

Exploring the Work-Family Interface: Perceptions of University Teachers

Rizwan Ahmad¹

Farhana Yasmin²

Sumaira Majeed³

¹University of Education, Lahore – Pakistan

²Lahore Garrison University, Lahore – Pakistan

³University of Education, Lahore – Pakistan

Abstract

The research study intended to explore whether there is any relationship between work-family interference and family-work interference. This quantitative research adopted correlational research and a cross-sectional survey was used to collect the data. Teachers at the University of Education Lahore made up the study's population. Carlson's work-family conflict scale was disseminated among the instructors using the census sampling technique. Before collecting the data, permission was taken. Through pilot testing, the validity and reliability of the instrument were insured. The researcher applied descriptive as well as inferential statistics to analyze the data. The ethics of research were observed. Teachers reported more work interfering with family than family interfering with work. Work-family conflict and family-work conflict were shown to have a strong association. There was a significant difference in WIF and FIW based on marital status, but no difference in WIF and FIW based on gender, qualification, age, or the number of children was observed.

Keywords: *Employee attitude, Family-work Conflict, Family life, Organizational Support, Role conflict, Workplace*

Author's E-mail: rizwanahmad@ue.edu.pk

Introduction

Family is a vital element of daily life and it is made up of people who are linked by cultural connections. Employees are more anxious than ever before about

balancing their work and family life in today's workplace. Work and family are the two most important aspects of a person's life. Multiple responsibilities in the professional and personal arenas need a large

expanse of time as well as energy. Balancing several responsibilities in both domains can result in larger interpersonal and intrapersonal conflict. It could lead to work-family conflict. Dual-earner families, which supplanted the traditional family model as the main family form typified by the role of males as breadwinners and females as caregivers for the home and children, are now uncommon (Chopur, 2011). People are nowadays faced with the issue of balancing family and job demands (Bodla & Danish, 2009; Hsu et al., 2001; Hennessy, 2007). Personal role conflict arises as a result of job and family duties (Anafarta, 2011).

To fulfill the work and family tasks, time and energy are required. Researchers (Beutell, 2010; Kinnunen et al., 2010) are of the view that balancing various duties in both domains can raise interpersonal and intrapersonal conflict, leading to work-family conflict. Multiple role demands suggest that conflict between roles is unavoidable inside

an adult (Bodla & Danish, 2009; Carlson, 2000; Pohlman & Gardiner, 2000). Work-family conflict is inherent since both are pulling in opposite directions that are misaligned with each other (Fredriksen & Scharlach, 2001; Shaffer et al., 2016). The demands coming from one domain make the performance of roles in the other domain more difficult (Boles et al., 2001). People from dual-income households have a harder time managing their household commitments and professional obligations. Expectations can lead to disputes at work and at home (Akintayo, 2010; Karatepe & Magaji, 2008).

Family-work conflict equally differs from work-family conflict. Demands of the job, the time spent on it, and the stress it causes interfere with family responsibilities. According to Makela and Suutari (2011), family-work conflict is a sort of inter-role conflict in which the family's general requirements, time spent with them, and the stress they

produce make it difficult to perform work-related obligations (Turner et al., 2014). Both types of conflict arise from an individual's effort to fulfill an overflow of expectations arising from the individual's home/family and work environments (Ansari, 2011; Byrne & Barling, 2017; Byron, 2005).

The literature has identified the three most critical characteristics of WFC. Short periods are spent with family or at work in time-based WFC, whereas major job responsibilities are included in strain-based WFC. Communication with superiors is a challenge in behavior-based WFC. These are only a handful of the contributing elements of WFC (Carlson et al., 2000). Work overload, workplace stress, long, inconsistent, and inflexible work hours, interpersonal challenges, extensive travel, career transitions, and an unsupportive boss or organization are all factors that contribute to WFC (Amstad et al., 2011). It is a conflict in which the immediate impact of two

sets of demands exerts pressure on one another, making compliance with one difficult as compliance with the other becomes problematic. Because each aspect requires time, energy, and attention, it is tough for an individual to meet all of his or her family and career obligations (Karatepe & Uludag, 2007). In this light, this research study is important because the results can help instructors and other stakeholders improve the satisfaction of university instructors with their professional and personal life, hence reducing the high turnover rate in the teaching profession. The purpose of this study was to look into work-family conflict among university professors, as well as look into work-family conflict among university teachers in relation to demographic factors.

Research on WFC ignores the teaching profession. Teaching is a profession that possesses a high possibility of experiencing conflict. According to researchers (Achour & Boerhannoeddin, 2011; Prieto et al.,

2010), teaching has been identified as one of the occupations with the highest amount of stress on a global scale. This element is even more important to consider when studying at educational institutions. These educational institutions are the major source of human resources. They are solely responsible for educating the nation's intellectual aptitude. The teaching profession necessitates satisfaction and a sense of balance between home and work life (Cunanan, 2006; Karatepe & Magaji, 2008). Employees try to balance work and family commitments; they are more worried about the conflict that exists between job and family obligations. This conflict might have serious consequences (Butler & Skkattebo, 2004). According to studies, conflict arises not only as a result of work but also as a result of family duties that interfere with professional performance (Choi & Kim, 2012). The intent of the present research was to explore the perception of work-family conflict as

well as family-work conflict in university teachers. It also explored the difference between the work-family conflict and family-work conflict based on demographic variables.

Methodology

This research study was conducted with the intent to explore the relationship between WIF and FIW. It was quantitative research that adopted a positivist research paradigm. It was most appropriate to use a correlational research design as the relationship between the variables was explored without manipulating them but described as they exist. A cross-sectional survey was used to collect the data. This study focused on teachers at The University of Education Lahore. It was decided to utilize the census sampling technique. As a consequence, the sample comprised all of the teachers of the university. Information regarding the population was obtained from the website of the university.

Table 1: *Demographic Properties of the Sample*

Demographics	<i>N</i>	%	Cumulative %
Gender			
Male	179	56.6 %	56.6 %
Female	137	43.4 %	100 %
Marital Status			
Married	157	49.7 %	49.7 %
Single	158	50.3 %	100 %
Qualification			
Masters	134	42.4 %	42.2 %
MPhil	126	39.9 %	82.3 %
PhD	56	17.7 %	100 %
Age			
29 and below	107	33.9 %	33.9 %
30-39	132	41.8 %	75.7 %
40-49	58	18.3 %	94.1 %
50 and above	19	6 %	100 %
Designation			
Lecturer	230	72.8 %	72.8 %
Assistant Professor	61	19.3 %	92.1 %
Associate Professor	18	5.7 %	97.8 %
Professor	7	2.2 %	100 %
Number of Siblings			
Above 4	10	3.2 %	3.2 %
3-4	44	13.9 %	17.1 %
1-2	154	48.7 %	65.8 %
No children	108	34.2 %	100 %

Table 1 presents the picture of the sample based on demographic variables. The researcher obtained

information regarding the demographic variables of the teachers like gender, age, qualification, marital

status, designation, and a number of siblings.

Work-family Conflict Scale (WFCS)

With permission taken via email, WFCS was adapted for this

research study. Dawn Carlson (2000) of Baylor University developed the instrument. The instrument was based on five points Likert-type rating scale consisting of five choices per item. The scales ranged from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

Table 2: *Description of WIF and FIW Sub Scale*

Scale	Item number in scale	Items	A
TB WIF (Time Based WIF)	1,7 and 13	3	0.8
SB WIF (Strain Based WIF)	3,9 and 15	3	0.9
BB WIF (Behavior Based WIF)	5,11 and 17	3	0.9
TB FIW (Time Based FIW)	2,8 and 14	3	0.8
SB FIW (Strain Based FIW)	4,10 and 16	3	0.8
BB FIW (Behavior Based FIW)	6,12 and 18	3	0.9

Negatively worded items were found in the WFCS. Items with negative wording (i.e. 5, 6, 8, 17, and 18) were reverse scored. The researcher conducted pilot study with the intent to confirm the validity as well as reliability of the instrument. Three professors working in the universities validated the instrument. They commented on the clarity and suitability of the instrument. Reliability analysis was performed to confirm the reliability ($\alpha=.9$). The

researcher incorporated minor changes keeping in view of pilot testing. The researcher collected questionnaires during the scheduled meetings. In addition, when respondents had finished the surveys, the remaining questions were gathered. The instrument took almost 25-30 minutes to rate the statements. The return rate was 73%. This research study concentrated on The University of Education Lahore might confine the capacity to generalize the

results. In the light of research inferential statistics were applied to questions, descriptive as well as the data.

Table 3: *Alignment of Objectives and Research Questions, An instrument with data Analysis*

Objectives	Research Questions	Instrumentation	Data analysis
Explore the perception regarding work-family conflict in university teachers.	What is the perception regarding work-family conflict of university teachers	WFCS	Mean and standard deviation
Explore the perception regarding family-work conflict in university teachers	What is the perception regarding family-work conflict of university teachers	WFCS	Mean and standard deviation
Explore the relationship between work-family conflict and family-work conflict in university teachers	Is there any relationship between work-family conflict and family-work in university teachers	WFCS	Pearson r
Explore the difference in WFC and FWC with respect to demographic variables	Is there any difference in WFC and FWC with respect to demographic variables	WFCS	Independent samples t-test and ANOVA

Results and Discussions

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of WIF and FIW

Sr. No.	Items	SD	D	UD	A	SA	M	SD
1	WIF 1	34	126	31	116	9	2.81	1.131
2	WIF 2	56	119	9	127	5	2.70	1.211
3	WIF 3	19	131	14	150	2	2.95	1.075
4	WIF 4	20	125	69	98	4	2.81	1.989
5	WIF 5	40	106	30	129	11	2.89	1.175
6	WIF 6	6	128	80	102	1	2.88	.890
7	WIF 7	80	82	49	104	2	2.57	1.197
8	WIF 8	38	80	64	107	27	3.02	1.191
9	WIF 9	13	42	32	187	42	3.64	1.006
10	FIW 1	27	111	16	153	9	3.02	1.138
11	FIW 2	22	115	12	159	8	3.05	1.117
12	FIW 3	12	126	42	128	8	3.01	1.036
13	FIW 4	19	110	35	152	2	3.17	1.159
14	FIW 5	39	60	36	169	12	2.74	.891
15	FIW 6	6	158	63	89	2	2.93	1.263
16	FIW 7	71	47	34	161	3	2.91	1.200
17	FIW 8	27	65	20	148	56	3.45	1.237
18	FIW 9	11	61	47	190	7	3.38	.937

Table 4 presents descriptive statistics for Work Interference with Family (WIF) and Family Interference with Work (FIW) scales. It provides a clear picture of the scales (WIF and FIW).

Descriptive Statistics of the WIF and FIW Sub Scales

For a better comprehension of the data, the table given below provides a quick and concise

summary of the variables. Frequency distribution as well as range (both potential and actual), were calculated. In order to confirm the normality of the data, skewness, as well as kurtosis, are calculated. Its values fall within the range of +1 to -1. Hence it was concluded the data is normally distributed. Data analysis reveals that

teachers at The University of Education Lahore face more conflict originating from their Family (FIW) as compared to conflict originating from their work(WIF). Teachers reported greater FIW ($M=27.74$, $SD=6.53$) as compared to WIF ($M=26.28$, $SD=4.68$).

Table 5: *Descriptive Statistics of WIF and FIW Scales*

Variable	N	M	SD	MPI	Range		Skewness	Kurtosis
					Potential	Actual		
TB WIF	316	08.19	2.78	02.73	03-15	03-13	0.09	-1.13
SB WIF	316	08.61	02.18	03.16	03-15	04-12	-0.68	-0.06
BB WIF	316	09.47	01.84	03.16	03-15	03-12	-0.97	1.07
TB FIW	316	08.96	02.90	02.99	03-15	03-13	-0.48	-1.27
SB FIW	316	09.67	02.84	03.22	03-15	03-14	-0.54	-0.64
BB FIW	316	09.11	01.91	03.04	03-15	03-13	-0.30	-0.12
WIF	316	26.28	4.86	02.92	18-90	15-34	-0.12	-1.12
FIW	316	27.74	6.53	03.08	18-90	9-38	-0.65	-0.68

Relationship between WIF and FIW

Table 6: *Relationship between WIF and FIW*

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. TB WIF	08.19	2.78	--						
2. TB FIW	08.96	02.90	.71**	--					
3. SB WIF	08.61	02.18	.30**	.66**	--				
4. SB FIW	09.67	02.84	.51**	.77**	.77**	--			
5. BB WIF	09.47	01.84	.34**	.31**	.31**	.45**	--		
6. BB FIW	09.11	01.91	.46**	.57**	.57**	.71**	.55**	--	
7. WIF	26.28	4.86	.83**	.82**	.82**	.70**	.61**	.70**	--
8. FIW	27.74	6.53	.65**	.91**	.91**	.93**	.47**	.82**	.84**

** significant at the 0.01level (2 tailed)

In order to know whether a relationship exists between WIF and FIW, Pearson r was run in SPSS. The results are given above. There were twenty-eight pairs of variables that were substantially associated. The association was found to be

significant ($r=.84$, $p.05$). Keeping in mind the guidelines suggested by Cohen (1988), the analysis revealed a strong positive correlation between WIF and FIW. It appears that as WIF rises, FIW rises as well.

Table 7: Gender wise Comparison of WIF and FIW Score

Scale	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect size <i>r</i> / Cohn's <i>d</i>
TB WIF	Male	8.32	2.89	314	.917	.360	.105/.052
	Female	8.03	2.63	2			
TB FIW	Male	9.14	2.87	314	1.247	.213	1.142/.071
	Female	8.73	2.92	2			
SB WIF	Male	8.60	2.08	314	-.040	.968	-.004/-.002
	Female	8.61	2.30	2			
SB FIW	Male	9.77	2.46	314	.809	.419	.091/.046
	Female	9.54	2.58	2			
BB WIF	Male	9.46	1.82	314	-.183	.855	-.022/-.011
	Female	9.50	1.86	2			
BB FIW	Male	9.01	1.83	314	-1.028	.305	-.115/-.057
	Female	9.23	2.00	2			
WIF	Male	26.38	4.75	314	.436	.663	.049/.025
	Female	26.14	5.02	2			
FIW	Male	27.92	4.75	314	.564	.573	.086/.043
	Female	27.50	5.01	2			

The researcher applied independent samples t-test to explore whether any difference exists in WIF and FIW scores based on gender. Results are shown in table 4. Data analysis revealed to the researcher that there is no significant difference in WIF scores of male (M = 26.38, SD = 4.75) and female university

teachers (M = 26.14, SD = 5.01); $t = .463$, $p = .663$ with small effect size (.049/.025). As far as the perception regarding FIW is concerned, no significant difference regarding the the perception of male (M = 27.92, SD = 4.75) and female teachers (M = 27.50, SD = 5.01); $t = .564$, $p = .573$

was observed with moderate effect size (.086/.043).

Table 8: *Comparison of WIF and FIW Score on the basis of Marital Status*

Scale	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect size <i>r</i> / Cohn's <i>d</i>
TB WIF	Married	8.49	2.66	314	2.83	.00	.166/.337
	Single	7.55	2.92	2			
TB FIW	Married	9.10	2.91	314	1.22	.23	.074/.149
	Single	8.67	2.86	2			
SB WIF	Married	8.55	2.29	314	-.70	.49	-.034/-.085
	Single	8.73	1.91	2			
SB FIW	Married	9.74	2.39	314	.72	.47	.045/.089
	Single	9.51	2.76	2			
BB WIF	Married	9.69	1.82	314	3.1	.00	.182/.731
	Single	9.02	1.79	2			
BB FIW	Married	9.09	1.85	314	-.26	.79	-.015/-.031
	Single	9.15	2.03	2			
WIF	Married	26.73	4.82	314	2.4	.01	.146/.294
	Single	25.31	4.83	2			
FIW	Married	27.93	6.39	314	.75	.45	.045/.089
	Single	27.34	6.84	2			

To compare WIF and FIW concerning the marital status of teachers, independent samples t-test was applied. According to table 5, a significant difference was seen in the WIF scores of married (*M*=26.73, *SD*=4.82) and single teachers (*M*=25.31, *SD*=4.83); *t*=2.4, *p*=.01

with a large effect size (.146/.294). Regarding the perception of FIW, it was observed that no significant difference exists in the perception of married (*M*=27.93, *SD*=6.39) and single teachers (*M*=27.34, *SD*=6.84); *t*=.75, *p*=.45 with a small effect size (.086/.043).

Table 9: Comparison of WIF and FIW Score on the basis of Qualification of Teachers

Scales	Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η^2
TB WIF	Between groups	314	2.732	1.366	.176	.84	.001
	Within groups	2	2428.5	7.759			
TB FIW	Between groups	314	33.48	16.74	2.01	.14	.012
	Within groups	2	2610.1	8.34			
SB WIF	Between groups	314	6.657	3.329	.70	.50	.004
	Within groups	2	1486.7	4.750			
SB FIW	Between groups	314	1.725	.863	.136	.87	.001
	Within groups	2	1986.0	6.345			
BB WIF	Between groups	314	8.430	4.215	1.251	.29	.008
	Within groups	2	1054.4	3.369			
BB FIW	Between groups	314	1.206	.603	.165	.85	.001
	Within groups	2	1143.1	3.652			
WIF	Between groups	314	14.905	7.453	.314	.73	.002
	Within groups	2	7434.1	23.751			
FIW	Between groups	314	49.731	24.865	.582	.56	.004
	Within groups	2	13378.7	42.744			

To compare WIF and FIW concerning the qualification of teachers, one-way ANOVA was applied. Based on qualifications, university teachers were grouped into BS/MA/MSc (group I) MPhil (group II) and PhD (group III). No

statistically significant difference was observed in WIF ($p=.73$; $F=.583$) with a small effect size (.002). The researcher observed no statistically significant difference in FIW ($p=.56$; $F=.582$) with a small effect size (.004).

Table 10: *Comparison of WIF and FIW Score on the basis of Age*

Scale	Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
TB WIF	Between groups	3	36.91	12.305	1.603	.19	.015
	Within groups	312	2394.3	7.674			
TB FIW	Between groups	3	31.66	10.554	1.261	.29	.011
	Within groups	312	2611.9	8.371			
SB WIF	Between groups	3	48.10	16.034	3.462	.02	.032
	Within groups	312	1445.2	4.632			
SB FIW	Between groups	3	8.406	2.802	0.442	.72	.004
	Within groups	312	1979.4	6.344			
BB WIF	Between groups	3	25.505	8.502	2.557	.05	.024
	Within groups	312	1037.3	3.325			
BB FIW	Between groups	3	16.934	5.645	1.562	.20	.015
	Within groups						

	Within groups	312	1127.4	3.613			
WIF	Between groups	3	49.43	16.476	0.695	.56	.007
	Within groups	312	7399.6	23.717			
FIW	Between groups	3	100.37	33.458	0.783	.50	.007
	Within groups	312	13328.3	42.719			

To compare WIF and FIW concerning the age of teachers, one way ANOVA was applied. Concerning age, university teachers were divided into four groups i.e. Group 1: 29 and below; Group 2: 30-39, Group 3: 40-49, and Group 4: 50

and above. No statistically significant difference was observed in WIF ($p=.56$; $F=.695$) with a small effect size (.007). Similarly, no statistically significant difference was observed in FIW ($p=.50$; $F=.783$) with a small effect size (.007).

Table 11: Comparison of WIF and FIW Score on the basis of Designation

Scale	Source	df	SS	MS	F	P	η^2
TB WIF	Between groups	5	95.56	19.112	2.53	.03	.001
	Within groups	310	2335.66	7.534			
TB FIW	Between groups	5	109.392	21.878	2.67	.02	.013
	Within groups	310	2534.15	8.175			
SB WIF	Between groups	5	62.548	12.510	2.71	.02	.004
	Within groups	310	1430.79	4,615			

Exploring the Work-Family Interface: Perceptions of University Teachers

SB FIW	Between	5	74.260	14.852	2.41	.04	.001
	groups						
	Within	310	1913.51	6.173			
	groups						
BB WIF	Between	5	16.021	3.204	0.95	.45	.008
	groups						
	Within	310	1046.77	3.377			
	groups						
BB FIW	Between	5	80.465	16.093	4.69	.00	.001
	groups						
	Within	310	1063.88	3.432			
	groups						
WIF	Between	5	325.74	65.148	2.84	.02	.002
	groups						
	Within	310	7123.31	22.978			
	groups						
FIW	Between	5	639.301	127.860	3.10	.01	.004
	groups						
	Within	310	12789.4	41.256			
	groups						

In order to compare WIF and FIW on the basis of the designation of teachers, the researcher applied one-way ANOVA. Teachers were divided into four groups based on their designation (Group 1: Lecturer; Group 2: Assistant Professor, Group 3: Associate Professor, and Group 4:

Professor). Statistically, a significant difference was observed in WIF ($p=.02$; $F=2.84$) with a small effect size (.002). Similarly, Statistically significant difference was observed in FIW ($p=.01$; $F=3.10$) with a small effect size (.004).

Table 12: Comparison of WIF and FIW Score on the basis of Number of Sibling

Scale	Source	<i>Df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η^2
TB WIF	Between groups	3	17.305	5.768	.746	.53	.007
	Within groups	312	2413.9	7.737			
TB FIW	Between groups	3	42.187	14.062	1.689	.17	.016
	Within groups	312	2601.36	8.338			
SB WIF	Between groups	3	65.616	21.872	4.780	.00	.044
	Within groups	312	1427.72	4.576			
SB FIW	Between groups	3	17.616	5.872	0.930	.43	.009
	Within groups	312	1970.16	6.315			
BB WIF	Between groups	3	15.565	5.188	1.546	.20	.015
	Within groups	312	1047.23	3.357			
BB FIW	Between groups	3	8.411	2.804	.770	.51	.007
	Within groups	312	1135.93	3.641			
WIF	Between groups	3	112.447	37.482	1.594	.19	.015

	Within groups	312	7336.60	23.515			
FIW	Between groups	3	173.089	57.696	1.358	.25	.013
	Within groups	312	13255.6	42.486			

To compare One way the WIF and FIW based on the number of children, one-way ANOVA was applied. Teachers were divided into three groups based on their number of children (Group 1: 0; Group 2: 1-2; Group 3: 3-4 and Group 5: above 4). No statistically significant difference was observed in WIF ($p=.19$; $F=1.594$) with a small effect size (.015). Similarly, no statistically significant difference was observed in FIW ($p=.25$; $F=1.358$) with a small effect size (.013).

Discussion

Employees are increasingly under pressure at work and home, and many everyday annoyances arise from employment obligations that are incompatible with family needs. This research paper aimed to outline the relationship between WIF and FIW. Concerning WFC, the study affirms

that university teachers perceived increasingly high level of FIW as compared to high level of WIF. Similar results have been reported in the literature (Yang et al., 2000). Similar findings were reported by Emmanuel et al. (2014), while in conflict with the findings of Akintayo's (2010). These findings might be related to instructors' inability to separate work and family life owing to family or job responsibilities. The findings of this study indicate a strong positive association between WIF and FIW. Findings from this study suggest that increased levels of WIF are positively related to FIW. Scrutiny of the existing literature suggests consistent findings concerning the relationship reported in the present research study (Arslaner & Boylu, 2017; Boles et al., 2001; Frone et al., 1992; Howard et al., 2009; Karatepe, 2013; McElwain,

2004; Miheli, 2014; Peeters, 2009; Posing & Kikul, 2004; Treistman, 2004; Zhang 2012). The results are contradictory to a past study (Abubakar, 2018).

Regarding the role of gender in WFC, it was found that gender cannot be held accountable for change in WIF and FIW. Similar findings were reported by researchers (Akintayo; 2010; Cinamon, 2002; Katarina, 2014; Lingard et al., 2010) but contradict the findings revealed by Kinnunen et al. (20014). Many researchers (Maria et al., 2004; Duxbury & Higgins, 1991 & Frone et al., 1992) also revealed similar findings in their research. According to the findings, both male and female university lecturers experience conflict at work and in their personal lives. The mixed family arrangement, which decreases the severity of the conflict, might be one reason for this. The importance of a joint family structure, as well as assistance from the husband and other family members, in lowering the amount of WFC, cannot be overstated. Like previous researches by Elisa and

Stewart, 2001 as well as Maria et al. (2004) marital status was not found to be responsible for the change in WIF but contradict the work of Boyar et al. (2008). In terms of the function of qualification in WFC, it was shown that there was no significant difference in WIF and FIW amongst instructors of different age groups. These findings back with prior studies that found comparable results (Maria et al., 2004), while being in conflict with the findings of (Boyar et al., 2008; Emmanuel et al., 2014). One possible explanation of these findings may be that faculty members have a tendency and energy to support their spouses.

There was a substantial difference in teachers with various age groups, according to the findings. Findings are aligned with research (Bandanadam, 2018; Boyar et al., 2008; Demerouti et al., 2012; Huffman et al., 2013) but contradict with many pieces of research (Lingard et al., 2010; Maria et al., 2004). The difference in WIF and FIW based on the designation was revealed. The reason for these

findings may be that young teachers have more zeal and energy to cope with WFC while comparatively older teachers have less workload and more time to deal with WFC. These findings are backed by the work of previous researchers (Huffman et al., 2013; Maria et al., 2004). The present study found no significant differences in WIF and FIW based on the number of children. These findings are consistent with previous researches (Bandanadam, 2018; Elisa & Stewart, 2011) but contradict some other research (Boyar et al., 2008, Duxbury & Higgins (1991). The probable reason behind the findings may be culture, society, and the context in which the research was conducted.

Conclusions

These findings may serve as a wake-up call to those involved in making decisions. The findings of the research support the occurrence of work-family conflict among teachers. These findings provide guidelines for the concerned authorities in developing work-family conflict-reduction plans, policies, rules, and regulations for the environment to

reduce the conflict. The less work-family friction there is, the happier you will be. Organizations must consider innovative career development models that allow employees to balance family and work demands. Organizations may adopt initiatives that enable workers to better fulfill the needs of their families (e.g. on-site daycare facilities, flexible time arrangements, and provide more autonomy). Work-life rules that benefit both employees and employers are a win-win situation.

References

- Abubakar, A. M. (2018). Linking work-family interference, workplace incivility, gender and psychological distress. *Journal of Management Development*, 37(3), 226-242.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-06-2017-0207>
- Achour, M., & Boerhannoeddin, A. B. (2011). The Role of Religiosity as a Coping with of Work-Family Conflict:

- The Case of Malaysian Women in Academia. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.7763/IJS SH.2011.V1.14>
- Adebola, H. E. (2005). Emotional expression at workplace: Implications for work-family role ambiguities. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(21), 102-115
- Aisyah, S. B. P., Badri, S. K. Z., Rajab, A., Rahman, H. A., & Shah, I. M. (2011). The Impact of Work Family Conflict on Psychological Well-Being among School Teachers in Malaysia, *Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1500-1507.
- 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.
- Amstad, F.T., Meier, L., Fasel, U., Alfering, A., & Semmer, N.K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching-domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(2), 151-169.doi:10.1037/a0022170.
- Ansari, S. A. (2011). *Gender Difference: Work and Family Conflicts and Family-Work Conflicts*. Pakistan Business Review.
- Armour, S. (2002). Workers put family first despite slow economy, jobless fears. *USA Today*, 6(3).
- Arslaner, E., & Boylu, Y. (2017). Perceived organizational support, work-family/family-work conflict and presenteeism in hotel industry. *Tourism Review*.

- Bodla, M. A., & Danish, R. Q. (2009). Politics and workplace: an empirical examination of the relationship between perceived organizational politics and work performance. *South Asian Journal of Management, 16*(1), 44-62.
- Boles, J. S., Howard, W. G., & Donofrio, H. H. (2001). An investigation into the inter-relationships of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and work satisfaction. *Journal of managerial issues, 37*6-390.
- Boyar, S. L., Maertz, C. P., & Pearson, A. W. (2005). The effects of work-family conflict and family-work conflict on non attendance behaviors. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(7), 919-925.
- Boyar, S. L., Maertz, C. P., Mosley, D. C., & Carr, J. C. (2008). The impact of work/family demand on work-family conflict. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.*
- Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Hospital restructuring stressors, work and family concerns and psychological well-being among nursing staff. *Community, Work & Family, 4*(1), 49-62.
- Butler, A. B., & Skattebo, A. (2004). What is acceptable for women may not be for men: The effect of family conflicts with work on job performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*, 553-564.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K., & Stepina, L. P. (1995). An examination of two aspects of work-family conflict: Time and identity. *Women in Management Review, 10*(1), 17-25.
- Carlson, D.S., (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of

- work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 56 (2), 249.
- Carlson D. S., Kacmar, K. M. & Williams, L. J. (2000), Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249–76.
- Choi, H. J., & Kim, Y. T. (2012). Work–family conflict, work–family facilitation, and job outcomes in the Korean hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(7), 1011–1028.
- Chopur, Z. (2011). *Work-Family Conflict: University Employees in Ankara*. Hacettepe University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences.
- Cole, D. W. (2004). Social reflection on women playing dual roles: An assessment of women in leadership positions. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 7(2), 126-132.
- Cunanan, Rose. (2006). *The Philippine Journal of Education*. Vol. LXXXV.
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflict. *Journal of applied psychology*, 76(1), 60-76.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 178-199.
- Elisa J. G., & Stewart I. D. (2001). Consequences of work-family conflict on employee well-being over time. *Work & Stress*, 15(3), 214-226.
- Emmanuel, G., Eunice F. A., Kwaku, A. & Anyim B. (2014).

- Work-family conflict among hotel employees in Sekondi – Takoradi Metropolis, Ghana. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 12(2), 1-8.
- Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. L. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.77.1.65>
- Hennessy, K. D. (2007). *Work-Family Balance: An Exploration Conflict and Enrichment for Women in a Traditional Occupation*. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park.
- Howard, W. G., Donofrio, H. H., & Boles, J. S. (2004). Inter-domain work-family, family-work conflict and police work satisfaction. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.
- Huffman, A., Culbertson, S. S., Henning, J. B., & Goh, A. (2013). Work-family conflict across the lifespan. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(8), 761-780.
- Karatepe, O. & Uludag, O. (2007). Conflict, exhaustion and motivation: A study of frontline employees in Northern Cyprus hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26, 645- 65.
- Karatepe, O. M. (2013). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 132-140.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Magaji, A. B. (2008). Work–family and facilitation in the hotel industry: A study in Nigeria.

- Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(4), 395–412.
- Kinnunen, U., Geurts, S., & Mauno, S. (2004). Work-to-Family conflict and its relationship with satisfaction and well being: A one year longitudinal study on gender differences. *Work & Stress*, 18, 1– 22.
- Lin, I. H. (2019). *The Relationship among Work Family Conflict, Family Work Conflict and Workplace Well-Being with the Moderating Effects of Mindfulness and Family Supportive Organization Perceptions* (Doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan Normal University (Taiwan)).
- Lu, L., Gilmour, R. (2004). Culture and conceptions of happiness: Individual oriented and social oriented SWB. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 5(3), 269–291. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-004-8789-5>
- Mamta U. O. (2011). Job Demands, Social Support, and Work-family Conflict: a Comparative Study of Immigrant and Native Workers in the United States. *Unpublished thesis University of Kentucky, USA.*
- Maria P. D. L. C., Angel, M. S. & Manuela. P. P. R. (2004). Work-family conflict in a southern European country: The influence of job-related and non-related factors, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(5), 21-34.
- McElwain, A. K. (2003). *Evaluating a predictive model relating demands, work-family conflict, and satisfaction: a consideration of gender differences* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Guelph).
- McKnight, H., George, J. (2007). IT road warriors: Understanding the role of work-family conflict: Autonomy and work

- overload on turnover intention. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 1-17.
- Mihelic, K. (2014). Work-family interface, job satisfaction and turnover intention: A CEE transition country perspective. *Baltic journal of management*, 9(4), 446-466.
- Milliken, F. J., & Dunn-Jensen, L. M. (2005). The changing time demands of managerial and professional work: Implications for managing the work-life boundary. In E. E. Kossek, & S. J. Lambert, (Eds.) *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives* (pp. 43-60). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pohlman, R., & Gardiner, G. (2000). *Value driven management: How to create and maximize value over time for organizational success*. Amacom. Div American Mgmt Assn.
- Prieto, L. L., Soria, M. S., Martinez, I. M., & Schaufeli, W. (2008). Extension of the job demands-resource model in the prediction of burnout and engagement among teachers over time. *Psicothema*, 20(3), 354-360.
- Rathi, N. (2007). Meaning in life and psychological well-being in pre-adolescents and adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 33(1), 31-38.
- Stoddard, M., & Madsen, S. R. (2007). Toward an understanding of the link between work-family enrichment and individual health. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9(1), 2-15.
- Treistman, D. L. (2004). *Work-family conflict and life satisfaction in female graduate students: Testing mediating and moderating hypotheses* (Doctoral dissertation).

- van Emmerik, I. H., & Peeters, M. C. (2009). Crossover specificity of team-level work-family conflict to individual-level work-family conflict. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Voydanoff, P. (1988). Work role characteristics, family structure demands, and work/family conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 749-761.
- Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work demands and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: Direct and indirect relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6) 707-726.
- Yang, N., Chen, C. C., Choi, J., & Zou, Y. (2000). Sources of work-family conflict: A Sino-US comparison of the effects of work and family demands. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(1), 113-123.
- Zhang, M., Griffeth, R. W., & Fried, D. D. (2012). Work-family conflict and individual consequences. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.