Limitations:

This study in not without limitations.

1. Only one sample i.e. the faculty members were used which limits the generalizability of the findings.

2. Individuals hold inaccurate opinions of themselves, which may produce erroneous results when they report on work-life imbalance, spousal support, family support, emotional stability, spiritual inclination, workaholism, supervisory support, etc. this was also stated by Spector (1994, Podsakoff et al., 2003). Although self-report data are irreplaceable as a means of collecting information on how people perceive themselves, a more accurate picture could be attained by gathering data from co-workers, supervisors, peer, spouse, close friends or other family members (Aziz and Zickar, 2006).

3. Perception of psychological constructs lie in the eye of the beholder. The faculty was asked to rate their level of satisfaction, common method of bias may have resulted from a self-report research design, using acquaintance ratings alleviates many of the problems that occur from relying on a single data source. Given the self-report nature of the study, causal inference was not made.

4. Single item measure had to be used in the analysis instead of validated scales that could measure the constructs of interest reliably and richly. But this need not always be a problem. Wanous et al., (1997) argue that in general, single item measures may have higher face validity than multi item measures because it is immediately clear to the respondents which construct is being measured. Recently, Van Hooff et al., (2007b) also supports that a single item measure was equivalent to a well validated six-item measure.

5. Common methods variance is a limitation to the use of one survey instrument, however the addition of qualitative data could have helped to alleviate the issue of work-life imbalance and have better understanding between the dependent and the independent variable.
6. Data was collected only from the full time faculty and not the part time faculty.

Future Implications:

1. Future research should use longitudinal research to enhance understanding of how work-life imbalance changes overtime and with different situations of the respondents.

2. Future research should be carried on employees from various diverse backgrounds to get a better picture on the determinants of work-life imbalance. As this research was limited to the faculty members of the higher education so the sample limits the generalizability of the findings.

3. Future research should do the comparison between the work-life imbalance of full time faculty and part time faculty.

4. Future research should study the determinants affecting part time faculty members which may be different from the full time workers.