to which the scale produces steady result if repetitive measures are made. Cronbach alpha is the measure to test the reliability, generally values of  $>0.6$  are considered as having satisfactory internal consistency reliability. In this study all constructs loadings were more than 0.6 that is a good indicator of reliability. Validity of a scale can be defined as the degree to which differences in observed scale scores replicate accurate differences among items on uniqueness being measured, rather than systematic or random error. Convergent validity exists in this study as scale correlates positively with other measures of same constructs. Discriminant validity also exists in this case.

**Result of Reliability is shown in table 3 (a)**

**Result of Validity is shown in table 3 (b)**

#### **IV. Conclusions And Managerial Implications**

The intention of the study was to investigate how teachers (university/school) manage their Work Life Balance. Since most of the past literature on work-life balance pertained to the employees in the corporate sector, this study intended to shift existing literature of work-life balance into the emerging phenomenon of teachers.

In the present study, an Independent sample T-test was deployed to check the differences between teachers on each dimension of work life balance **Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL), Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW), Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)**.

No significant differences were observed between males and females teachers on the dimensions of Work Life Balance (Work Interference with Personal Life, Personal Life Interference with Work and Work Personal Life Enhancement). It can be concluded that since the respondents are almost of the same age, there are similarities in their perceptions. So gender was not found to be a significant differentiating factor. No significant difference was observed among teachers on the basis of marital status, occupation of spouse, number of dependents and age on the dimension of Work Interference with Personal Life, Personal Life Interference with Work and Work Personal Life Enhancement. However, significant difference was observed between University and School teachers on the dimension of Work Life Balance (Work Interference with Personal Life, Personal Life Interference with Work and Work Personal Life Enhancement) thus, there were significant differences between university and school teachers on the study dimensions. It can be concluded that since the respondents are from school as well as university, there are differences in their perceptions. Although they are teaching in the same university, they share differences in physical evidence and type of students and work hours, differences in workload, training requirements and nature of course that they are teaching. Teachers in professional courses usually experience more work-life pressures.

It is a unique study because it has been in context of teachers as earlier no such study on university and school teachers were carried out. Thus, there have been limited researches on this topic. It provides an insight to researchers for future study. It provides an understanding of issues which are of concern to teachers. It may therefore give insight to university authorities regarding the problems that teachers usually face in their lives. Interaction between teacher and higher authorities should be enhanced so that teachers can share their problems. Interaction between authorities and teachers should be enhanced to understand WLB issues confronting them. Balance should be established between workload distribution, leisure time and extra-curricular activities so as to engender academic excellence.

#### **V. Limitations and Future Research Directions**

1. The study is limited to teachers of only University (university itself and the related schools under university), so this study can be extended to compare the dimensions of work life balance with teachers of other universities.
2. The study was conducted in a limited time period on a limited sample. For the purpose of the future study and much better results, the sample size of the respondents can be increased.
3. Data collection was a problem because most of the teachers generally do not have time to provide responses. Some respondents were so busy in their routine life that they are not easily ready to fill the questionnaire. An intensive follow-up and reminder mechanism is needed in future to enhance the rigor of the process.

#### **References**

- [1]. Acker Sandra (1996), Gender and Teachers' Work; Review of Research in Education, Vol. 21, pp. 99-162
- [2]. Beaugregard, T. A. (2006). Predicting interference between work and home: A comparison of dispositional and situational antecedents. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(3), 244-264.

[3]. Blackburn, R. T., and Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

[4]. Borg, M., and R. Riding. (1991), *Stress in Teaching: A study of Occupational Stress and its determinants, Job Satisfaction and career commitment among primary school teachers*, *Journal Of Educational Psychology* 11: 59-75.

[5]. Clark (1989).*The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds* .*Educational Researcher*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (Jun. - Jul., 1989), pp. 4-8

[6]. Clark SC (2000) *Work/family border theory: a new theory of work/family balance*. *Human Relations* 53:747–770

[7]. Dahlin, M., Joneborg, N., &Runeson, B. (2005). *Stress and depression among medical teachers: A cross-sectional study*. *Medical Education*, 39, 594-604

[8]. Dex S and Bond S (2005): *Measuring work-life balance and its covariates*. *Work, Employment and Society* 19(3): 627–37.

[9]. Farber, B. (1991). *Crisis in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[10]. Fleetwood, S. (2007) *Why work–life balance now?* *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18,3, 387–400.

[11]. Glass, J. &Camarigg, V. (1992). *Gender, parenthood, and job-family compatibility*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 131–151.

[12]. Hakanen Jari J , Arnold B. Bakker b, Wilmar B. Schaufeli (2006), *Burnout and work engagement among teachers*,*Journal of School Psychology* 43 :495–513

[13]. Hakanen et al: (2006): *Burnout and work engagement among teachers*, *Journal of School Psychology*, 43 (2006) 495–513

[14]. Hayman, J. (2005). *Psychometric Assessment of an Instrument Designed to Measure Work Life Balance*, *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13(1), 85-91.

[15]. Ho C.L. & Au W.T. (2006). *Teaching satisfaction scale: measuring job satisfaction of teachers*. *Educational and psychological Measurement*, 66, 172-185.

[16]. Jacobs A. Jerry ,(2004); *The Faculty Time Divide ;Sociological Forum*, Vol. 19, No. 1pp. 3-27

[17]. Jerry A. Jacobs and Sarah E. Winslow (2004). *Overworked Faculty: Job Stresses and Family Demands: Annual journals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 596, .104-129

[18]. Johnsrud, L. K., and Rosser, V. J. (2002). *Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation*. *The Journal of Higher Education* 71(1): 34-59.

[19]. Kai-Wen. (2003). *A study of stress among college teachers in Taiwan*, *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*.

[20]. Kalimo, R., & Hakanen, J. (2000). *Work and Health in Finland: Burnout*. Virtanen (Ed.), (pp. 119– 126).

[21]. Karim Ssesanga and Roger M. Garrett (2005). *Job Satisfaction of University Academics: Perspectives from Uganda* .*Higher Education*, Vol. 50, pp. 33-56

[22]. Leiter, M. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1996). *Consistency of the burnout construct across occupations*. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, 9, 229–243.

[23]. Lewis, S., Brannen, J and Nilsen, A (2009) *Work, Families and Organisations in Transition*.

[24]. *European Perspectives*. London: Policy Press.

[25]. Mathew V.R, Panchanathan N, (2010), *an empirical analysis of the impact of various dimensions of WLB on Organization Commitment among service sector employees in India: IJMS* 17(1) 129-147

[26]. Near P .Janet and Mary Deane Sorcinelli (1989);*Relations between Work and Life Away from Work among University Faculty*; 59-81

[27]. Oshagbemi, T. (1997). *Job satisfaction profiles of university teachers*. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12 (1), 27–39.

[28]. Pichler, F. (2008) *Determinants of Work-life Balance: Shortcomings in the Contemporary Measurement of WLB*, Aberdeen, UK, *Soc Indic Res Vol. 92: 449-469*.

[29]. Robotham, G. (2001). *Safety training that works*. *Professional Safety* 46(5):33-37

[30]. Rosner, E., Lisa Indovino, Jennifer DeNicolis Bragger, Ofelia Rodriguez-Srednicki, Eugene J. Kutcher, (2005); *Work-Family Conflict, Work-Family Culture, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Teachers*., *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 2 pp. 303-324

[31]. Rosser (2004).*Faculty member` sintentions to leave:A National Study on Their Worklife and Satisfaction*. *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No. 3.

[32]. Sandeep Aggarwal (2012), *balancing professional and personal life : WLB study @ Indian oil corporation*, *international journal of business and management tomorrow*, vol 2 no.2

[33]. Schaufeli, W.B. & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study andpractice: Acritical analysis*. London: Taylor & Francis.

[34]. Simpson, R. L., & Simpson, I. H. (1969). *Women and bureaucracy in the semi-professions*. organization .*International journal of New York*: (pp. 196-265).

[35]. Smyth (2005). *Devolution and Teachers' Work: The Underside of a Complex Phenomenon*;*Educational Management Administration &Leadership* ; 23: 168-175,

[36]. Wolf-Wendel, L., & Ward, K. (2006). *Academic life and motherhood: Variations by institutional type*. *Higher Education*, 52(3), 487-521.

[37]. Warren tracey(2004). *Working part-time: achieving a successful‘work-life’ balance?**The British Journal of Sociology* 2004 Volume 55 Issue 1

	University/ School	Mean	S.D
<b>Work Interference with Personal Life ( WIPL)</b>	University Teacher	3.23	0.804
	School Teacher	2.90	0.633
<b>Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)</b>	University Teacher	3.69	0.797
	School Teacher	3.38	0.702
<b>Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)</b>	University Teacher	2.19	0.709
	School Teacher	2.50	0.798

**Exhibit 1(a) : T-Test Group Statistics**



	t test for equality of means			Null hypothesis
	t	df	Sig. ( 2 tailed)	
CWIPL	2.340	110	0.021	Rejected
CPLIW	2.094	110	0.039	Rejected
CWPLE	2.160	110	0.033	Rejected

**Exhibit 2(a): Independent sample T test (equal variances assumed)**

**University and School Teachers**

	Gender	Mean	S.D
Work Interference with Personal Life ( WIPL)	Male	3.07	0.679
	Female	3.11	0.783
Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)	Male	3.61	0.704
	Female	3.54	0.798
Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)	Male	2.375	0.773
	Female	2.306	0.759

**Exhibit 1(b) : T-Test Group Statistics**

	t test for equality of means			Null hypothesis
	t	df	Sig. ( 2 tailed)	
CWIPL	-0.227	110	0.820	Accepted
CPLIW	0.477	110	0.634	Accepted
CWPLE	0.431	110	0.667	Accepted

**Exhibit 2(b): Independent sample T test (equal variances assumed)**

**Gender**

	Marital status	Mean	S.D
Work Interference with Personal Life ( WIPL)	Single	3.07	0.639
	Married	3.11	0.810
Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)	Single	3.57	0.765
	Married	3.55	0.778
Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)	Single	2.39	0.656
	Married	2.29	0.812

**Exhibit 1(c) : T-Test Group Statistics**

	t test for equality of means			Null hypothesis
	t	df	Sig. ( 2 tailed)	
CWIPL	-0.261	110	0.795	Accepted
CPLIW	0.131	110	0.896	Accepted
CWPLE	0.661	110	0.510	Accepted

**Exhibit 2(c): Independent sample T test (equal variances assumed)**

**Marital Status**

	Occupation of Spouse	Mean	S.D
Work Interference with Personal Life ( WIPL)	Working	3.11	0.836
	Non Working	3.08	0.778
Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)	Working	3.53	0.798
	Non Working	3.60	0.777
Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)	Working	2.26	0.780
	Non Working	2.44	0.884

**Exhibit 1(d) : T-Test Group Statistics**

	t test for equality of means			Null Hypothesis
	t	df	Sig. ( 2 tailed)	
CWIPL	0.152	69	0.880	Accepted
CPLIW	-0.338	69	0.737	Accepted
CWPLE	-0.808	69	0.422	Accepted

**Exhibit 2(d): Independent sample T test (equal variances assumed)**

**Occupation of spouse**

	Number of Dependents	Mean	S.D
Work Interference with Personal Life ( WIPL)	Less Than 3	3.16	0.748
	4 and Above	2.98	0.754
Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW)	Less Than 3	3.55	0.774
	4 and Above	3.58	0.722
Work Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE)	Less Than 3	2.30	0.790
	4 and Above	2.36	0.714

**Exhibit 1(e) : T-Test Group Statistics**

	t test for equality of means			Null Hypothesis
	t	df	Sig. ( 2 tailed)	
CWIPL	1.244	110	0.216	Accepted
CPLIW	-0.210	110	0.834	Accepted
CWPLE	-0.400	110	0.690	Accepted

**Exhibit 2(e): Independent sample T test (equal variances assumed)**

**Number of dependents**

**\*\* In all the t tests there is no significant difference (except the test regarding institute) that is why null hypothesis was not rejected. As all sig. values are > 0.05.**

**ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
CWIPL	Between Groups	.207	2	.103	.180	.835
	Within Groups	62.574	109	.574		
	Total	62.781	111			
CPLIW	Between Groups	2.203	2	1.102	1.887	.156
	Within Groups	63.622	109	.584		
	Total	65.825	111			
CWPLE	Between Groups	3.016	2	1.508	2.690	.072
	Within Groups	61.089	109	.560		
	Total	64.105	111			

**Exhibit 3: One way ANOVA for age**

**\*\*\* In ANOVA also there were no significant differences found thus null hypothesis was not rejected. As all sig. values are > 0.05.**

**Reliability**

Cronbach's alpha	constructs
.660	CWIPL
.618	CPLIW
.788	CWPLE

**Exhibit 3(a):**

	CWIPL	CPLIW	CWPLE
C Pearson Correlation	1	.268**	-.150

W I P L	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004	.115
		112	112	112
C P L I N W	Pearson Correlation	.268**	1	-.186*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004		.049
		112	112	112
C W P L N E	Pearson Correlation	-.150	-.186*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.115	.049	
		112	112	112

Exhibit 3 (b):Correlations

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

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

Dimensions	Null Hypothesis
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Institutes	Not Accepted *
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Institutes	Not Accepted*
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Institutes	Not Accepted*
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Gender	Accepted*
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Gender	Accepted*
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Gender	Accepted*
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Marital status	Accepted*
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Marital status	Accepted*
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Marital status	Accepted*
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Spouse’s Occupation	Accepted *
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Spouse’s Occupation	Accepted*
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Spouse’s Occupation	Accepted*
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Number of dependents	Accepted*
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Number of dependents	Accepted*
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Number of dependents	Accepted*
Work interference with personal life vis-à-vis Age	Accepted*
Personal life interference with work vis-à-vis Age	Accepted *
Work personal life enhancement vis-à-vis Age	Accepted*

Exhibit 4 : Hypotheses Testing

\* Significant at p<0.05