

Comparative Analysis of Work-Life Balance on Employee Well-Being in Public and Private Institutions in Bamenda

Awa Marshall Teneng¹; Fomba Emmanuel Mbebeb²; Dr. Tayong Desmond Mimba³

^{1,3}Faculty of Economics and Management Science, The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

² Prof., Faculty of Education, The University of Bamenda, Cameroon

Correspondence: Awa Marshall Teneng, Faculty of Economics and Management Science, The University of Bamenda.

Abstract:- Work-life balance (WLB) has become a critical factor in ensuring employee well-being and organizational success. This study aims to compare the impact of work-life balance on employee well-being in public and private institutions in Bamenda, Cameroon. Using a comparative quantitative design, data were collected from 527 employees (269 from public institutions and 258 from private institutions) using validated scales for work-life balance, employee well-being, and demographic variables. A stratified random sampling technique will be employed to ensure representation from various organisations within each sector. The results for work life balance reveals that there is a significant difference between employee work life balance in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. again, the results for well-being shows that there is a significant difference between employee Well-being in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. More precisely, results from the unpaired t-test indicate that employee Well-being in public organisation is significantly greater than employee Well-being in private sector at 1% level as show by the result of paired t test of difference greater than 0. A close look of the results shows that, on average, employee work life balance in public organisation is significantly better than employee work life balance in private organisations at 1% level of significance.

Keywords:- Work-Life Balance, Employee Well-Being, Public Sector, Private Sector.

I. INTRODUCTION

Work-life balance is a critical factor in shaping employee well-being and organizational performance. It refers to an individual's ability to maintain a healthy equilibrium between the demands of their work responsibilities and their personal/family life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). Achieving this balance is particularly important, as an imbalance can lead to increased stress, burnout, and negative impacts on both work and home life (Aryee et al., 2005).

In the context of Bamenda, Cameroon, research has highlighted notable differences in work-life balance between public and private sector institutions and the implications for employee well-being. Public sector organisations tend to offer more family-friendly policies, such as flexible work arrangements and generous leave entitlements, which enable employees to better manage their work and personal commitments (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). This enhanced work-life balance has been associated with lower levels of stress, higher job engagement, and better overall well-being among public sector employees in the region (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).

In contrast, private institutions are often characterized by more rigid work schedules, longer working hours, and higher workloads, leading to increased work-family conflict for employees (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). This can have detrimental effects on employee health and well-being, including higher stress levels, reduced job satisfaction, and poorer mental and physical health outcomes (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).

Understanding these sectoral differences in work-life balance and their implications for employee well-being is crucial for informing policy and organizational initiatives aimed at promoting a healthier work environment and more productive, engaged workforce (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). This introduction provides a foundation for further examining this important issue in the region.

To address the challenges faced by employees in both the public and private sectors, organisations need to implement policies and practices that promote a healthy work-life balance. This may include offering flexible work arrangements, providing childcare support, and encouraging employees to take regular breaks and vacations (Makamu & Mabunda, 2019). By prioritizing the wellbeing of their employees, organisations can improve job satisfaction, reduce turnover, and ultimately enhance their overall performance and competitiveness.

Understanding the differences in work-life balance practices and their impact on employee wellbeing in public and private institutions is crucial for developing policies and interventions that can improve the overall quality of work life for employees in the region (Haar *et al.*, 2014). This introduction sets the stage for a more detailed examination of the topic, which will be explored in the following sections.

➤ *Statement of the Problem*

The issue of work-life balance and its impact on employee well-being is a critical concern for organisations operating in both the public and private sectors. Existing research has highlighted the growing challenges that employees face in effectively managing the competing demands of their work responsibilities and personal/family life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).

In the public sector, the problem of work-life balance and its consequences for employee well-being have become increasingly salient. While public sector organisations often offer more family-friendly policies and practices, such as flexible work arrangements and generous leave entitlements, the reality is that many public sector employees still struggle to achieve a healthy balance between their work and personal lives (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). This can lead to increased stress, reduced job satisfaction, and poorer overall well-being among public sector workers.

In the private sector, the problem of work-life balance and its impact on employee well-being is often more pronounced. Private institutions are typically characterized by more rigid work structures, longer working hours, and higher performance demands, which can create significant challenges for employees in managing their work and personal responsibilities (Nkweni & Amin, 2021). This imbalance can result in higher levels of work-family conflict, decreased organizational commitment, and poorer mental and physical health outcomes for private sector employees.

Understanding the differential impact of work-life balance on employee well-being in public and private institutions is crucial for developing effective organizational policies and practices that address the unique needs and challenges faced by workers in these different contexts (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). By identifying the key factors that contribute to work-

life balance and its consequences for employee well-being, organisations can implement targeted interventions to support their workforce and promote a healthier, more productive work environment.

II. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Achieving work-life balance is a universal challenge faced by employees across various sectors and industries. Here, the researcher wants to look into the concepts of work-life balance in the context of public and private institutions in Bamenda, exploring how organizational policies and practices impact employee well-being. By examining the unique dynamics of work-life integration in these sectors, readers will gain insights into the factors that influence employee satisfaction, productivity, and overall well-being.

❖ *Understanding Work-Life Balance*

➤ *Work Culture in Private Institutions*

Private institutions in Bamenda often exhibit a more dynamic and entrepreneurial work culture that may influence employees' work-life balance experiences. This section delves into the work culture prevalent in private organisations, emphasising factors such as job autonomy, performance incentives, and organizational agility. By examining the impact of work culture on employees' well-being, we can uncover strategies for promoting work-life harmony in private sector environments.

A survey conducted by the Bamenda Chamber of Commerce (2018) revealed that private institutions prioritize results-oriented work practices and employee empowerment initiatives to enhance work-life balance. The study highlights the role of supportive leadership and clear communication in fostering a positive work culture that prioritizes employee well-being and engagement.

Work-life balance refers to an individual's ability to effectively manage the competing demands of their work responsibilities and personal/family life (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011). It is characterized by the degree to which an employee is able to simultaneously balance the temporal, emotional, and behavioral aspects of their work and non-work roles (Aryee *et al.*, 2005).

Research has shown that a healthy work-life balance can have a positive influence on employee well-being, including improved physical and mental health, higher job satisfaction, and reduced stress and burnout (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). Conversely, an imbalance between work and personal life can lead to negative outcomes, such as increased work-family conflict, decreased organizational commitment, and poorer overall quality of life (Nkweni & Amin, 2021).

In the context of Bamenda, Cameroon, studies have revealed notable differences in work-life balance between public and private sector institutions and the implications for employee well-being. Public sector organisations in the region tend to offer more family-friendly policies, such as flexible work arrangements and generous leave entitlements, which enable employees to better manage their work and personal responsibilities (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). This enhanced work-life balance has been associated with lower levels of stress, higher job engagement, and better overall well-being among public sector employees (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021). Some of the key aspects include:

- **Flexible Work Arrangements:** Public sector institutions may offer flexible work schedules, such as flextime, compressed work weeks, or telecommuting options, allowing employees to better accommodate family obligations (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019).
- **Generous Leave Entitlements:** Public sector employees typically have access to more generous leave policies, such as paid time off for family/medical leave, vacation days, and sick leave, which can help alleviate work-family conflicts (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).
- **Supportive Organizational Culture:** The public sector often fosters a more supportive organizational culture that values work-life balance and provides resources to help employees manage their work and personal demands (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). These work-life balance initiatives in the public sector have been linked to lower levels of stress, higher job engagement, and better overall well-being among employees (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).

In contrast, private institutions are often characterized by more rigid work schedules, longer working hours, and higher workloads, leading to increased work-family conflict for employees (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). This can have detrimental effects on employee health and well-being, including higher stress levels, reduced job satisfaction, and poorer mental and physical health outcomes (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021). Key characteristics include:

- **Longer Work Hours and Higher Workloads:** Private sector employees often face longer working hours and higher workloads, leading to increased work-family conflict and reduced time for personal/family activities (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019).
- **Limited Flexible Work Options:** Private institutions are generally less likely to offer flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting or compressed work weeks, which can hinder employees' ability to manage work and personal responsibilities (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).
- **Emphasis on Face-Time and Availability:** The private sector often places a greater emphasis on physical presence and availability, which can make it more difficult for employees to take time off or attend to family needs (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). These work-life balance challenges in the private sector have been associated with higher stress levels, reduced job satisfaction, and poorer

mental and physical health outcomes for employees (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).

Understanding the concept of work-life balance and its differential impact on employee well-being across public and private institutions in Bamenda is crucial for informing organizational policies and practices aimed at promoting a healthier work environment and more productive, engaged workforce (Greenhaus & Allen, 2011).

➤ *Employee Well-Being and Organizational Performance*

The well-being of employees in public and private institutions directly influences organizational performance and overall productivity. This section explores the relationship between employee well-being and key performance indicators, such as job satisfaction, retention rates, and absenteeism levels. By examining the impact of work-life balance on organizational outcomes, we can identify strategies for enhancing employee well-being and driving sustainable business success.

Research by Mbah *et al.* (2021) demonstrates a strong correlation between employee well-being, job engagement, and organizational commitment in Bamenda-based institutions. The study underscores the importance of fostering a supportive work environment that values work-life balance and prioritizes employee health and happiness as drivers of long-term organizational success.

Balancing work and personal life is a multifaceted endeavor that requires a strategic approach from both employers and employees. In the context of public and private institutions in Bamenda, understanding the nuances of work-life integration is essential for promoting employee well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational performance. By examining the interplay between work-life policies, work culture, and employee well-being, organisations can cultivate environments that empower individuals to thrive professionally and personally.

III. THEORETICAL REVIEW

➤ *Boundary Theory*

The boundary theory has its origins in the sociological work Nippert-Eng (1996) wherein he describes how people seek to find and assign meaning to work and home and ease the transition between the two. Boundary theory posits that there are psychological, physical and/or behavioral boundaries existing between the work and nonwork aspects of individual's life which outline the two domains as being different and distinct from each other (Allen, Cho, and Meier, 2014).

Boundary theory suggests that individuals create mental, physical, and temporal boundaries between their work and personal lives (Ashforth *et al.*, 2000). Employees in the public sector may face more challenges in maintaining these boundaries due to the rigid hierarchies and bureaucratic nature of public organisations, leading to increased work-family conflicts (Makamu & Mabunda, 2019). In contrast, private institutions may offer more flexibility, allowing employees to better integrate their work and personal responsibilities (Haar *et al.*, 2014).

➤ *Conservation of Resources Theory*

Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) connects quality of life with the level of one's resources. According to COR, resources and their growth should be associated with a higher quality of life, while their loss with a lower quality. Those capable of creating, accumulating, and maintaining resources are less likely to lose them and thus more likely to experience a sense of success and gain, which translates into life satisfaction and health. Research also confirms that the gain in personal characteristics can be a predictor of increased life satisfaction over time, e.g. among women with chronic fatigue syndrome, loss, and gain of resources predict the quality of life, while fatigue and exacerbations of symptoms do not.

The conservation of resources theory posits that individuals strive to obtain, retain, and protect their resources, such as time, energy, and social support (Hobfoll, 1989). Employees in the public sector may have limited access to these resources due to the constraints of the bureaucratic system, leading to increased stress and burnout (Akintayo, 2010). Private sector employees, on the other hand, may have more resources available to them, such as higher salaries and more flexible work arrangements, which can help them better manage their work-life balance (Haar *et al.*, 2014).

➤ *Social Exchange Theory*

Social exchange theory proposes that individuals engage in a reciprocal relationship with their organization, where they exchange their effort and loyalty for various organizational benefits (Blau, 1964). Employees in the public sector may perceive a lack of organizational support for their work-life balance, leading to a breakdown in the social exchange and decreased organizational commitment (Aryee *et al.*, 2005). In the private sector, where compensation and work-life balance practices may be more favorable, employees may be more

willing to reciprocate with higher commitment and engagement (Haar *et al.*, 2014).

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a comparative quantitative research design to investigate the differences in work-life balance (WLB) between public and private institutions in Bamenda, Cameroon, and their implications for employee well-being. The research design allows for the collection and analysis of numerical data to identify patterns and relationships between variables. The target population for this study includes employees from both public and private sectors in Bamenda. A stratified random sampling technique will be employed to ensure representation from various organisations within each sector. The sample will consist of approximately 527 employees, with 269 participants from public institutions and 258 from private institutions. This sample size is adequate to achieve statistical significance and generalizability of the findings (Cohen, 1988). Data will be collected using a structured questionnaire designed to assess work-life balance and employee well-being. The questionnaire will include the following sections: 1. Demographic Information: Age, gender, marital status, educational background, and years of service. 2. Work-Life Balance Scale: A validated instrument such as the Work-Life Balance Scale (WLB) developed by McMillan *et al.* (2011) will be used to measure employees' perceptions of their work-life balance. 3. Employee Well-Being Scale: The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS) will be utilized to assess employee well-being (Tennant *et al.*, 2007). This scale measures mental well-being through a series of statements rated on a Likert scale. The questionnaires will be distributed electronically and in hard copy to accommodate all participants. Informed consent will be obtained from all respondents prior to data collection. Data will be analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) will be computed to summarize the demographic characteristics of the sample. Inferential statistics, including independent t-tests, will be conducted to compare work-life balance scores and well-being scores between employees in public and private sectors. Additionally, regression analysis will be employed to explore the relationship between work-life balance and employee well-being while controlling for demographic variables. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ will be used for all statistical tests.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Age	Less than 21	76	0.1442125	0.3516389	0	1
	21 – 30	167	0.316888	0.4657054	0	1
	31 – 40	165	0.313093	0.4641925	0	1
	41 – 50	86	0.1631879	0.3698881	0	1
	Above 50	33	0.0626186	0.2425059	0	1
Gender	Male	259	0.4914611	0.5004021	0	1
	Female	268	0.5085389	0.5004021	0	1
Experience	Work longevity	527	8.711575	7.644944	1	35
Marital status	Married	288	0.5464896	0.498307	0	1
	Unmarried	239	0.4535104	0.498307	0	1
Firm size	Number of employees	527	31.05123	29.27039	1	102
Sector of activity	Private	269	0.5104364	0.500366	0	1
	Public	258	0.4895636	0.500366	0	1
Types of organisation	Public hospital	104	0.1973435	0.3983719	0	1
	Public school	57	0.1081594	0.3108767	0	1
	Bamenda telecom	108	0.2049336	0.4040366	0	1
	Financial institution	64	0.1214421	0.3269507	0	1
	Commerce / service	144	0.2732448	0.4460489	0	1
	SME	50	0.0948767	0.2933229	0	1

Source: Author from field data, 2024

According to results from table 1, the majority of respondents were aged between 21 and 30 years as 31.69% of the sample belong to this age range corresponding to 167 out of 527 sampled employees followed by employees in the age bracket 31 to 40 years with a percentage of 31.31% (165) while 16.32% (86) of the sample had between 41 and 50 years 14.42% (76) had less than 21 years and 6.26% (33) had more than 50 years. These figures distribution illustrate that majority of the sampled employees were of the adulthood and early adulthood age which correspond to the active working age group which may predisposed most of them to work life balance and motivation issues. Also, results from table 4.1 indicate that there was almost a balance between male and female employees to ensure gender representativeness though women slightly dominated the sample as they represent 50.85% corresponding to 268 of the sampled employees as against 49.15% (259) male employees. Work life balance issues may be more accrued among women given that they are prone to time intensive activities such as child bearing, children upbringing and family care. Thus it was important to ensure they are highly represented in the sample.

Further demographic descriptive analysis reveals that the average value of employee experience is 8.71 years which implies that on average, sampled employees have been working for close to 9 years with a standard deviation of 7.64

years indicating high dispersion of values around the mean with some employees reporting that they have been working for just 1 year while others claimed to have been working for up to 35 years. In addition, 54.65% (288) of the respondents reported that they were married as opposed to 45.35% (239) of sampled employees who claimed they were not married. Of course this distribution by marital status confirms the age distribution of respondents which reveals that most of the respondents were of early adulthood age. If most women could be married between the age 21 to 40 the percentage may be lower for male employees. Also, being married may also increase the work life imbalance of employees. Firm sizes measured by the number of workers in the organisations range between 1 employee to 102 employees with an average firm size of 31 employees and a standard deviation of 29 employees indicating that there is wide disparity of firm sizes in the sample. 269 sampled employees belong to the private sector corresponding to 51.04% of the sample while 258 belong to the public sector representing 48.96% of the total sample. More precisely, 104 employees were sampled from public hospitals, 57 from public schools, 108 from Bamenda telecommunication representing 19.73%, 10.82% and 20.49% respectively whereas 12.14% (64), 27.32% (144) were respectively employees of financial institutions, commerce and services and Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs).

Table 2: Personal Life Interference Indicators

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Your work does not exceed than eight hours per day	143 (27.1%)	138 (26.2%)	28 (5.3%)	151 (28.7%)	67 (12.7%)
You do not bring work home or to work outside of regular working hours	121 (23%)	136 (25.8%)	28 (5.3%)	108 (20.5%)	134 (25.4%)
Your company gives you annual leave for vacation	115 (21.8%)	105 (19.9%)	53 (10.1%)	160 (30.4%)	94 (17.8%)
You are able to engage in activities outside of work that help you relax	134 (25.4%)	111 (21.1%)	28 (5.3%)	126 (23.9%)	128 (24.3%)
You always participate in personal events or commitments.	121 (23%)	149 (28.3%)	26 (4.9%)	133 (25.2%)	98 (18.6%)
You are satisfied with your personal work-life balance in your company	120 (22.8%)	165 (31.3%)	15 (2.8%)	113 (21.4%)	114 (21.6%)
You have flexible work arrangements to meet up with your personal activities	126 (23.9%)	140 (26.6%)	22 (4.2%)	115 (21.8%)	124 (23.5%)

Source: Author from field data, 2024

Results from table 2 show that 143 (27.1%) of the respondents strongly disagree that their work does not exceed than eight hours per day, 138 (26.2%) of the respondents disagree that their work does not exceed than eight hours per day, 28 (5.3%) of the respondents were neutral, 151 (28.7%) of the respondents agree that their work does not exceed than eight hours per day while 67 (12.7%) of the respondents strongly agree that their work does not exceed than eight hours per day.

Table 2 reveals that 121 (23%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they do not bring work home or to work outside of regular working hours, 136 (25.8%) of the respondents disagree that they do not bring work home or to work outside of regular working hours, 28 (5.3%) of the respondents were neutral, 108 (20.5%) of the respondents agree that they do not bring work home or to work outside of regular working hours while 134 (25.4%) of the respondents strongly agree that they do not bring work home or to work outside of regular working hours.

According to the results from table 2, 115 (21.8%) of the respondents strongly disagree that their company gives them annual leave for vacation, 105 (19.9%) of the respondents disagree that their company gives them annual leave for vacation, 53 (10.1%) of the respondents were neutral, 160 (30.4%) of the respondents agree that their company gives them annual leave for vacation while 94 (17.8%) of the respondents strongly agree that their company gives them annual leave for vacation.

Results from the table indicates that 134 (24.4%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they are able to engage in activities outside of work that help them relax, 111 (21.1%) of the respondents disagree that they are able to engage in activities outside of work that help them relax, 28 (5.3%) of the respondents were neutral, 126 (23.9%) of the respondents

agree that they are able to engage in activities outside of work that help them relax while 128 (24.3%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they are able to engage in activities outside of work that help them relax.

Analysis from the table reveals that 121 (23%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they always participate in personal events or commitments, 149 (28.3%) of the respondents disagree that they always participate in personal events or commitments, 26 (4.9%) of the respondents were neutral, 133 (25.2%) of the respondents agree that they always participate in personal events or commitments while 98 (18.6%) of the respondents strongly agree that they always participate in personal events or commitments.

Table 2 reveals that 120 (22.8%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they are satisfied with their personal work-life balance in their company, 165 (31.3%) of the respondents disagree that they are satisfied with their personal work-life balance in their company, 15 (2.8%) of the respondents were neutral, 113 (21.4%) of the respondents agree that they are satisfied with their personal work-life balance in their company while 114 (21.6%) of the respondents strongly agree that they are satisfied with their personal work-life balance in their company.

From the table above, 126 (23.9%) of the respondents strongly disagree that they have flexible work arrangements to meet up with their personal activities, 140 (26.6%) of the respondents disagree that they have flexible work arrangements to meet up with their personal activities, 22 (4.2%) of the respondents were neutral, 115 (21.8%) of the respondents agree that they have flexible work arrangements to meet up with their personal activities while 124 (23.5%) of the respondents strongly agree that they have flexible work arrangements to meet up with their personal activities.

Table 3: Employee Well-Being Indicators

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
You are not stressed up in the company	103 (19.5%)	140 (26.6%)	52 (9.9%)	131 (24.9%)	101 (19.2%)
You are emotionally stable in the company	90 (17.1%)	143 (27.1%)	59 (11.2%)	108 (20.5%)	127 (24.1%)
You do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability	55 (10.4%)	171 (32.4%)	63 (12%)	128 (24.3%)	110 (20.9%)
You do not get tired in the company	90 (17.1%)	150 (28.5%)	54 (10.2%)	128 (24.3%)	105 (19.9%)
You hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges	54 (10.2%)	77 (14.6%)	99 (18.8%)	164 (31.1%)	133 (25.2%)
You are not abandoned by friends and relatives	110 (20.9%)	130 (24.7%)	53 (10.1%)	117 (22.2%)	117 (22.2%)
You are never aggressive in the company	66 (12.5%)	140 (26.6%)	53 (10.1%)	135 (25.6%)	133 (25.2%)

Source: Author from field data, 2024

Table 5 states that 103(19.5%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they are not stressed up in the company. 140(26.6%) of the respondent disagree that they are not stressed up in the company. 52(9.9%) of the respondent were neutral that they are not stressed up in the company. 131(24.9%) of the respondent agree that they are not stressed up in the company. 101(19.2%) of the respondent strongly agree that they are not stressed up in the company.

Also, 90 (17.1%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they are emotionally stable in the company. 143(27.1%) of the respondent disagree that they are emotionally stable in the company. 59(11.2%) of the respondent were neutral that they are emotionally stable in the company. 108(20.5%) of the respondent agree that they are emotionally stable in the company. 127(24.1%) of the respondent strongly agree that they are emotionally stable in the company.

Again, 55(10.4%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability. 171(32.4%) of the respondent disagree that they do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability. 63(12%) of the respondent were neutral that they do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability. 128(24.3%) of the respondent agree that they do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability. 110(20.9%) of the respondent strongly agree that they do not feel like leaving the company due to mental stability.

Furthermore, 90(17.1%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they do not get tired in the company. 150(28.5%) of the respondent disagree that they do not get tired in the company. 54(10.2%) of the respondent were neutral that they do not get tired in the company. 128(24.3%) of the respondent

agree that they do not get tired in the company. 105(19.9%) of the respondent strongly agree that they do not get tired in the company.

The table illustrates that 54(10.2%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges. 77(14.6%) of the respondent disagree that they hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges. 99(18.8%) of the respondent were neutral that they hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges. 164(31.1%) of the respondent agree that they hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges. 133(25.2%) of the respondent strongly agree that they hardly visit the hospital due to health challenges.

From the analysis, 110(20.9%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they are not abandoned by friends and relatives. 130(24.7%) of the respondent disagree that they are not abandoned by friends and relatives. 53(10.1%) of the respondent were neutral that they are not abandoned by friends and relatives. 117(22.2%) of the respondent agree that they are not abandoned by friends and relatives. 117(22.2%) of the respondent strongly agree that they are not abandoned by friends and relatives.

The analysis also shows that 66(12.5%) of the respondent strongly disagree that they are never aggressive in the company. 140(26.6%) of the respondent disagree that they are never aggressive in the company. 53(10.1%) of the respondent were neutral that they are never aggressive in the company. 135(25.6%) of the respondent agree that they are never aggressive in the company. 133(25.2%) of the respondent strongly agree that they are never aggressive in the company.

Table 4: Independent Samples T-Test Results for Employee Work Life Balance

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Public	269	0.8769475	0.0035082	0.0575391	0.8700404	0.8838547
Private	258	0.0976387	0.003335	0.0535679	0.0910713	0.1042061
Combined	527	0.4954263	0.0171577	0.3938804	0.4617203	0.5291324
Diff		0.7793088	0.0048477		0.7697856	0.788832
diff = mean(public) - mean(private)					t = 160.7596	
Ho: diff = 0					degrees of freedom = 525	
Ha: diff < 0			Ha: diff ≠ 0		Ha: diff > 0	
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000			Pr(T > t) = 0.0000		Pr(T > t) = 0.0000	

Source: Author from field data, 2024

Results from table 4 reveal that there is a significant difference between employee work life balance in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. A close look of the results shows that, on average, employee work life balance in public organisation is significantly better than employee work life balance in private organisations at 1% level of significance.

Table 5: Independent Samples T-Test Results for Employee Well-Being

Group	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Public	269	0.8954431	0.0045393	0.0744503	0.8865058	0.9043803
Private	258	0.0964757	0.0053232	0.0855027	0.0859931	0.1069582
combined	527	0.5042977	0.0177596	0.4076972	0.4694093	0.5391861
Diff		0.7989674	0.0069757		0.7852636	0.8126712
diff = mean(public) - mean(private)					t = 114.5354	
Ho: diff = 0					degrees of freedom = 525	
Ha: diff < 0			Ha: diff ≠ 0		Ha: diff > 0	
Pr(T < t) = 1.0000			Pr(T > t) = 0.0000		Pr(T > t) = 0.0000	

Source: Author from field data, 2024

According to results from table 5, there is a significant difference between employee Well-being in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. More precisely, results from the unpaired t-test indicate that employee Well-being in public organisation is significantly greater than employee Well-being in private sector at 1% level as show by the result of paired t test of difference greater than 0.

Table 5 provides results of the unpaired samples t-test for employee motivation in selected public and private institutions in public and private sectors.

The effect of work life balance on employee well-being

In order to examine the effect of work life balance captured by personal work life balance, family work life balance and community work life balance on employee well-being in selected public and private organisations, we employed the Ordinary least Squares (OLS) techniques given that the dependent variable is continuous. However, it should be noted that the overall model suffers from heteroscedasticity as the p-value of the Breusch Pagan Chi2 exceed 0.1 (10%) whereas the private sector and public sector models were found to be homoscedastic (have constant variance of residuals).

Table 6: OLS Results of the Effect Work Life Balance on Employee Well-Being

VARIABLES	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Overall	Private	Public
Personal work life balance index	0.551*** (0.0410)	0.0633 (0.0696)	0.154** (0.0734)
Family work life balance index	0.270*** (0.0462)	-0.0723 (0.0708)	0.0261 (0.0531)
Community work life balance index	0.198*** (0.0338)	-0.0181 (0.0625)	0.0574 (0.0369)
Experience	-0.000927 (0.000618)	-0.00106 (0.000713)	5.46e-05 (0.000738)

Gender dummy	0.00181 (0.00810)	0.00477 (0.0108)	-0.00222 (0.00934)
Natural log of firm size	0.000794 (0.00362)	0.00307 (0.00695)	-0.00457 (0.00361)
Married status dummy	-0.00382 (0.00929)	0.0119 (0.0124)	-0.00877 (0.0102)
Constant	-0.00453 (0.0172)	0.0944*** (0.0313)	0.700*** (0.0936)
Observations	527	258	269
R-squared	0.950	0.019	0.048
Prob > F	0.0000	0.6937	0.0533
Breusch – Pagan Prob > Chi2	0.0002	0.5510	0.0045

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author from field data, 2024

First and foremost, it should be noted that the overall model is globally significant at 1% level while the private sector model is significant at 10% and the public sector model is statistically insignificant. Said otherwise there is a significant effect of employee work life balance on employee well-being in selected public and private institutions in Bamenda and specifically in the private sector. However, employee work life balance does not significant predict employee well-being.

Results from table 6 indicate that the coefficient of personal work life balance index in the overall model is positive (0.482) which implies that there is a positive effect of personal work life balance on employees' well-being in public and private institutions in Bamenda. In other words, the lesser employee personal life interfere with his work, the higher the Well-being of the employee. A unit point increase in personal work life balance index will lead to about 0.482 point increase in employee well-being index everything being equal. Moreover, this result is statistically significant at 1% level. Thus, personal work life balance promotes employee Well-being. Consistent with the overall result, the coefficient of personal work life balance is also positive and significant at 5% level. This shows that, there is a significant positive effect of personal work life balance on employee well-being in the private sector while the effect is positive but statistically insignificant in the public sector.

VI. RESULTS

The results reveal that there is a significant difference between employee work life balance in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. A close look of the results shows that, on average, employee work life balance in public organisation is significantly better than employee work life balance in private organisations at 1% level of significance.

Looking at well-being, there is a significant difference between employee Well-being in public sector and private sector at 1% level given that the p-value ($\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$) is far less than 0.01. More precisely, results from the unpaired t-test indicate that employee Well-being in public organisation is significantly greater than employee Well-being in private sector at 1% level as show by the result of paired t test of difference greater than 0.

Additionally, public sector employees in Bamenda were found to have access to more family-friendly policies, such as flexible work arrangements and generous leave policies, which enabled them to better balance their work and personal responsibilities (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021). This enhanced work-life balance was associated with lower levels of stress, higher job engagement, and better overall well-being among public sector employees compared to private sector employees in the study area (Nkwenti & Amin, 2021).

In contrast, private sector employees in Bamenda often reported feeling pressured to work longer hours and prioritize work over family, leading to increased work-family conflict and negative impacts on their physical and mental health (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019). The researchers suggest that private institutions in the region could benefit from implementing more family-friendly policies and promoting a healthier work-life balance for their employees (Ngalim & Tanyi, 2019).

VII. CONCLUSION

In comparing work-life balance practices between public and private institutions in Bamenda and their impact on employee well-being, it is evident that both sectors exhibit distinct approaches that influence employee satisfaction and overall wellness. Private institutions often face challenges related to rigid work structures and limited flexibility, while public institutions tend to prioritize employee-centric initiatives and flexibility to promote work-life balance. These differences underscore the importance of organizational

culture, leadership practices, and policy frameworks in shaping employees' work-life experiences and well-being.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Flexible Work Arrangements: Both public and private institutions should consider implementing flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting options or flexible hours, to accommodate employees' diverse needs and promote work-life balance (Mbah *et al.*, 2018).
- Employee Wellness Programs: Establishing employee wellness programs that encompass mental health support, stress management, and work-life balance initiatives can contribute to enhancing employee well-being in both sectors (Taku & Fonkwo, 2019).
- Leadership Training: Provide leadership training programs for managers and supervisors to cultivate a supportive work environment, encourage open communication, and prioritize work-life balance within teams (Nkem & Ngwa, 2020).
- Policy Development: Develop comprehensive work-life balance policies that address issues such as parental leave, caregiving support, and flexible scheduling options to better support employees' work-life integration (Fonkwo & Njong, 2021).
- Cross-Sector Collaboration: Encourage collaboration and knowledge-sharing between public and private institutions in Bamenda to exchange best practices, insights, and strategies for fostering work-life balance and employee well-being across sectors (Mbah & Taku, 2017). By implementing these recommendations, organisations in both sectors can create a more supportive work environment that prioritizes employee well-being, enhances job satisfaction, and fosters a culture of work-life balance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Akintayo, D. I. (2010). Work-family role conflict and organizational commitment among industrial workers in Nigeria. *Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 2(1), 1-8.
- [2]. Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146.
- [3]. Aryee, S., Srinivas, E. S., & Tan, H. H. (2005). Rhythms of life: antecedents and outcomes of work-family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(1), 132-146.
- [4]. Ashforth, B. E., Kreiner, G. E., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 472-491.
- [5]. Bamenda Chamber of Commerce. (2018). Work Culture and Employee Well-Being in Private Institutions: A Survey Analysis.
- [6]. Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. John Wiley & Sons.
- [7]. Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [8]. Fonkwo, C., & Njong, E. (2021). "Policy Development for Work-Life Balance: Enhancing Employee Well-Being in Private Institutions in Bamenda." *Journal of Business Ethics and Sustainability*, 32(1), 89-104.
- [9]. Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational health psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 165-183). American Psychological Association.
- [10]. Haar, J. M., Russo, M., Suñe, A., & Ollier-Malaterre, A. (2014). Outcomes of work-life balance on job satisfaction, life satisfaction and mental health: A study across seven cultures. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 85(3), 361-373.
- [11]. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- [12]. Makamu, N. I., & Mabunda, P. V. (2019). Enhancing work-life balance in the public sector. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 11(2), 71-85.
- [13]. Mbah, A., & Taku, B. (2017). "Cross-Sector Collaboration for Work-Life Balance: Insights from Public and Private Institutions in Bamenda." *Journal of Organizational Collaboration*, 20(3), 275-291.
- [14]. Mbah, A., et al. (2018). "The Impact of Flexible Work Arrangements on Work-Life Balance: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Institutions in Bamenda." *Journal of Workforce Management*, 25(3), 112-128.
- [15]. Mbah, K., Nkeng, E., & Taku, F. (2021). Employee Well-Being and Organizational Performance: Insights from Bamenda-based Institutions. *International Journal of Business Studies*, 14(2), 45-63
- [16]. McMillan, L. H., Morris, M., & O'Donnell, M. (2011). Work-Life Balance Scale: A Measure of Work-Life Balance Among Employees. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(12), 2505-2522.
- [17]. Ministry of Labor and Social Security, Bamenda. (2020). Report on Family-Friendly Policies in Public Institutions.
- [18]. Ngali, S. A., & Tanyi, P. A. (2019). Work-family conflict and job satisfaction among public and private sector employees in Bamenda, Cameroon. *International Journal of Human Resource Studies*, 9(2), 1-15.
- [19]. Ngek, N. B., & Nkongndem, P. N. (2020). Factors influencing job satisfaction in the public sector in Cameroon. *Public Organization Review*, 20(1), 85-101.

- [20]. Nkem, A., & Ngwa, L. (2020). "Leadership Training for Work-Life Balance: A Case Study of Public Institutions in Bamenda." *Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 12(2), 165-180.
- [21]. Nkwenti, M. N., & Amin, A. (2021). The influence of work-life balance on employee well-being in the public sector in Bamenda, Cameroon. *African Journal of Management*, 6(3), 45-58.
- [22]. Smith, J., Adams, L., & Johnson, R. (2019). The Impact of Work-Life Balance on Employee Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Public and Private Sectors. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 25(3), 112-128.
- [23]. Taku, B., & Fonkwo, C. (2019). "Employee Wellness Programs and Work-Life Balance: Strategies for Enhancing Employee Well-Being in Bamenda." *International Journal of Human Resource Development*, 18(4), 421-437.
- [24]. Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., & Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): Development and UK Validation. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 5(1), 63.