



RESEARCH PAPER

Work-Family Conflict: A Study of Secondary School Teachers

Rizwan Ahmad*¹ Sumaira Majeed² Farhana Yasmin³

1. Assistant Professor, Division of Education, University of Education Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor (Visiting), Division of Education, University of Education Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Lahore Garrison University, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author:** rizwanahmad@ue.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research project was to investigate whether there was a connection between family-work and work-family interference in SSTs. Correlational research was used in this quantitative study. A cross-sectional survey was utilized to acquire the data. SSTs government high schools of Jhang were the population for this study. Six hundred and seventy SSTs were given Carlson's work-family conflict scale using random sampling. Permission was obtained before data collection began. The validity and reliability were ensured by pilot testing. On the data, pertinent statistics were applied. Research ethics were followed. More teachers reported work-related family conflict than work-related family conflict. In terms of gender, marital status, and qualification, there were no appreciable differences in WFC, however there were differences depending on age. It was discovered that WIF and FIW had a strong positive association. Organizations need to take into account new approaches to professional development that let people balance work and family obligations.

KEYWORDS Conflict, Family-interference with Work, Work-interference with Family

Introduction

For most individuals, the most important aspects of adult life are job and other non-work family, and these domains have historically served as the backbone of human survival. A variety of factors impact people's capacity to balance office and home tasks, including the type of jobs they have, the networks they use, and the financial, social, and societal climate in which they live. Work and family life are inextricably linked. As a result, a person's work time may have an influence on his personal life and vice versa (Munn, 2013; Peeters et al., 2005). This notion has been separated into two categories due to the continuing interweaving of work and family obligations: WFC and FWC (Cinamon & Rich, 2002). Nowadays, there are more dual-career families than ever before, as well as an unprecedented number of single-parent households (Hill et al., 2001; Kuzulu et al., 2013). In this context, WFB is more challenging and complex than in households where the woman stays at home while the husband works (Boles et al., 2001; Powell & Greenhaus, 2006). WFC might arise from challenges juggling the usually incompatible needs of work and family (Eby et al., 2005).

Those who are having a hard time obtaining job have fewer resources, which necessitate family involvement. Those who have better access to workplace social services have more resources connected to their jobs, which helps them deal with stress more successfully (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Lappiere & Allen, 2006). As a result, consider job-to-home and home-to-job overflow instead of thinking of WFC as a one-way path. As WFC is a form of inter-role conflict, people who suffer role stress in both scenarios are socially mismatched. Despite the fact that there has been little research on overflow from home to work, the data imply that family life affects an individual's energy, mood, and attention at work. Work-to-family conflict arises when job instructions have an influence on family life,

whereas family-to-work conflict arises when work expectations have an impact on family life (Carlson et al., 2000; Ford et al., 2007).

WFC happens when work gets in the way of everyday life, whereas family-to-work conflict happens when work gets in the way of daily life (Anafarta, 2011). There are many such duties, including those of an employee, student, mother, father, husband, or spouse. WFC was defined as overall sum of time spent on and stress generated by professional duties that interfere with completing domestic-related commitments. WFC is internal conflict that occurs when an individual has several roles to perform and finds it difficult to participate in all of them.

It occurs when the load of work from the office and house is too great to properly perform these tasks. Inter-role conflict refers to the difficulty of balancing work and family obligations. There are several authors participating. WFC is a type of internal conflict in which work-related demands collide with family commitments (Kalliath & Kalliath, 2013). WFC is an internal conflict that occurs when individuals struggle to complete tasks of both (family and home) because duties are mismatched. It has been discovered that when working individuals marry and have children, the constraints between job and family become very absorptive. Kahn et al. (1964) defined WFC, which is employed in this work. Numerous other researchers use a definition that is similar to this one.

Review of Related Literature

WFC and Real Life

WFC develops when a person needs to fulfill many tasks, according to Kahn et al. (1964): worker, spouse, and in most cases, parent and old parent care givers. Each function demands time, energy, and effort. Overload and interference are two forms of role strains identified by the combined stressors of numerous functions. Overburden occurs when the total demand on interval and vigor associated with suggested actions of multiple characters is infinite. Interference arises when opposing stress makes it impossible to fulfill the requirements of many positions.

WFC Influencing Factors

According to researchers (Fredriksen-Goldsen & Scharlach, 2001) working with a partner, receiving spousal support, emphasizing work-life balance at home, having adequate eldercare or childcare arrangements, one's orientation and marital status, the degree to which beneficiaries of adult care are hindered, and the age of ward children are all variables that may affect this type of conflict.

Inter-role Conflict

Twenge et al. (2003) identified the critical components that contribute to the three-tier operationalization paradigm. The strain-based WFC indicator role conflict, the interval-based WFC indicator freedom limitation, and the behavior-based WFC indicator sexual discontent

Time Based Conflict (TBC)

TBC occurs when several roles participate in an individual's interval. Paid labor hours are a finite resource. When resources, including time, effort, or psychological dedication, are fixed, they could not be accessible for use in other domains, leaving other domains' demands unmet. Time constraints from one activity might prevent someone from participating in another, and stress can make someone fixated on one thing, which interferes with their involvement in other activities. Because of this, concentrating on one task takes

more time and effort than concentrating on others. One sort of time-based conflict identified by Twenge et al. (2003) is the restriction of freedom. The authors define freedom restriction as a constraint on a married person's freedom. As a result, obligations like as caring for children, working, and taking care of the home limit people's ability to choose how they spend their free time (Twenge et al., 2003).

Examine a person's time responsibilities, especially those from employment and home labor, while keeping freedom in mind. Longer hours are associated with a higher risk of work-family conflict. A relatively tiny percentage of respondents said they would want extra paid employment, while over half of those polled said they would like to work five hours less per week than they already do. As a result, the majority of moms and fathers who have two incomes set time limits for their personal time, time with their spouse, and time with their kids. Regardless of gender, being unavailable for their family due to economic activities is highly linked to work-family conflict among parents who have two incomes (Nomaguchi et al., 2005).

Strain Based Conflict (SBC)

It appears when the execution of one function is influenced by the performance of another. The roles are incompatible in the sense that one's stress makes meeting the requirements of the other difficult. Mental spillover from the job domain to the family domain happens as a result of strain-based demands (Voydanoff, 2005). When people seek to manage the responsibilities and expectations of several roles, Negative experiences in one function are likely to have an effect on unfavorable experiences in another, resulting in work-family conflict. Because of the subjective nature of role conflict, two persons doing the same job may feel differently burdened (Hecht, 2001).

Position conflict occurs when a person's ability to satisfy the demands of one job clashes with his capability to conquer the challenges of another. While some scholars believe that having many responsibilities benefits one's psychological well-being, others say that having many jobs might contribute to feelings of overload. Attempting to juggle many duties, such as job and family, according to some authors, can lead to stress and conflict. Role conflict has been related to poorer levels of psychological and physical well-being (Frone, 2002; Hecht, 2001).

Behavior Based Conflict

Conflict arises when a specific result of role conduct is misaligned with performance potentials in another area. As a result of playing many roles with varying expectations, people may find it difficult to engage in some activities, such as sexual intimacy, which can lead to sorrow. Parents may experience higher behavioral stress than non-parents (Dew & Wilcox 2011). This is especially true when a couple spends less time together as they move towards parenthood. Having children is also associated with less marital interaction and contentment (Barnet-Verzat et al., 2011).

Financial Dissatisfaction and WFC

Another reason childless couples report better levels of marital happiness than parents is that they are satisfied with their financial condition. A previous study discovered that financial contentment is important in understanding the association between parental status and marital satisfaction (Twenge et al., 2003). Unexpectedly, the link between financial pleasure and actual financial sufficiency is fragile. According to Grable et al. (2013), financial happiness is greater in that positive income bias than in those who have a negative income bias. Moreover, subjective measures of financial security are more significant than objective measures. The authors contend that whether someone feels pleased or dissatisfied depends on their perception of their level of economic sufficiency.

As a person's subjective assessment of their earnings may be more significant than actual, objective earnings, financial happiness is an important concept to include in this study. Due to the strong theoretical and empirical connection to marital satisfaction and the consequences for a variety of work-family restrictions, this study will investigate meta-analysis financial satisfaction (Twenge et al., 2003). Numerous studies have found that WFC and FWC have a detrimental influence on employee happiness across the board, including general life satisfaction. Employee contentment has a negative connection with WFC and FWC across a wide range of variables, including general life satisfaction.

Theories Related to WFC

The role hypothesis considers the effort-household sector, predicting that various duties produce role stress, which causes strain, which is the source of effort-household conflict. According to Role Theory, a set of mental activity that focuses on how the execution of one role interacts with another. Roles are the result of others' expectations about correct behavior in a certain position. Role conflict is described as a mental strain induced by competing role stressors (Saltzein et al., 2001)

Representatives with subordinate consideration duties must discover and maintain an adequate and acceptable balance between these typically conflicting work and family spheres. The quantity of demands they confront at work and at home, the repercussions they associate with their participation in the work-family framework, as well as the assets available and their ability to use them to meet requirements, all have an influence on people's mental experiences of conflict (Felstead et al., 2002).

Material and Methodology

It was quantitative research. In order to look into the relationship between the variables, the researcher used a correlational study design. A cross-sectional survey was utilized to obtain data. Government high schools in district Jhang were population of the study. There are 1098 SSTs working in 200 government high schools of Jhang district. With the help of random sampling technique desired sample was selected. 670 SSTs voluntarily participated in this research study.

Demographic characteristics of the SSTs were also collected with Work-family Scale (WFCS). The researcher created a data sheet that includes gender, marital status, age, and qualification in order to collect demographic information from the SSTs. WFCS was used to measure WFC. It was used with prior permission. WFC questionnaire statements are divided into three magnitudes of WFC (time, strain and behavior). It consists of 18 measuring components of WFC (Carlson et al., 2000).

Table 1
WFCS subscales

	Scales	Items
1.	Time Based WIF (TBWIF)	1, 2, 3
2.	Time Based FIW (TBFIW)	4, 5, 6
3.	Strain Based WIF (SBWIF)	7, 8, 9
4.	Strain Based FIW (SBFIW)	10, 11, 12
5.	Behavior Based WIF (BBWIF)	13, 14, 15
6.	Behavior Based FIW (BBFIW)	16, 17, 18

Table 1 shows the subscales of WFCS. The scale was comprised of subscales on two dimensions of WFC. Family interference with work (FIW) and work interference with family (WIF) are the two dimensions of WFC. Validity and reliability of the instrument were verified by a pilot study. Expert opinion was sought to confirm validity of the instrument. Necessary changes were made proposed by the experts. The researcher conducted pilot

testing on 100 SSTs who were not be part of the final sample. Cronbach alpha calculated to ensure reliability of the scale. It yielded value .84 that indicated the instrument to be reliable.

Data Collection and Analysis

The researcher collected the data with permission from the concerned authority and the respondents. Respondents were assured of the anonymity and confidentiality of the responses. SSTs were briefed regarding instrument and the rating scale of the instrument. It posed no physical or psychological threat to the respondents. Individual responses for each instrument used in the study were obtained from each school. For data analysis, SPSS was utilized. Relevant statistics were applied to the data. In order to find relationship between the FIW and WIF correlation analysis was performed.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Overview of the WFCS

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for the Perception Regarding WFC Items

Items	N	M	SD	SDA	DA	UD	A	SA
TBFIW 1	670	3.02	1.11	55	209	107	265	34
TBFIW 2	670	3.23	1.13	45	169	104	285	67
TBFIW 3	670	3.28	1.12	41	164	94	302	69
TBWIF 1	670	3.05	1.12	33	247	94	239	57
TBWIF 2	670	3.09	1.17	30	256	91	208	85
TBWIF 3	670	2.98	1.19	55	245	99	197	74
SBFIW 1	670	3.51	1.13	32	127	102	282	127
SBFIW 2	670	3.37	1.10	27	158	116	278	91
SBFIW 3	670	3.45	1.08	26	144	92	316	92
SBWIF 1	670	3.17	1.18	47	200	93	252	78
SBWIF 2	670	3.00	1.20	49	247	108	181	85
SBWIF 3	670	3.01	1.13	57	207	126	230	50
BBFIW 1	670	3.25	1.03	28	162	137	194	49
BBFIW 2	670	3.29	1.06	34	149	136	290	61
BBFIW 3	670	3.09	1.16	41	220	129	195	85
BBWIF 1	670	3.18	1.17	43	197	106	241	83
BBWIF 2	670	3.25	1.05	29	160	158	259	64
BBWIF 3	670	3.20	1.17	41	188	129	218	94

Table 2 presents responses of SSTs regarding WFC. The responses are based of five point Likert type rating scale. Item wise mean and standard deviation are also given.

Table 3
Psychometric Properties of WFCS

Scale	N	M	MPI	SD	Range	Skewness	Kurtosis
TB FIW	670	9.14	3.05	2.82	3-15	.09	-.88
TB WIF	670	9.19	3.06	2.88	3-15	.00	-.88
SB FIW	670	9.64	3.21	2.66	3-15	-.08	-.38
SB WIF	670	9.55	3.18	2.74	3-15	-.25	-.72
BS FIW	670	10.34	3.45	2.73	3-15	-.34	-.66
BS WIF	670	9.64	3.21	2.41	3-15	-.22	-.32
FIW	670	27.97	3.11	6.93	9-45	.19	-.42
WIF	670	29.53	3.28	6.02	13-45	-.16	-.42
WFC	670	57.50	3.19	11.91	22-90	.12	-.12

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics of WFCs. Skewness and kurtosis were calculated that indicate the data to be normally distributed because the values fall within the normal range. Perception of SSTs regarding WFC falls above the scale median near the scale point Agree (M=57.50, MPI=3.19, SD=11.91). Perception of SSTs regarding WIF (M=29.53, MPI=3.28, SD=6.02) was reported to be higher than FIW (M=27.97, MPI=3.11, SD=6.93). The subscale BBFIW has the highest mean value (M=10.34, MPI=3.45, SD=2.73) while the subscale TBFIW has the lowest mean value (M=9.14, MPI=3.05, SD=2.82).

Difference in WFC on the basis of Demographic Characteristics

Table 4
Gender wise Comparison of WFC

Scale	Gender	M	SD	df	t	p	Cohn's d/effect size r
TBWIF	Male	9.14	2.77	668	0.21	.98	0.003/0.001
	Female	9.13	2.86				
TBFIW	Male	9.40	2.89	668	1.05	.29	-0.086/-0.043
	Female	9.64	2.64				
SBWIF	Male	9.20	2.86	668	.53	.59	0.006/0.003
	Female	9.18	2.89				
SBFIW	Male	10.15	2.82	668	1.37	.17	-0.109/-0.054
	Female	10.45	2.67				
BBWIF	Male	9.70	2.69	668	.53	.59	0.041/0.020
	Female	9.59	2.65				
BBFIW	Male	9.40	2.49	668	2.04	.04	-0.161/-0.080
	Female	9.79	2.35				
WIF	Male	28.04	6.96	668	.24	.81	0.018/0.009
	Female	27.91	6.92				
FIW	Male	28.97	6.37	668	1.93	.05	-0.151/-0.075
	Female	29.89	5.76				
WFCs	Male	57.02	12.40	668	.83	.40	-0.065/-0.032
	Female	57.81	11.59				

The independent samples t-test was used to determine the difference in WFC on the basis of gender. Results of the analysis are illustrated in table 4. No significant difference was observed in the perception of male and female SSTs based on gender (M=57.02, SD=12.40) and females SSTs (M=57.81, SD=11.59).

Table 5
Marital Status wise Comparison of WFC

Scale	M. Status	M	SD	df	t	p	Cohn's d/effect size r
TBFIW	Married	9.11	2.78	668	.73	.47	-0.122/-0.061
	Unmarried	9.49	3.40				
TBWIF	Married	9.20	2.86	668	.28	.78	0.043/0.021
	Unmarried	9.07	3.16				
SBFIW	Married	9.62	2.67	668	1.08	.28	-0.110/-0.055
	Unmarried	9.91	2.57				
SBWIF	Married	9.52	2.74	668	.75	.46	-0.167/-0.083
	Unmarried	9.98	2.75				
BBFIW	Married	10.36	2.72	668	.51	.61	0.112/0.056
	Unmarried	10.04	2.96				
BBWIF	Married	9.63	2.42	668	.42	.67	-0.081/-0.040
	Unmarried	9.82	2.22				
FIW	Married	27.93	6.83	668	.36	.72	-0.071/-0.035

	Unmarried	28.47	8.27				
WIF	Married	29.51	5.98	668	.36	.72	-0.052/-0.026
	Unmarried	29.84	6.57				
WFC	Married	57.44	11.78	668	.41	.68	-0.067/-0.033
	Unmarried	58.31	13.74				

The independent samples t-test was used to determine the difference in WFC based on marital status. Results of the analysis are shown in table 5. There was no significant difference in the scores of married (M=57.44, SD=11.78) and unmarried (M=58.31, SD=13.74) SSTs based on marital status.

Table 6
Descriptive Statistics of WFC on the Basis of Age

Scales	Age Groups	N	M	SD
TBFIW	Below 30	22	11.90	3.42
	30-40	294	8.61	2.74
	41-50	218	9.64	2.87
	Above 50	136	9.00	2.42
TBWIF	Below 30	22	10.27	3.74
	30-40	294	8.74	2.75
	41-50	218	9.59	3.10
	Above 50	136	9.34	2.45
SBFIW	Below 30	22	10.72	3.31
	30-40	294	9.15	2.57
	41-50	218	10.19	2.61
	Above 50	136	9.61	2.65
SBWIF	Below 30	22	11.63	1.61
	30-40	294	9.35	2.76
	41-50	218	9.77	2.84
	Above 50	136	9.26	2.51
BBFIW	Below 30	22	11.18	1.96
	30-40	294	9.92	2.741
	41-50	218	10.78	2.89
	Above 50	136	10.36	2.44
BBWIF	Below 30	22	11.18	2.17
	30-40	294	9.28	2.19
	41-50	218	10.01	2.52
	Above 50	136	9.57	2.55
FIW	Below 30	22	11.18	2.17
	30-40	294	32.90	10.01
	41-50	218	26.51	6.41
	Above 50	136	29.43	7.27
WIF	Below 30	22	27.97	6.04
	30-40	294	34.00	4.44
	41-50	218	28.57	5.67
	Above 50	136	30.57	6.45
WFC	Below 30	22	29.20	5.72
	30-40	294	66.90	13.89
	41-50	218	55.08	10.88
	Above 50	136	60.01	12.80
	Below 30	22	57.17	10.73

Table 6 presents the age wise descriptive statistics of WFC and the subscales. On the basis of age, SSTs were classified into four age groups as mentioned in table 6.

Table 7
Age wise Comparison of WFC

Variables		df	SS	MS	F	p	η^2
TBFIW	Between groups	3	308.958	102.986	13.613	.000	0.057
	Within groups	666	5038.409	7.565			
TBWIF	Between groups	3	124.211	41.404	5.075	.002	1.101
	Within groups	666	5433.952	8.159			
SBFIW	Between groups	3	160.436	53.479	7.730	.000	0.944
	Within groups	666	4607.876	6.919			
SBWIF	Between groups	3	128.827	42.942	5.814	.001	4.318
	Within groups	666	4919.048	7.386			
BBFIW	Between groups	3	109.407	36.469	4.950	.002	0.0218
	Within groups	666	4906.684	7.367			
BBWIF	Between groups	3	119.535	39.845	7.017	.000	0.160
	Within groups	666	3781.921	5.679			
FIW	Between groups	3	1628.656	542.885	11.825	.000	0.050
	Within groups	666	30576.747	45.911			
WIF	Between groups	3	961.514	320.505	9.150	.000	0.039
	Within groups	666	23329.263	35.029			
WFC	Between groups	3	5049.252	1683.084	12.464	.000	0.053
	Within groups	666	89930.242	135.030			

One way ANOVA was used to determine the difference in WFC based on marital status. Results of the analysis are shown in table 7. Significant differences in perception of SSTs related WFC were detected based on age status.

Table 8
Descriptive Statistics of WFC on the Basis of Qualification

Scale	Qualification Groups	N	M	SD
TBFIW	MA/MSc	189	8.84	2.78
	MPhil	283	9.30	2.85
	PhD	198	9.17	2.82
TBWIF	MA/MSc	189	9.50	2.78
	MPhil	283	9.47	2.71
	PhD	198	9.69	2.76
SBFIW	MA/MSc	189	9.07	2.87
	MPhil	283	9.34	2.87

	PhD	198	9.07	2.89
SBWIF	MA/MSc	189	10.53	2.67
	MPhil	283	10.38	2.70
	PhD	198	10.08	2.83
BBFIW	MA/MSc	189	9.74	2.89
	MPhil	283	9.40	2.65
	PhD	198	9.86	2.43
BBWIF	MA/MSc	189	9.78	2.33
	MPhil	283	9.49	2.53
	PhD	198	9.72	2.31
FIW	MA/MSc	189	27.67	7.12
	MPhil	283	28.06	6.79
	PhD	198	28.12	6.98
WIF	MA/MSc	189	29.83	5.84
	MPhil	283	29.35	6.09
	PhD	198	29.50	6.11
WFC	MA/MSc	189	57.50	11.93
	MPhil	283	57.42	11.97
	PhD	198	57.62	11.87

Table 8 presents the qualification wise descriptive statistics of WFC and the subscales. On the basis of qualification, SSTs were classified into three qualification groups as mentioned in table 8.

Table 9
Qualification wise Comparison of WFC

Variables		df	SS	MS	F	p	η^2
TBFIW	Between groups	2	24.13	12.06	1.51	.22	0.004
	Within groups	667	5323.22	7.98			
TBWIF	Between groups	2	5.82	2.91	.38	.68	0.001
	Within groups	667	5042.04	7.55			
SBFIW	Between groups	2	12.12	6.06	.72	.48	0.004
	Within groups	667	5546.04	8.31			
SBWIF	Between groups	2	21.41	10.70	1.43	.24	0.005
	Within groups	667	4994.67	7.48			
BBFIW	Between groups	2	27.46	13.73	1.93	.14	0.002
	Within groups	667	4740.84	7.10			
BBWIF	Between groups	2	11.33	5.66	.97	.37	0.003
	Within groups	667	3890.12	5.83			
FIW	Between groups	2	23.79	11.89	.24	.78	0.001
	Within groups	667	32181.60	48.24			
WIF	Between groups	2	25.74	12.87	.35	.70	0.001
	Within groups	667	24265.03	36.37			
WFC	Between groups	2	4.69	2.34	.01	.98	0.005
	Within groups	667	94974.80	142.39			

One way ANOVA was used to determine the difference in WFC based on qualification. Results of the analysis are shown in table 9. Significant differences in SSTs' perceptions of WFC were detected based on qualification.

Table 10
Relationship between FIW and WIF in SSTs

Scales	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. TBFIW	670	9.14	2.82								
2. TBWIF	670	9.19	2.88	.61**							
3. SBFIW	670	9.64	2.66	.51**	.47**						
4. SBWIF	670	9.55	2.74	.51**	.35**	.22**					
5. BBFIW	670	10.34	2.73	.49**	.51**	.30**	.50**				
6. BBWIF	670	9.64	2.41	.44**	.50**	.62**	.29**	.32**			
7. FIW	670	27.97	6.93	.85**	.84**	.79**	.43**	.53**	.63**		
8. WIF	670	29.53	6.02	.63**	.59**	.49**	.80**	.81**	.68**	.69**	
9. WFC	670	57.50	11.91	.82**	.79**	.70**	.66**	.72**	.71**	.93**	.91**

Pearson r was run to explore the relation between FIW and WIF. Results are shown in table 10. Data analysis indicates strong positive relationship between FIW and WIF ($r=.69$).

Conclusion and Discussion

Perception of SSTs regarding WFC falls above the scale median. The findings are consistent with previous studies on WFC undertaken by other researchers (Madhavi, 2003; Yu-Ying, 2007). The same results are illustrated by many previous studies (Allen, 2001; Clark, 2000; Kossek et al., 2014; Thompson et al., 2010; Ying & Pheng, 2010). The findings are also supported by the vast array of researchers (Haya et al., 2012; Emmanuel et al., 2014; Rehman & Waheed, 2012).

WFC is not shown to be strongly associated to gender. These findings are consistent with those of Kinnunen et al. (2004), Maria et al. (2004), and Rehman & Waheed (2012), but contradict those of Elisa & Stewart (2001). According to Elisa and Stewart (2001), Maria et al. (2004), and Rehman and Waheed (2004), data analysis found no significant correlation between married and single instructors (2012).

Maria et al. (2004) describe the same results, however Emmanuel et al. (2014) disagree. These findings contrast those of Haya et al. (2012), Emmanuel et al. (2014), and Ann et al. (2015). (2012). It was revealed from the data nalaysis that there is significant difference in WFC with different age groups. Results are consistent with previous study (Bandanadam, 2018; Boyar et al., 2008). Many previous researches show similar findings (Demerouti et al., 2012; Huffman et al., 2013). Some other researches exist that reveal contradict results (Lingard et al., 2010; Maria et al., 2004).

The findings revealed positive relationship between WIF and FIW. Similar findings are revealed by the researches in literature (Arslaner & Boylu, 2017; Boles et al., 2001). The findings are in line with the findings in the literature (Howard et al., 2009; Karatepe, 2013; McElwain, 2004; Miheli, 2014; Peeters, 2009). Moreover, many researchers also explored the similar findings (Posing & Kikul, 2004; Treistman, 2004; Zhang, 2012). There are researches that contradict with the findings (Abubakar, 2018).

Recommendations

Psychological development should be considered more. It includes needs, desires, motivational level and happiness. Management should develop various family friendly policies. They should give the greatest training skills and conflict resolution solutions to

instructors. You will be pleased if there is less WFC. Organizations need to take into account new approaches to professional development that let people balance work and family obligations. Work-life policies that help both employees and businesses benefit everyone.

References

- Anafarta, N. (2011). The relationship between work-family conflict and job satisfaction: A structural equation modeling (SEM) approach. *International journal of business and management*, 6(4), 168-177.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 45(4), 144.
- Barnet-Verzat, C., Pailhé, A., & Solaz, A. (2011). Spending time together: The impact of children on couples' leisure synchronization. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 9(4), 465-486.
- Boles, James S., W. Gary Howard, and Heather Howard Donofrio. (2001). An investigation into the inter-relationships of work-family conflict, family-work conflict and work satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial issues* 12(9), 376-390.
- 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.
- Carlson, D. S., & Kacmar, K. M. (2000). Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference?. *Journal of management*, 26(5), 1031-1054.
- Cinamon, R. G., & Rich, Y. (2002). Gender differences in the importance of work and family roles: Implications for work-family conflict. *Sex roles*, 47(11), 531-541.
- Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human relations*, 53(6), 747-770.
- Dew, J., & Wilcox, W. B. (2011). If momma ain't happy: Explaining declines in marital satisfaction among new mothers. *Journal of marriage and family*, 73(1), 1-12.
- Eby, L. T., Casper, W. J., Lockwood, A., Bordeaux, C., & Brinley, A. (2005). Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of vocational behavior*, 66(1), 124-197.
- 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.
- Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Phizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). Opportunities to work at home in the context of work-life balance. *Human resource management journal*, 12(1), 54-76.
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: a meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(1), 57.
- Fredriksen, K. I., Scharlach, A. E. (2001). *Families and Work: New Directions in the Twenty first Century*. Oxford University Press.

- Frone, M.R. (2002) Work-Family Balance. Work-family balance. In J. Quick, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 143-162). American Psychological Association.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of management review*, 31(1), 72-92.
- Hecht, S. (2001). Work life balance. *International journal of current research*, 3(4), 186-189.
- Hill, E. J., Hawkins, A. J., Ferris, M., & Weitzman, M. (2001). Finding an extra day a week: The positive influence of perceived job flexibility on work and family life balance. *Family relations*, 50(1), 49-58.
- 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.
- Kalliath, P., & Kalliath, T. (2013). Does job satisfaction mediate the relationship between work-family conflict and psychological strain? A study of Australian social workers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 23(2), 91-105.
- Karatepe, O. M., Kilic, H., & Isiksel, B. (2008). An examination of the selected antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict and family-work conflict in frontline service jobs. *Service Marketing Quarterly*, 29(4), 1-24.
- Kossek, E. E., Valcour, M., & Lirio, P. (2014). Organizational strategies for promoting work-life balance and wellbeing. *Work and wellbeing*, 3(2), 295-318.
- Kuzulu, E., Kurtuldu, S., & Özkan, G. V. (2013). A research on the relationship between work-life balance and life satisfaction. *Sakarya İktisat Dergisi*, 2 (5), 88-127.
- Madhavi, C. (2003). Gender-and age-related differences in the morphology of the corpus callosum. *Clinical Anatomy: The Official Journal of the American Association of Clinical Anatomists and the British Association of Clinical*
- 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.
- Munn, D. H. (2013). Indoleamine 2, 3 dioxygenase and metabolic control of immune responses. *Trends in immunology*, 34(3), 137-143.
- Nomaguchi, K. M., Milkie, M. A., & Bianchi, S. M. (2005). Time strains and psychological well-being: Do dual-earner mothers and fathers differ? *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(6), 756-792.
- Peeters, M. C., Montgomery, A. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Balancing work and home: How job and home demands are related to burnout. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 12(1), 43.
- Thompson, B. M, Hall, G. B., Dollard, M. F., Tuckey, M. R., Winefield, A. H. (2010). Job demands, work-family conflict, and emotional exhaustion in police officers: A longitudinal test of competing theories. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 83(1), 237-250.

Twenge, J. M., Catanese, K. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2003). Social exclusion and the deconstructed state: time perception, meaninglessness, lethargy, lack of emotion, and self-awareness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 85(3), 409.

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, 10(4), 491.