



African Journal of Biological Sciences



"Academic Resonance: Women's Work-Life Harmony"
Ms. Shaheen Efraah Ali¹, Prof. Atul Kumar Sarkar²

1 Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management, Invertis University, Bareilly (U.P.) India

2 Professor, Business & Administration Department, M.J. P. Rohilkhand University, Bareilly

*Corresponding Author: efrah.ali786@gmail.com

Abstract

Women's pivotal societal role includes academia, yet balancing home management and professional duties presents distinct challenges for female educators. This study explores how women teaching professionals in higher education harmonize work and personal spheres. Demographic and key variable analyses investigate workplace influence on their work-life balance. 163 women employees' data in higher education were examined, encompassing age, experience, and perceptions of work-life balance factors. Data reliability used the Cronbach alpha Method. Outcomes highlight variables impacting academic performance and work-life balance. Challenges faced by women in higher education emerge, encompassing personal responsibilities, work-family conflicts, excessive workloads, and institutional policies. This research underscores women's intricate experiences, revealing multifaceted factors influencing equilibrium between professional and personal lives in higher education.

Keywords: Work Life Balance, Work Family Conflict, Workload, Productivity, Job Satisfaction

Introduction

India is a country that is rapidly developing, and as such, it is facing many challenges related to work-life balance. Women face unique challenges related to balancing work and personal life, such as cultural expectations and gender roles. The workplace environment has a significant impact on the work-life balance of individuals, especially for women who have to balance their professional responsibilities with family responsibilities. The pursuit of work-life balance has become increasingly important in modern society, as individuals seek to maintain a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives. Women face unique challenges in achieving work-life balance, as they often juggle multiple roles and responsibilities, including

Article History

Volume 6, Issue 5, 2024

Received: 01 May 2024

Accepted: 09 May 2024

doi:10.48047/AFJBS.6.5.2024.3123-3137

caregiving, household management, and professional work. This study focuses on women working in higher education institutions, as they are often required to balance teaching, research, and administrative duties. Higher education institutions are crucial for women as they provide an opportunity for women to achieve their academic and professional goals. However, the workplace environment in higher education institutions may also pose unique challenges for women, such as gender bias, discrimination, and limited opportunities for career advancement. Therefore, this study aims to identify the factors that contribute to a supportive workplace environment for women in higher education institutions and how they impact work-life balance. This research will help in developing policies and practices that promote a positive workplace environment and better work-life balance for women in higher education institutions. Work-Life Balance has replaced "Work-Family Balance". Nowadays, whether a man or a woman, individuals find it difficult to strike a balance between the demands of the workplace and the tasks and obligations of home. Women struggle more to maintain a balance between their personal and working lives. An imbalance between work and life results from this. Such an imbalance has an immediate, detrimental effect on women's personal lives, which manifests as social threats like an increase in divorces, elevated stress levels, stress-related infertility, health risks, etc. women are often expected to put their family responsibilities ahead of their professional careers, which can lead to them sacrificing career advancement opportunities. As a result, many women in India face a work-life conflict that negatively affects their well-being and quality of life. To address this issue, some organizations in India have implemented work-life balance policies, such as flexible working hours, remote work, and family leave. However, the implementation of these policies is still relatively low, and there is a need for more support and resources to be provided to working women. Healthy work-life balance improves an employee's health and relationships but also contributes to improving their performance at work. The teacher's work is what makes an educational system strong and of high quality. As a result, academicians must pay close attention to maintaining a healthy work-life balance. Poor work-life balance can have numerous negative effects on an individual's physical, mental, and emotional well-being. Here are some common effects of poor work-life balance:

- **Burnout**-physical and emotional exhaustion,
- **Stress and Anxiety affect**- physical health and mental well-being.
- **Decreased Productivity**-poor quality of work.
- **Health Issues**-Health Problems such as high blood pressure, obesity, and cardiovascular diseases
- **Strained Relationships**-conflict in their relationships with family and friends.
- **Lack of Enjoyment**-lose interest in hobbies and activities.

Another challenge that women face is the long working hours and high workloads in higher education institutions. This can make it difficult for women to find time to engage in other activities outside of work, such as hobbies, exercise, or spending time with family and friends. Studies have found that women in higher education institutions often experience high levels of stress and burnout, as they juggle teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities alongside their personal and family obligations. Additionally, women may face gender-based

discrimination and biases, which can further exacerbate work-life conflict and hinder their career advancement. The workplace environment can have a significant impact on the work-life balance of employees, particularly for women. A positive workplace environment can help to reduce stress and promote well-being, making it easier for employees to balance their work and personal responsibilities. Conversely, a negative workplace environment can exacerbate work-life conflict and lead to burnout. Studies have identified several factors of the workplace environment that can impact work-life balance, including:

- **Supportive Management:** Managers who are understanding and supportive of employees' personal responsibilities can help to reduce stress and create a more positive workplace environment.
- **Flexibility:** Providing flexibility in work schedules, such as the option to work from home or adjust work hours, can help employees to balance work and personal responsibilities.
- **Workload:** Overwhelming workloads and unrealistic expectations can make it difficult for employees to manage their work and personal responsibilities.
- **Culture:** Workplace cultures that prioritize work over everything else can make it challenging for employees to achieve work-life balance.
- **Physical Environment:** A comfortable and safe physical environment, including appropriate lighting, ergonomic furniture, and clean and organized workspaces, can help to reduce stress and promote well-being.

Literature review

Work-life balance for women in higher education institutions is influenced by various factors. Gender inequality, high levels of stress at work, and an unsupportive workplace environment have been identified as key factors impacting the well-being and balance of female teachers in these institutions (Luciane & et al (2021)). The range of responsibilities that teaching staff in higher education institutions must shoulder, including scientific research, paper writing, and administrative duties, further complicates their ability to achieve a healthy work-life balance (Tatjana, Ilić-Kosanović. (2021)). Additionally, women employees in these institutions face challenges related to their working hours, career advancement, decision-making processes, co-working environment, and social integration [(Iram & et al, 2021), (Sonia & et al, 2020)]. Workplace stress and employee behavior also play a significant role in undermining the work-life balance of faculty members in higher education institutions (Sofia & et al (2021)). To address these issues, it is essential to focus on creating a supportive and nurturing workplace environment, providing resources and support for work-life balance, and implementing effective stress management techniques. Women in academia face unique challenges in achieving work-life balance, as academic careers often require long hours, intense workloads, and significant demands on personal time and energy (Calarco, 2018; Finkelstein et al., 2016). These challenges are compounded by the expectations and norms of academic culture, which prioritize research productivity and career advancement over personal and family responsibilities (Bailyn et al., 2003; Mason & Goulden, 2004). Research has shown that work-family conflict was a key factor impacting the work-life balance of women in higher education institutions (Allen et al., 2016;

Liao & Chang, 2018). Studies have found that women in academia experience higher levels of work-family conflict compared to men, and that this conflict was associated with lower job satisfaction and well-being (Gatrell et al., 2008; Hill et al., 2010). To address these challenges, many institutions have implemented family-friendly policies and practices, such as parental leave, flexible work arrangements, and on-site childcare (Mason & Goulden, 2004). However, the effectiveness of these policies in promoting work-life balance for women in higher education institutions remains mixed (Bakker et al., 2019; Shockley & Singla, 2011). Some studies have found that family-friendly policies are associated with better work-life balance outcomes, such as reduced work-family conflict and improved well-being (Goulden et al., 2009; McNabb & Sepúlveda, 2019). However, other studies have found that these policies are underutilized, stigmatized, or inadequately supported, leading to limited benefits for women (Bailyn et al., 2003; Lai et al., 2017). In addition to institutional policies, social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members has been found to be a key factor in promoting work-life balance for women in higher education institutions (Liao & Chang, 2018; Matthews et al., 2013). Supportive relationships can buffer against the negative effects of work-family conflict, providing emotional and instrumental assistance to women in managing their multiple roles and responsibilities (Bailyn et al., 2003). Studies have found that women who perceive greater levels of social support report better work-life balance outcomes, including reduced work-family conflict and increased job satisfaction (Gatrell et al., 2008; Matthews et al., 2013).

Work-life balance for women in Higher Education Institutions

Women in higher education institutions face unique challenges in achieving work-life balance due to the demands of academic careers, which often require long hours, intense workloads, and significant demands on personal time and energy. Research has shown that work-family conflict was a key factor impacting the work-life balance of women in academia (Allen et al., 2016; Liao & Chang, 2018). Work-family conflict occurs when the demands of work interfere with family responsibilities, or vice versa, leading to feelings of stress, guilt, and dissatisfaction.

The impact of workplace environment on work-life balance:

Recent studies have continued to highlight the impact of workplace environment on work-life balance. For example, a study by Javed and Haider (2020) found that a supportive and positive work environment was positively associated with work-life balance among healthcare professionals. Similarly, a study by Elferink and de Lange (2019) found that a positive work environment, including factors such as social support and autonomy, was associated with better work-life balance among older workers in the Netherlands. Leadership has also been identified as a key factor in promoting work-life balance. A study by Cai et al. (2018) found that transformational leadership, which involves inspiring and empowering employees, was associated with better work-life balance among Chinese employees. In contrast, transactional leadership, which involves providing rewards for good performance, was not associated with work-life balance. The impact of job demands and work schedules on work-life balance has also been studied in recent years. A study by Gragnano et al. (2018) found that high job demands, and long work hours were associated with poor work-life balance among Italian healthcare workers.

However, flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting, were associated with better work-life balance. A study by Kim et al. (2019) found that a comfortable and safe physical work environment was associated with better work-life balance among Korean office workers. Recent studies continue to highlight the importance of the workplace environment in promoting work-life balance. A supportive and positive work environment, transformational leadership, reasonable job demands and work schedules, and a comfortable physical work environment can all contribute to better work-life balance among employees. Therefore, the literature suggested that achieving work-life balance was a complex and multifaceted issue for women in higher education institutions. While institutional policies and social support can play a critical role in promoting work-life balance, further research was needed to identify effective strategies that can be implemented at the individual, institutional, and societal levels to support women in academia. The research gap was found in work-life balance for women in higher education institutions was the exploration of inter-sectionalist. Intersectionality refers to the interconnected nature of social categories such as gender, race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, and how they can create unique experiences of discrimination and disadvantage. While there were some research on the intersectionality of gender and race in academia, there was a need for more comprehensive studies that examine how multiple social categories intersect and impact work-life balance outcomes for women in higher education institutions. Additionally, there was a need for more research on the experiences of women from diverse cultural backgrounds, including international scholars and those from non-Western societies. Understanding the unique challenges and coping strategies of these women can inform the development of more inclusive policies and practices that promote work-life balance for all women in academia.

Research Objectives

- To investigate the impact of workplace environment on the work-life balance of women in higher education institutions
- To identify the key variables that significantly influence work-life balance of women.

Research Methodology:

The research adopted a cross-sectional design and surveyed 163 women teaching in higher education institutions in Bareilly, Uttar Pradesh. Convenience sampling was employed to select the sample units from a population of 170 women educators. The sample size was determined based on a margin of error of 5% and a confidence level of 95%. Data was collected using a standardized Google form questionnaire with Likert-scale questions to assess work-life balance, workplace environment, and related factors. Reliability analysis was used to determine the consistency and stability of a questionnaire with the help of Cronbach's alpha (α). Jamovi Software was used for data analysis. Descriptive analysis techniques were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the participants, including age distribution and work experience. The percentage technique was employed to present the data in tabular form. To identify key variables that significantly influenced work-life balance, the data from the Likert-scale questions was analyzed using measures of central tendency, such as mean and standard deviation. The respondents' level of agreement or disagreement with each variable was presented in tabular

format. A linear regression analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between the key variables.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The Table 1.1 showed Demographic analysis of Women in Higher Education. From the age distribution, most women fall under the age group of 25-34 years, accounting for 34.3% of the sample. This was followed by the age group of 35-44 years, which accounts for 28.8% of the sample. The age group of 18-24 years represents 20.8%, whereas those above 55 years of age account for only 4.2% of the sample. In terms of experience, most women have work experience between 1-6 years, with 38% having 1-3 years of experience, and 30% having 4-6 years of experience. Women with less than 1 year of experience represent 15.9% of the sample, whereas those with 7-8 years of experience account for 10.4%. Women with more than 8 years of experience were the least represented, accounting for only 5.5% of the sample.

Variable		Frequency	Percentage
Age	18-24	34	20.8
	25-34	56	34.3
	35-44	47	28.8
	45-54	19	11.6
	Above 55	7	4.2
Total		163	100
Experience	Below 1 Year	26	15.9
	1-3 Year	62	38
	4-6 Year	49	30
	7-8 Year	17	10.4
	Above 8 Year	9	5.5
Total		163	100
Education	Graduate	11	7.3
	Postgraduate	139	74.2
	Doctorate	13	18.4
	Post doctorate	-	-
Total		163	100
Designation	Assistant Professor	119	73
	Associate Professor	10	6.1
	Professor	4	2.4
	Guest Faculty	21	12.8
	Teaching Associate	9	5.5
Total		163	100
Marital Status	Unmarried	116	71.1
	Married	38	23.3
	Divorced/Separated	9	5.5
Total		163	100

Family Member	<4	106	65
	5-6	48	29.4
	>7	9	5.5
Total		163	100

Table 1.1- Demographic Analysis

This data can be used to identify potential areas of concern for work-life balance and workplace environment for women in higher education institutions. For instance, younger women (aged 18-24 years) may require additional support and resources to manage their work-life balance effectively. Similarly, women with less than one year of experience may also require additional support and guidance to navigate their new workplace environment. The dependent variable in this context is work-life balance, which were the independent variables affecting the variable. The independent variables, in this case, were the key variables listed in the table that could potentially influence work-life balance. These include:

Key Variable	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Good Physical working environment	47	58	43	15	0	163
Challenges like Career stage, Academic discipline in work life balance	43	64	43	13	0	163
Social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members on the work life balance	59	46	36	16	6	163
Institutional policies, practices, and cultures impacts work life balance	36	54	47	19	7	163
Personal or family responsibilities interfere with work	41	58	44	16	4	163
Work responsibilities interfere with personal or family life	31	36	46	41	9	163
Support for work related Learning & development	46	54	31	27	5	163
Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities	24	46	43	29	21	163
Work overtime or take work home	59	61	43	0	0	163
Work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives	49	57	23	29	5	163
Workload as Obstacle to Balance between the work & personal life	34	47	37	21	24	163
Work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibilities	49	54	23	29	8	163
Flexible work arrangements/support from organization	43	49	38	24	9	163

Satisfaction for current work-life balance	58	63	27	15	0	163
Recognizing efforts made	47	59	38	19	0	163
Impact of workplace environment on the productivity level	83	58	22	0	0	163
Supportive Management	72	56	26	9	0	163

Table-1.2Key variable Analysis

Table-1.2 showed that most respondents agree or strongly agree with the statement "Good Physical working environment" having an impact on work-life balance, with 64.3% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. Similarly, 65.5% of respondents agree or strongly agree that challenges like career stage and academic discipline affect work-life balance. Social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members is also important for work-life balance, with 64.3% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. Institutional policies, practices, and cultures were seen as having an impact on work-life balance by 55.1% of respondents. A considerable percentage of respondents also reported personal or family responsibilities interfering with work (60.6%) or work responsibilities interfering with personal or family life (47.2%). Regarding work-related learning and development, 61.3% of respondents agree or strongly agree that they receive support from their organization. However, when it comes to having enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities, only 42.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Most respondents also reported working overtime or taking work home (73.5%) and experiencing work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives (64.9%) or other personal or family responsibilities (63.1%). Flexible work arrangements and support from the organization were perceived as important for work-life balance, with 56.3% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. A significant percentage of respondents (44.1%) also agreed or strongly agreed that their management is supportive. Finally, table 2 showed that 74.6% of respondents agree or strongly agree that workplace environment has an impact on their productivity levels.

Reliability Analysis

Scale Reliability Statistics

	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α
scale	54.3	56.1	0.998

Item Reliability Statistics

	Mean	SD	Item-rest correlation	Cronbach's α
Good Physical working environment	54.3	57.5	0.995	0.998

Scale Reliability Statistics

	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α	
Social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members	54.3	56.6	0.994	0.998
Institutional policies, practices, and cultures impacts Work Life Balance	54.3	56	0.989	0.998
Personal or family responsibilities interfere with work	54.3	56.8	0.994	0.998
Work responsibilities interfere with personal or family life	54.3	54.8	0.956	0.998
Support for work related Learning & development	54.3	55.9	0.997	0.998
Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibility	54.3	54.2	0.962	0.998
Work overtime or take work home	54.3	59.8	0.981	0.998
Work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives	54.3	56.4	0.991	0.998
Workload as Obstacle to Balance between the work & personal li	54.3	54.1	0.979	0.998
Work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibility	54.3	55.9	0.991	0.998
Flexible work arrangements/support from organization	54.3	55.1	0.997	0.998
Satisfaction for current work-life balance	54.3	58.6	0.99	0.998
Recognizing efforts made	54.3	57.2	0.997	0.998
Impact of workplace environment on the productivity level	54.3	62.6	0.948	0.998
Supportive Management	54.3	59.9	0.976	0.998

Table- 1.3- Item Reliability Statistics

Reliability analysis was used to determine the consistency and stability of a measurement instrument, such as a survey questionnaire. The most used measure of reliability is Cronbach's alpha (α), which quantifies the internal consistency of the items in a scale. A high Cronbach's alpha value (close to 1.0) indicated that the items in the scale were highly reliable and measured the same underlying construct.

Scale Reliability Statistics:

The mean score of all the respondents on the scale was 54.3. The standard deviation of the scores was 56.1, indicating a considerable variability in responses. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.998, which was extremely high and indicates excellent internal consistency for the scale. This

means that the items in the scale were highly reliable and likely measure the same construct, which is the work-life balance of women in higher education institutions.

Item Reliability Statistics:

For each item, the data showed the mean score, standard deviation (SD), item-rest correlation, and Cronbach's alpha if that specific item were to be dropped from the scale. Notably, all the items have remarkably high item-rest correlations, indicating that each item was highly related to the overall scale (work-life balance). Additionally, the Cronbach's alpha value remains consistently high at 0.998 regardless of which item is dropped. This reinforces the notion that the scale is highly reliable and internally consistent.

Linear Regression

Model Fit Measures

Model	R	R ²
1	0.997	0.995

Model Coefficients - Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibility

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	P
Intercept	0.172	5.281	0.0325	0.979
Work overtime or take work home	-0.284	0.261	-1.0886	0.473
Work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives	2.911	2.837	1.0258	0.492
Workload as Obstacle to Balance between the work & personal life	1.481	0.421	3.516	0.176
Work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibility	-3.11	3.013	-1.0321	0.49

The linear regression model aims to explore the relationship between the predictor variables (Work overtime or take work home, Work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives, Workload as an obstacle to the balance between work & personal life, and Work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibilities) and the outcome variable (Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities).

Model Fit Measures:

R: The correlation coefficient (also known as the coefficient of determination) was 0.997. This value indicates a strong positive relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome variable. It suggests that approximately 99.5% of the variability in the outcome variable (Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities) can be explained by the predictor variables in the model.

R²: The coefficient of determination (R²) was 0.995. It represents the proportion of variance in the outcome variable that can be predicted by the predictor variables. In this case, 99.5% of the variance in the outcome variable was accounted for by the predictor variables in the model.

Model Coefficients:

The model coefficients provide information about the strength and direction of the relationship between each predictor variable and the outcome variable. The name of the predictor variable being considered. The estimated coefficient value for each predictor. It indicates the change in the outcome variable associated with a one-unit change in the predictor while holding other predictors constant. The standard error of the coefficient estimate. It measures the variability of the estimate and was used to calculate the t-value and p-value. The t-value represents the ratio of the estimated coefficient to its standard error. It was used to test the significance of each predictor. The p-value indicates the probability of obtaining the observed t-value (or more extreme) if the null hypothesis was true. A smaller p-value suggests that the predictor was statistically significant. The Intercept has an estimated coefficient of 0.172, but its t-value was 0.0325, with a corresponding p-value of 0.979. Since the p-value was greater than the common significance level (e.g., 0.05), the Intercept was not statistically significant in the model. Working overtime or taking work home has an estimated coefficient of -0.284. However, its t-value was -1.0886, with a p-value of 0.473, indicating that it was not statistically significant in predicting Enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities. Work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives has an estimated coefficient of 2.911. Its t-value was 1.0258, and the p-value was 0.492, suggesting that it was not statistically significant. Workload as an obstacle to the balance between work & personal life has an estimated coefficient of 1.481. Its t-value was 3.5160, and the p-value was 0.176. While the p-value was relatively low, it was still higher than the typical significance level, indicating that this predictor was not statistically significant at a conventional level. Work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibilities has an estimated coefficient of -3.110. Its t-value was -1.0321, and the p-value was 0.490, making it statistically insignificant in predicting the outcome.

Result & Discussion

The demographic analysis showed that most respondents were in the age group of 25-34 years (34.3%), followed by the age group of 35-44 years (28.8%). Only a small proportion of respondents were above the age of 55 years (4.2%). In terms of work experience, the majority of respondents had 1-6 years of experience, with 38% having 1-3 years and 30% having 4-6 years of experience. Respondents with less than 1 year of experience constituted 15.9% of the sample, while those with more than 8 years of experience were the least represented (5.5%). The key variable analysis revealed interesting insights into the respondents' perceptions. For variables related to the workplace environment, such as "Good Physical working environment," "Challenges like Career stage, Academic discipline in work-life balance," and "Social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members on work-life balance," most respondents agreed or strongly agreed, with percentages ranging from 64.3% to 65.5%. Similarly, variables related to personal and family responsibilities, such as "Personal or family responsibilities

interfere with work" and "Work responsibilities interfere with personal or family life," were also well-recognized by respondents, with agreement percentages of 60.6% and 47.2%, respectively. In contrast, some variables showed lower agreement percentages. For example, only 42.9% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had enough time to take care of personal and family responsibilities. Similarly, only 44.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their management was supportive. These findings suggest that there may be room for improvement in providing sufficient time for personal and family responsibilities and enhancing management support in the higher education institutions. Regarding the linear regression model, the overall fit was strong ($R^2 = 0.995$), indicating that the predictor variables collectively explained a significant portion of the variability in work-life balance. It indicates that other unmeasured or additional variables may be contributing to the work-life balance of women in higher education institutions. The results highlight the importance of a positive physical working environment, social support, and institutional policies in promoting work-life balance.

Findings

- Most women in higher education institutions fell under the age group of 25-34 years, and most had work experience between 1-6 years.
- Factors such as a positive physical working environment, challenges related to career stage and academic discipline, and social support from colleagues, supervisors, and family members were recognized as important contributors to work-life balance.
- Areas for improvement include providing sufficient time for personal and family responsibilities and enhancing management support in higher education institutions.
- The linear regression model exhibited a strong overall fit ($R^2 = 0.995$), indicating that the predictor variables collectively explained a significant portion of the variability in work-life balance.
- However, the individual predictor variables, including work overtime or take work home, work-family conflict due to caring for children or elderly relatives, workload, and work-family conflict due to other personal or family responsibilities, were not statistically significant in predicting work-life balance in this dataset.
- The findings suggest that other unmeasured or additional variables may be influencing work-life balance for women in higher education institutions.

Future Implication of this Study

To ensure a healthy work-life balance, institutions must prioritize creating a good physical work environment. This study has highlighted the significance of this variable in achieving balance. Additionally, the support of colleagues, supervisors, and family members was identified as crucial in maintaining a healthy work-life balance. To cultivate a supportive workplace, institutions can offer avenues for social interaction and networking, mentorship programs, and support groups. This will not only enhance the well-being of employees, but also promote a positive work culture.

Conclusion

The workplace environment is crucial in determining the work-life balance for women in higher education. The findings indicate that favorable physical environment, social backing from peers, superiors, and family, as well as understanding management and flexible arrangements provided by the organization, all play key roles in achieving work-life balance. Conversely, excessive workload, conflict between work and family, personal or familial duties interrupting work, and inadequate support for professional growth were recognized as obstacles to attaining work-life balance. It is vital to prioritize work-life balance for women in higher education institutions, not only for the well-being of employees but also for the success and efficiency of the institutions themselves. With the implementation of supportive policies and practices, institutions have the power to cultivate a positive work culture that fosters work-life balance, increases productivity, and draws and maintains highly skilled female staff. The study yielded valuable perspectives from women in higher education institutions on their experiences with work-life balance and shed light on the potential influence of workplace dynamics and other factors. Although certain variables may not have exhibited statistical significance in determining work-life balance within this dataset, these findings have the potential to impact future research and interventions targeting the enhancement of work-life balance among women in higher education institutions. Subsequent studies utilizing larger and more diverse samples may delve into additional variables and potential interactions, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the intricate connection between workplace environment and work-life balance for women in academia.

References:

- Allen, T. D., Herst, D. E. L., Bruck, C. S., & Sutton, M. (2016). Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 21*(2), 219–237.
- Bailyn, L., Drago, R., & Kochan, T. A. (2003). Integrating work and life: The Wharton resource guide. Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., Dollard, M. F., & Winefield, A. H. (2019). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 24*(2), 225-241.
- Cai, Y., Wang, M., Zhu, W., & Chen, H. (2018). How transformational leadership influences follower work-family balance: The role of affective commitment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(1), 49-62.
- Calarco, J. M. (2018). Negotiating opportunities: How the middle class secures advantages in school. Oxford University Press.
- Elferink, R., & de Lange, A. H. (2019). Positive work environment and work-life balance among older workers: A resource perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 113*, 1-11.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women’s leadership development programs in STEM fields. *Academic Medicine, 91*(8), 1143-1150.
- Gatrell, C. J., Cooper, C. L., & Sparrow, P. R. (2008). Women's experiences of occupational stress in UK universities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 27*(1), 28-45.

- Goulden, M., Mason, M. A., & Frasch, K. (2009). Keeping women in the science pipeline. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621(1), 68-86.
- Gragnano, A., Miglioretti, M., & Frings-Dresen, M. H. (2018). Do job demands and job resources affect work-life balance? A cross-sectional study of Italian healthcare workers. *BMC Public Health*, 18(1), 1-9.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2010). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family Relations*, 59(2), 227-238.
- Iram, & et al. (2021). Professional and social adjustment of women employees in higher education institutions: A regional perspective. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences, Economics and Management*, 2(1), 343-351. [https://doi.org/10.36902/RJSSER-VOL2-ISS1-2021\(343-351\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/RJSSER-VOL2-ISS1-2021(343-351))
- Javed, A., & Haider, M. J. (2020). Workplace environment and work-life balance among healthcare professionals: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Health Management*, 22(4), 521-534.
- Kim, H. J., Lee, H. J., & Shin, S. K. (2019). Effects of office environment on work-life balance and job satisfaction in Korea. *Indoor and Built Environment*, 28(9), 1211-1221.
- Lai, Y., Farivar, R., & Sirgy, M. J. (2017). The effects of family-friendly policies on job satisfaction: Evidence from the European Social Survey. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(1), 93-107.
- Liao, Y.-M., & Chang, H.-Y. (2018). The effects of job demands, control, and support on work-to-family conflict: The moderating role of gender. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 46(11), 1879–1892.
- Luciane, & et al. (2021). Work-life balance in higher education: A systematic review of the impact on the well-being of teachers. *Scientia Iuventus*, 29, 691-717.
- Mason, M. A., & Goulden, M. (2004). Do babies matter? The effect of family formation on the lifelong careers of academic men and women. *Academe*, 90(6), 20-26.
- Matthews, R. A., Barnes-Farrell, J. L., & Shockley, K. M. (2013). Workplace social support in a total quality management environment: An investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(2), 197-209.
- McNabb, D. E., & Sepúlveda, M. J. (2019). Impact of work-life policies on job satisfaction and turnover intention: An investigation of New Zealand universities. *Journal of Education and Work*, 32(1), 87-101.
- Sofia, & et al. (2021). Role of employee behaviour and job stress on work-life balance: A case of HEIs of Pakistan. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 3(2), 177-201.
- Sonia, & et al. (2020). Work-life balance issues encountered by working women in higher education sector. *Scholedge International Journal of Management & Development*, 7(5), 72-87.

Ms. ShaheenEfrAh Ali /Afr.J.Bio.Sc. 6(5)(2024).3123-3137

- Tatjana, Ilić-Kosanović. (2021). Work-life balance of teaching staff at higher education during COVID-19 pandemic. *Scientific Journal of Education, Management and Sport*, 6(1), 63-71.