

Prithvi Journal of Research and Innovation

(A Peer-Reviewed, Open Access Journal of Research Reports)

ISSN 2705-4888 (Print); ISSN 2705-4896 (Online)

Volume 1; 15 December 2019

Work Life Balance among Faculty Members of Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara

Resam Lal Poudel, Lecturer

Faculty of Management

Prithvi Narayan Campus, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara

ABSTRACT

Work life and personal life are almost inseparable. The main objective of the study is to find the factors affecting work-life balance and perception of faculty members towards those factors. Descriptive research has been used for the study. Out of the total population, only two hundred and twenty samples were selected employing multi stage sampling. However, only one hundred seventy four questionnaires were duly used for the study. Reliability and validity has been tested with Cronobah's Alpha of .710 comprising 23 items. Survey questionnaire as a primary source of data were used. The questionnaire was prepared both in English and Nepali script for the easiness of the respondents. Different statistical technique was used like mean, standard deviation, chi-square test, ANOVA test. The SPSS software was used for coding and output of data. The data output was presented in tabular form. The perceptual difference has been identified on the basis of demographic profile. Individual life at work and with family is not the influencing factors, but the other factors were the important factors affecting work life balance. Perceptual difference on the basis of gender, faculty involvement, designation, age and mode of residence has been noted on work-life balance. Lastly, it is recommended to the administration to develop a separate Human Resource Management Cell to maintain work life balance. Future researchers need to conduct research covering faculty members of different colleges. Factor analysis along with Structural Equation Modeling statistical tools need to be used in future studies too.

KEYWORDS: Differences faculty, perception, work life balance

INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance (WLB) is essentially the balance between three components, namely; paid work, unpaid work and personal time (Agha et al., 2017). Hackanen et. al (2006) stated that work-life balance is a factor which is always used in the context of employees. However, teachers are found to be overburden because of their workload and career issues. Therefore work-life balance issues need to be addressed in the academic sector.

Work life and personal life are almost inseparable. Balancing work and life is hard enough for the employees working in different organizations. It thus has affected the level of satisfaction among employees. Continuous efforts are being placed by organizations to ensure their employees are content by moving towards a more humanistic approach in dealing with them and identifying the role of a workers' life more

than just the hours they spend in the office. Some employees have real problems managing their time with work duties and family responsibilities which leads them to feel dissatisfied with work arrangements in the workplace. More stress and anxiety increases due to work overload. Another problem is that some employees in open office environments are dissatisfied because of lack of privacy and distraction. The open office environment may be an obstacle to reaching a good work-life balance. In addition, some employees can not finish their tasks at the workplace because of workload and other work conflicts and sometimes they stay longer hours.

Prithvi Narayan Campus does have a large number of teaching and non-teaching staffs. However, according to the proposed master plan, proper management of employees is necessary for the betterment of the campus and to meet the quality accreditation. However, it is also very important to manage employee's work-life balance. Therefore this research focuses on various aspects of work-life balance among university teachers which is less explored research in Nepalese context.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Modern organization, especially academic institutions should address work-life balance issues and implement policies to support them to manage work-life balance. Today, good balance between work and family is a growing concern for every profession (Subha,2013). Alexander & Ebria (2015) in their study concluded that time spent with the family members is important to maintain work-life balance. Work pressure affects family life and it also leads to a decline in the quality of work. Munn (2013) in their study concluded that female teachers have a problem in maintaining work-life balance compared to male teachers. However, (Helvaci, Bakalim, Can, & Akkoyun, 2017) carried out a study in Usak University among the university teachers. They revealed that gender dimension does not play a significant role in work-life balance. It means to say that work-life balance among academician is not significantly different between male and female teachers.

Negi and Singh (2012) explored the challenges associated with managing the professional and personal lives of employees. Life balance has become a quest for professionals in banking industries and also that employees work better when they do make time for family and personal interest. Varatharaj and Vasantha (2012) have studied on women working in the service sector with reference to Chennai city. It is said that the relationship between personal and professional life for women working in the service sector at Chennai can be achieved through emotional intelligence. Better emotion management is necessary in order to accomplish the day-to-day objectives of life. The findings of the study reveal that the majority of the women employees feel comfortable in their workplace irrespective of their trivial personal and work-place irritants. The secret to work-life balance will vary depending on the field of work, family structure, and financial position. The public sector banks scarify their career ambition for the sake of the family. Kumar & Hagargi (2013), highlights how the Indian ITES (Information Technology Enabled Services) are striving hard to balance the work-life of its employees and how employees balance the professional life and personal life in the hectic work environment. They have to make tough choices even when their work and personal lives are nowhere close to equilibrium. Work life and personal life are interrelated and interdependent. Spending more time in office, dealing with clients and the pressures of the job can interfere with and affect the personal life, sometimes making it impossible to even complete the household chores. On the other hand, personal life can also be demanding, if one has a kid or aging parents, financial problems or even problems in the

life of a dear relative. It can lead to absenteeism from work, creating stress and lack of concentration at work.

Nepali (2018) carried out a study on balancing work life and family life among women professionals in Nepal. He pointed out that women professional have many difficulties in maintaining work-life balance. Work-load and responsibility were the major reasons for poor work-life balance. He suggested that management should consider about work life that affects family life in any organization. A study carried out by Bista (2016) shows that there is no significant difference between male and female employees in commercial banks in Nepal. Biswakarma (2015) concluded in his study that employees working in Nepalese financial institutions have a comparatively low quality of work life in comparison to employee working in Nepalese non-financial institutions. His research concentrated on other non-financial sector but not the university teachers in specific. Gyanwali (2017) in his research explains that the working female school employees perceive that their higher household responsibilities hinder their work domain and cause stress. He also concluded that public sector teachers stress level is significantly lower than of private sector female school teachers in Nepal

This research will contribute to add literature in the field of human resource management. Similarly, research indicating those factors among university teachers is very new in the case of Prithvi Narayan Campus (PNC). Prithvi Narayan Campus is making a master plan to convert the campus to deemed university. Therefore, the research will also fulfill the literature gap of work-life balance among university teachers in Nepal.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Descriptive research design has been used to analyze, interpret and present the perception of faculty members on a different dimension of work-life balance among faculty members. Faculty member's perception towards work life balance are observed and described without influencing it in any way.

Population and Sample

The study has been based on primary data. The population of the study comprises of all faculty members involved in Prithvi Narayan Campus. The faculty and department of Prithvi Narayan Campus are mainly classified as management, humanities and social sciences, law, education and science and technology. The sample unit of the study includes the entire faculty in Prithvi Narayan Campus. Faculty of PNC (2017) shows that there are currently 490 faculty members from different faculty mentioned above. Among the faculty members, using finite population sample size determination formula developed by Yamane (1973), a sample of 220 has been determined with 5 % random error term.

$$\text{Sample Size } (n) = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

N=Population n=sample size e=random error term

The list of all faculty members provided by the administration section of the campus serves as the sample frame in this study. Multistage sampling technique was used to draw the sample. The first stage focuses on purposive sampling selecting Prithvi Narayan Campus from the different campus in Pokhara. Five faculty within the campus was selected in the second stage employing stratified sampling. Finally, respondents

comprising the faculty members were selected as a sample employing purposive sampling.

Total number of 296 questionnaires was administered and 296 copies were distributed to them. Of the 296 copies of questionnaires distributed to respondents, only 178 were returned. However out this number 176 were duly completed, but only 174 were useable and were processed for research work.

Research Instruments

For this study, the survey-questionnaire instrument has been used to achieve the objective of the study. The questionnaire was designed after referring to extensive literature available on same area of research and researcher self-intuition. A self-administered questionnaire has also been distributed to the faculty members. The questionnaire was mainly divided into three parts comprising the work-life balance dimension, job satisfaction dimension, and profile of respondents. The questionnaire follows open-ended and closed-ended systematically developed in English and translated into Nepali for the convenience of the faculty members. Five-point Likert scales have been employed, 5 indicating strongly agree and 1 indicating strongly disagrees. All form of scale, namely nominal, ordinal and scale data has been used in the questionnaire.

Reliability and Validity

Validity and reliability are the two important features for measuring tools to be taken into consideration. These two components are interrelated. Various measures will be undertaken to ensure the reliability and validity of measurement instruments, data collected, and analysis methodology employed. The face validity was ensured through evaluation undertaken by a number of assessors. Content validity has been presented by including all the necessary content of work-life balance in the questionnaire with the help of a statistician. To determine content validity, the human resource management experts were asked to consider whether items were placed in appropriate categories. It relies on the findings of the study. Criterion validity shows the level to which test scores are correlated with external indicators. For this purpose, the test result has been compared with the external indicators relating to work-life balance. Construct validity was ensured through the theoretical perspective of work-life balance.

The reliability of constructs used in questionnaire survey has been accessed via internal consistency reliability measure Cronbach's Alpha rather than the test-retest method. The Cronbach's Alpha of .710 comprising of 23 items has been identified which focus on internal consistence reliability. Additionally, pre-testing of the questionnaire and expert opinion has been undertaken. The random pilot sample has been chosen representing five faculty members from each faculty except faculty of law. The findings of the pilot study led to very few minor changes being made to the questionnaire.

Data Analysis Tools and Technique

The descriptive and inferential analyses both have been conducted. Similarly, univariate bivariate analyses have been used for analyzing data. Collected data has been presented and analyzed with the help of table and graph. Mean value of Likert scale and standard deviation, if and when necessary has been used as a part of the descriptive analysis. Univariate analysis has been performed using mean and frequency. The bivariate analysis has been utilized for cross tabulation and Chi-Square test to assess the association between the different sets of independent and dependent variables. One way ANOVA was assessed to find the perceptual difference among respondents. Those

descriptive and inferential analyses have been conducted with the software Microsoft Excel (Ms-Excel) and Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Respondents

Table 1

Demographic Profile of Respondents

<u>Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	150	86.2
Female	24	13.8
<u>Faculty</u>		
Management	54	31
Science	56	32.2
Humanities	38	21.8
Education	22	12.6
Law	4	2.3
<u>Qualification</u>		
Phd	15	8.6
M.Phil	7	4
Masters	152	87.4
<u>Designation</u>		
Professor	9	5.2
Assoc. Professor	24	13.8
Lecturer	90	51.7
Teaching Assistant	11	6.3
Adjunct Faculty	40	23
<u>Age of Respondents</u>		
Below 30	8	4.6
30-40	54	31
40-50	75	43.1
Above 50	37	21.3

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Out of the sample respondents, demographic characteristics including gender, age, faculty currently involved, qualification, designation currently held has been presented. This demographic representation highlights different issues on work life balance and job satisfaction of sample faculty members in Prithvi Narayan Campus.

Table 1 demonstrates the demographic characteristics of respondents. Results from the study indicates that most of the respondents are male (86.2%) followed by female (13.2%). Most of the respondents belongs to science and technology faculty comprising of 32.2 % followed by management, humanities, education and the least from law faculty including only 2.3 %. Most of the respondent's qualification is masters comprising of 87.4 % and remaining has completed their Mphil and PhD degree. Most of the respondents designation is lecturer (51.7%) followed by adjunct faculty, associate professor, professor and teaching assistant. Results from the questionnaire shows that the respondents aged 40 to 50 is the highest which comprises of 41.3 % . Only limited faculty members are below 30.

Work Life Balance Factors

Work life balance among faculty members is important to determine job satisfaction dimension. The research mainly focus on three dimension of work life balance namely individual life at work, individual life with family and other work life balance factors. In this study, mainly four items are presented to identify the individual life at work. The detail of individual life at work has been presented in table 2.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Individual Life at Work

<i>Items</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>
I believe I am an effective employee	174	1.00	5.00	3.97	1.09
I am happy with the quality of my work output	174	1.00	5.00	3.98	.96
I feel enthusiastic in my job	174	1.00	5.00	4.08	.93
Finding time to relax is easy for me	174	1.00	5.00	3.47	1.19

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 2 depicts the mean score and standard deviation of individual life at work among the respondents. All the items has mean score of more than 3 which indicates that faculty members of Prithvi Narayan Campus tends to maintain work life. Among the respondents, most of them feel enthusiastic towards their work. Similarly, they are satisfied with the work output. However, mean score of relaxation of 3.47 indicates that the faculty members has easiness to allocate relax time at work.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Individual Life with Family

<i>Items</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>max</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>
I do not have to change plans at home because of the demand of my job	174	1.00	5.00	3.28	1.21
I do have enough time to participate in leisure activities with my family/friends because of my job	174	1.00	5.00	3.29	1.16
After work, I have more energy left for the things I need to do with family	174	1.00	5.00	3.43	1.07
I do not think about work when I am with my family	174	1.00	5.00	3.39	1.29

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 3 presents the average means score and standard deviation of faculty perception towards individual life with family. The table depicts four dimensions of individual life with family measuring work life balance. All mean scores depict that faculty members are managing their individual life with family. However, individual life with family seems to be little more complex than that of individual life at work. Most of the faculty members do not have to think about their work when they are with family.

The mean score of more than 3 exhibits that they are able to plan their schedule, have energy, time for leisure activities too.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of other Factors of Work Life Balance

<i>Items</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>
My Coworker is supportive when I have a life problem	174	1.00	5.00	3.62	1.01
It is very easy for me to balance the demand of my work and my personal and family life	174	1.00	5.00	3.59	1.02
I have sufficient time left away from my job to maintain adequate work and family life balance	174	2.00	5.00	3.51	.01
When I take a Vacation, I am able to separate myself from work and enjoy myself	174	1.00	5.00	3.68	.06
I feel myself completely successful in balancing my work and family life	174	1.00	5.00	3.56	.14

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 4 presents the mean score and standard deviation of other factors affecting work life balance. All the factors mentioned in the table has mean score more than 3 indicating a fair amount of work life balance among the faculty members in Prithvi Narayan Campus. Most of the respondents perceive that apart from individual and family factors affecting work life balance there are other factors affecting it too. The highest mean score of 3.68 depicts that the faculty members are able to manage time and separate themselves from work by taking vacation. They are able to balance personal and family life with a mean score of 3.59.

Table 5
Descriptive Statistics Overall Work Life Balance Factors

<i>Items</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	174	1.25	5.00	3.87	.68
WLB Individual Life at Home	174	1.80	4.80	3.30	.75
WLB Others	174	1.80	5.00	3.59	.67

Source: SPSS Output of Field Survey, 2018

Table 5 exhibits the three important factors affecting work life balance combined. Mainly, out of the 14 questions asked to the respondents, classification was made on the above mentioned factors. Among the three factors, individual life at work with highest mean score of 3.87 depicts that faculty members perceive that their individual life at work were relatively interesting that other factors namely family life and other work life balance factors. However, individual life at home needs more attention by respective faculty members.

Table 6
Association between Gender and Working Over Time

			<u>Do you Work Over Time</u>		
			Yes	No	<u>Total</u>
<u>Gender of Respondents</u>	Male	N	55	95	150
		%	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%
	Female	N	0	24	24
		%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	N	55	119	174	
	%	31.6%	68.4%	100.0%	
χ^2					12.867
Sig					0.001
Cramer's V					.272

Table 6 depicts the association of gender and over time worked by the faculty members. Majority (68.4%) of the respondents do not work overtime in the college. Only 36.7 % of the total male faculty members work over time in the campus followed by 0% of female faculty members. This indicates that they give more time for their family members. χ^2 of 12.867 is significance at 1 % level of significance, it can thus be inferred that there is an association between gender of respondents and intention to work over time. Cramer's V of .272 also signifies an association between these two factors. However, males tend to work more than females. This indicates that female faculty members devote more time to family members to maintain work life balance.

Table 7
Association of Gender and their Partners Employment Status

			<u>Partner Employment Status</u>		<u>Total</u>
			Yes	No	
<u>Gender of Respondents</u>	Male	N	55	95	150
		%	36.7%	63.3%	100.0%
	Female	N	19	5	24
		%	79.2%	20.8%	100.0%
Total	N	74	100	174	
	%	42.5%	57.5%	100.0%	
χ^2					15.290
Sig					0.000
Cramer's V					.296

Table 7 exhibits the cross tabulation of gender and partners employment status of respective faculty members. It shows that spouses of males are less employed comprising only 36.7 % of the total male respondents. However, in case of female respondents, higher fraction comprising 79.2 % of their spouse being employed. It shows those males are more employed than female. This also indicates female devoting more time to family members. Overall, partner's employment status of male and female is only 42.5 %. The χ^2 being significant with value of 15.290 and Cramer's V .296 indicates that employment status depends on gender of faculty members.

Table 8
Gender Wise Analysis of WLB Factors

	<i>Gender of Respondents</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>t-stat</i>	<i>sig</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	Male	150	3.88	.67	.275	.784
	Female	24	3.84	.74		
WLB Individual Life at Home	Male	150	3.28	.75	-.74	.458
	Female	24	3.40	.78		
WLB Others	Male	150	3.59	.65	.03	.978
	Female	24	3.59	.82		

Table 8 presents independent sample t-test results of different work life balance factors on the basis of gender. In each of the work life balance factors the t-test is not significant as the significance value is more than 0.05. This indicates that male and female faculty members both perceive all those factors in the same way. However, in terms of work life balance, individual life at home is more influencing factors on female with mean score of 3.40. In terms of individual life at work, male tends to spend more time at work with the mean score of 3.88. However, in case of other WLB there is no significant difference between male perception towards these factors, each with a mean score of 3.59.

Table 9
Designation Wise Analysis of WLB Factors

		<i>N</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>f-stat</i>	<i>sig</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	Adjunct	40	3.53	.736	7.909	0.00
	Teaching Assistant	11	3.45	.610		
	Lecturer	90	4.07	.588		
	Associate Professor	24	4.07	.665		
	Professor	9	3.47	.475		
	Total	174	3.87	.681		
WLB Individual Life at Home	Adjunct	40	3.03	.771	3.541	0.08
	Teaching Assistant	11	3.14	.764		
	Lecturer	90	3.47	.691		
	Associate Professor	24	3.06	.684		
	Professor	9	3.53	1.095		
	Total	174	3.30	.759		
WLB Others	Adjunct	40	3.41	.656	4.055	0.04
	Teaching Assistant	11	3.09	.422		
	Lecturer	90	3.65	.683		
	Associate Professor	24	3.92	.606		
	Professor	9	3.60	.721		
	Total	174	3.59	.679		

Table 9 presents the designation wise analysis of WLB factors. ANOVA test has been undertaken to analyze it. In term of individual life at work, the f-stat is significant at 1 % level of significance indicating perceptual difference of faculty members on

individual life at work. Mean score for each level of designation is more than 3 indicating fairness on individual life at work. However, associate professor and lecturer (4.07) termed it as the important factors affecting work life balance and teaching assistant (3.45) as the least. Similarly, in terms of individual life at work there is no significant difference of perception of different designation. Professors perceive individual life at home an influential factor affecting work life balance with mean score of 3.53. With reference to other factors of WLB, the test is significant at 5 % level of significance indicating perceptual difference between different designations. Lecturers term other factors as important with mean score of 3.65 and teaching assistant perceive these factor as less important with mean score of 3.09 only.

Table 10
Faculty Wise Analysis of WLB Factors

		<i>n</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>f-stat</i>	<i>sig</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	Management	54	3.87	.731	5.694	0.00
	Science and Technology	56	3.88	.675		
	Education	22	3.37	.391		
	Humanities	38	4.19	.616		
	Law	4	3.62	.144		
	Total	174	3.87	.681		
WLB Individual Life at Home	Management	54	3.26	.716	1.949	0.105
	Science and Technology	56	3.26	.723		
	Education	22	3.06	.835		
	Humanities	38	3.46	.772		
	Law	4	4.00	.923		
	Total	174	3.30	.759		
WLB Others	Management	54	3.37	.612	5.577	0.00
	Science and Technology	56	3.75	.669		
	Education	22	3.26	.593		
	Humanities	38	3.84	.702		
	Law	4	3.90	.346		
	Total	174	3.59	.679		

Table 10 exhibit the faculty wise analysis of WLB factors. In term of individual life at work, the f-stat is significant at 1 % level of significance indicating perceptual difference of faculty members on individual life at work. The mean score for each faculty is more than 3 indicating fairness on individual life at work. However, faculty members of humanities (4.19) termed it as the important factors affecting work life balance and faculty members of education (3.37) as the least. Similarly, in terms of individual life at work there is no significant difference of perception of different faculty at 5 % level of significance. Faculty members of law perceive individual life at home an influential factor affecting work life balance with mean score of 4.00 and the faculty members of education termed those factors as less important with mean score of 3.06. With reference to other factors of WLB, the test is significant at 1 % level of significance indicating perceptual difference between different designations. Faculty members of law termed other factors as important with mean score of 3.90 and faculty members of education perceive these factor as less important with mean score of 3.26 only.

Table 11
Age Wise Analysis of WLB Factors

			<i>N</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>f-stat</i>	<i>sig</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	Under 30	8	3.59	1.017	5.871	0.001	
	30-40	54	3.60	.739			
	40-50	75	4.06	.541			
	Over 50	37	3.95	.644			
	Total	174	3.87	.681			
WLB Individual Life at Home	Under 30	8	2.92	.183	1.429	.236	
	30-40	54	3.35	.883			
	40-50	75	3.37	.679			
	Over 50	37	3.15	.773			
	Total	174	3.30	.759			
WLB Others	Under 30	8	3.75	1.198	1.451	.230	
	30-40	54	3.50	.652			
	40-50	75	3.55	.634			
	Over 50	37	3.77	.654			
	Total	174	3.59	.679			

Table 11 demonstrates the age wise analysis of WLB factors. Only individual life at work is significant at 1 % level of significance with f-stat of 5.871. Individual life at home or family and other factors are not significant. It indicates that the perceptual difference of faculty members towards individual life at work on the basis of age has been demonstrated. However, perceptual difference can not be seen in other two factors. Age groups of 40-50 perceive both individual life at work and in an important factor affecting work life balance with mean score of 4.06 and 3.37 respectively. Under those two factors age group under 30 pays less importance with mean score of 3.59 and 2.92 respectively. However, in case of other WLB factors; age group of over 50 perceive this factor as the most important factor.

Table 12
Perceptual Difference of WLB on the Basis of Faculty Mode of Residence

			<i>n</i>	<i>mean</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>f-stat</i>	<i>sig</i>
WLB Individual Life at Work	Own House		129	3.92	.706	1.625	.200
	Rental		34	3.69	.540		
	Residential(Campus)		11	3.90	.726		
	Total		174	3.87	.681		
WLB Individual Life at Home	Own House		129	3.34	.761	6.203	.003
	Rental		34	2.97	.744		
	Residential(Campus)		11	3.81	.208		
	Total		174	3.30	.759		
WLB Others	Own House		129	3.63	.723	2.193	.115
	Rental		34	3.38	.434		
	Residential(Campus)		11	3.76	.680		
	Total		174	3.59	.679		

Table 12 demonstrates the analysis of WLB factors on the mode of residence faculty have. Only individual life at home is significant at 5 % level of significance with f-stat of

6.203. Individual life at work and other factors are not significant. It indicates that the perceptual difference of faculty members towards individual life at home on the basis of mode of residence has been demonstrated. However, perceptual difference can be seen in other two factors. Faculties having their own house perceives individual life at work as an important factor affecting WLB with mean score of 3.92 but faculty having their residence within the campus and live at rental house gives less important on this factor. Similarly, in case of individual life at home, faculty residing within the campus as important factor with mean score of 3.81 while faculty residing on rental basis perceive individual life at home as more difficult. The Same nature of opinion is also demonstrated regarding the perception of faculty towards other factors of WLB.

CONCLUSIONS

The faculty members of Prithvi Narayan Campus perceive that the individual life at work, individual life with family and other factors of WLB are the major factors affecting WLB. However, the important factors affecting WLB are the other factors. The least prioritized factors affecting work life balance are the individual life with family. It signifies that there are problems with faculty members to devote more time for the family members. Male faculty member's work more compared to female faculty members which indicates that female faculty members devote more time to the family. There is some association of working over-time and gender. Similarly, association is also seen between gender and employment status of faculty members. There is no perceptual difference between male and female towards work life balance. However, female devote more time with family compared to male. Perceptual difference towards individual life at home and other factors has been identified on the basis of designation. There are also perceptual differences noticed on the basis of faculty involvement. Only individual life at work is significant which indicates that there is perceptual difference of faculty members on the basis of their age. Mode of residence also affects individual life at home. Association has been established between other WLB factors with the individual life at home and at work. It indicates that individual life at home and at work strongly influences other factors of WLB.

Work Life Balance is the important dimensions which directly influence faculty members' performance. If individual life at home and at work is balanced, it is easy to maintain job satisfaction as mentioned by many empirical researches. The study concluded that time spent with the family members is important to maintain work life balance which is correlated with the findings made by Alexander & Ebria (2015). The study concludes that gender dimension plays a significant role in work life balance as female faculty members contribute more time with their family members. This finding is in contrast with the conclusion made by Helvacı, Bakalim, Can, & Akkoyn (2017). The satisfaction of faculty members depends on the job itself factors rather than pay, promotion, communication and recognition. It correlates with the findings made by Asan & Wirba (2017).

There is a necessity for the faculty members to devote more time with the family members, specially the male faculty members so that WLB can be maintained properly. The campus authority should also concentrate on individual faculty member's activities during and after their job. For this purpose a separate Human Resource Department need to be established for managing grievance of faculty members. Since this research mainly concentrated on limited factors on work life balance, further research need to be conducted on many other factors of WLB. Future researchers may also conduct research using other tools like factor analysis and structural equation modeling. Lastly,

researchers are advised to conduct research on non-teaching staffs and faculty members from other campuses of Pokhara too.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is thankful to all the members of Prithvi Narayan Campus Research Committee (PNCRC) for providing the research grant for conducting research on work life balance and its impact on job satisfaction among faculty members of Prithvi Narayan Campus. This research paper is a part of the same research.

REFERENCES

- Agha, O.K., Azmi, F.T., & Irfan, A. (2017). Work-life balance and job satisfaction: An empirical study focusing on higher education teachers in Oman. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 7 (3), 164-171. doi:10.18178/ijssh.2017.7.3.813
- Alexander, A.P., & Ebria, A. (2015). Work-life balance: A study among the teaching staffs of Bengtol college of Chirang district, Assam. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 5(10), 21
- Asan, J., & Wibra, V. (2017). Academic staff job satisfaction in Saudi Arabia: A case study of an academic institution in the Eastern province of Saudi Arabia. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 73-89
- Bista, P. (2016). Job satisfaction among employees of commercial banks I Nepal. *Conference on Business and Social Sciences* (pp. 163-177). Dubai: Tennessee State University. satisfaction-in-the-workplace.
- Biswakarma, G. (2015). Quality of work life in Nepal: A comparative study of financial and nonfinancial institutions. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences*, 3(8), 19-26. Retrieved from https://academia.edu/18315066/Quality_of_worklife_in_Nepal
- Faculty of PNC. (2017). *In Prithivi Narayan Campus*. Retrieved from <http://pncampus.edu.np/faculties.php>
- Gyanwali, A. (2017). Work-family balance and its outcome among female teachers in Nepal. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*, 4(6), 23-29. Retrieved from <http://ijrbsm.org/papers/v4-i6/3.pdf>
- Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and Work Engagement among Teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495-513. Retrieved from doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001
- Helvacı, M. A., Bakalim, O., Can, V., & Akkoyun, U. (2017). The work life balance of academics. *The Online Journal of New Horizon in Education*, 7 (4), 80-85. Retrieved from <https://www.tojned.net/journals/tojned/articles/v07i04/v07i04-09.pdf>
- Kumar, A., & Hagargi, S. (2013). A study on the perception of work-life balance policies among software professionals. *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, 9(3), 34-60.
- Munn, S.L. (2013). Unveiling the work-life system: the influence of work-life balance on meaningful work. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15 (4), 401-417. doi: 10.1177/1523422313498567
- Negi, D., & Singh, S. (2012). Work-life balance for banking employees: A comparative study. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics, and Management*, 2(6), 115-118. Retrieved from http://ijrcm.org.in/article_info.php?article_id=1844
- Nepali, T. N. (2018). Balancing work life and family life. *Pravaha: Journal of Management*, 2 (1), 217-232.

- Subha, T. (2013). A study on the work-life balance among women faculties working in Arts and Science college with special reference to Coimbatore City. *Indian Journal of Research*, 2(12), 160-163
- Varatharaj, V., & Vasantha, S. (2012). Work-life balances a source of job satisfaction: An exploratory study on the view of women employees in the service sector. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2 (3), 450-458. Retrieved from http://zenithresearch.org.in/images/stories/pdf/2012/March/ZIJMR/34_ZEN_VOL2_ISSUE3_MARCH12.pdf
- Yamane, T. (1973). *Statistics: An Introductory Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.