

## **Interrelation of Work-Family Commitment and Marital Satisfaction of University Teachers\***

Holeyannavar, P.G.<sup>1</sup> and Khadi, P.B.<sup>2</sup>

*Department of Human Development and Family Studies*

*Rural Home Science College, University of Agricultural Sciences Dharwad-580 005, Karnataka, India*

---

**Abstract:** A study on “Interrelation of Work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of University Teachers” on a sample of 150 University teachers drawn from 3 cities of Karnataka in 2011-12, offering UG/PG courses in agriculture/science faculty belonging to Assistant professor to Professor and above cadre were randomly and proportionately selected. The work-family commitment was assessed using Work Life Balance scale developed by Fischer-McAuley et al., (2003) and marital satisfaction by Marital Satisfaction Scale developed by Haynes et al., (1992). Results revealed that more than half of the SAU (54.5%) and about 3/4<sup>th</sup> of Non-SAU (74.5%) teachers possessed high work-family commitment. None of them were in low levels of work-family commitment. Significant interactionary effects of gender and cadre was observed, indicating that males with Professor and above cadre revealed higher work-family commitment than females, while no such trend was observed among Assistant and Associate professors. Most of the SAU (83.8%) and Non-SAU (94.1%) teachers had high levels of marital satisfaction whereas none of them were in low levels. There were no main and interactionary effects of university, gender and cadre on marital satisfaction. There was positive and highly significant relationship between work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of SAU teachers (0.345) but non-significant among Non-SAUs (-0.105), indicating that higher levels of marital satisfaction significantly increased the work-family commitment among SAU teachers.

**Keywords:** Work-Family Commitment, Marital Satisfaction, University Teachers

---

### **I. Introduction**

In the present changing socio-economic scenario a new picture of work-life balance is emerging. Today, women and men are confronted with the “balancing act” that follows a dual commitment to paid work and family. The primacy of job commitments for men and family commitments for women has become part of our folklore and our social science. It has been recently suggested that these role conflicts are beginning to lessen and that men are relaxing their work commitments as family considerations are increasing in importance. Likewise employed women are relaxing some of their own work and family stress by putting less emphasis on family roles and identifying more with their work organizations.

Satisfaction with ones marriage is, in our growing society, an important component of individual’s well-being. When a male’s workload is greater, he is more likely to withdraw at home, whereas a female with a greater workload is more likely to increase her anger at home. This demonstrates the gender difference where men have a tendency to retreat while women have a desire for further connection. As a result, women report lower marital satisfaction due to decreased time shared with their husbands (Sweet and Moen, 2007). This lower marital satisfaction may affect commitment to job and family spheres. The university teachers face higher work demands in the professional career and family area than the school teachers. It is necessary to strike a balance between work and family life. Participation in both work and family roles can protect the university teachers from distress in one of the roles. Improved work performance resulting from the instrumental transfer of skills, behaviors, and knowledge from family domain generates intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, which in turn, weaken their perception of hardships and struggles at work and subsequent job dissatisfaction. Therefore satisfaction with one’s family and marriage may be beneficial in enhancing the work-family commitments of university teachers. Hence there was an imperative need to focus on “Interrelation of work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of university teachers.”

### **II. Material And Methods**

Out of 4 universities of each type of agricultural and non-agricultural universities in Northern Karnataka, two of each, a total of 4 universities were purposively selected. A sample of 165 University teachers (50% of the population of male teachers (n=105) and all the female teachers (n=60) were selected for the study with the criteria that the teachers should offer UG/PG courses in agriculture/science faculty and should belong to Assistant professor to Professor and above cadre.

Work Life Balance scale developed by Fischer-McAuley *et al.*, (2003) was used to assess the work-family commitment of university teachers. This scale consists of 15 items (10 negative and 5 positive), divided into 3 dimensions: Work Interference with Personal Life (WIPL) with 7 items, Personal Life Interference with Work (PLIW) with 4 items and Work/Personal Life Enhancement (WPLE) with 4 items. For each statement a score of 7, 4 and 1 was given for responses 'not at all', 'sometimes', and 'all the time' respectively for the negative items. Five items of the scale had reverse scoring. The scores obtained for each of the statements were summated to get the total score for work-family commitment. The total score ranged from 15-105. Based on the scores obtained on work-family commitment, the teachers were classified into low (15-45), average (46-75) and high (76-105) categories.

Marital Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Haynes *et al.*, (1992) was used to assess the marital satisfaction of University teachers. This scale consists of 24 items. It is a 6 point scale. For items 1 to 21, for each item a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 is to be given for responses 'very dissatisfied', 'dissatisfied', 'somewhat dissatisfied', 'somewhat satisfied', 'satisfied' and 'very satisfied' respectively. Items 22 and 23 have 4 alternative responses and the scoring follows a system of 4, 3, 2 and 1 from upper to lower end. For item 24 there are 6 alternative responses and scoring of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 respectively. The scores obtained for each of the statements were added to obtain the total score of marital satisfaction. The total score varies from 23-141. Based on the scores obtained, the teachers were categorized into low (23-61), average (62-101) and high (102-141) levels.

The questionnaires were mailed/e-mail/handed in person in 3 sections. Some of the teachers were also interviewed for in-depth information. The university teachers were first approached in person in the respective cities and informed consent was obtained.

### **III. Results And Discussion**

#### ***Work-family commitment***

The results of work-family commitment of SAU and Non-SAU teachers are represented in Table 1. It is clear from Table 1 that, none of the university teachers were in low levels of work-family commitment. Among SAU teachers, 54.5 and 45.5 per cent indicated high and moderate levels, whereas 74.5 and 25.5 per cent of Non-SAU teachers expressed high and moderate levels of work-family commitment respectively. There was significant association between work-family commitment and type of university ( $X^2=6.177$ ) at five per cent level, indicating that higher percentage of Non-SAU teachers were in high levels of work-life balance. The probable reason may be due to the heavy workload in case of SAU teachers, they may find it difficult to balance their work and family life as comfortably as Non-SAU teachers can do, since they have less workload in comparison to SAU teachers. The findings are in agreement with Gareis *et al* (2009) who found that adults of 25-74 years rated both kinds of enrichment viz. family-to-work and work-to-family enrichment as more frequent than both kinds of conflict. They rated family as enriching work more often than the reverse, whereas they rated work as conflicting with family more often than reverse. Ahmad (2007) revealed that 35.1 per cent of factory operators reported low intensity of work-to-family conflict, followed by moderate and high conflict. For family-to-work conflict, half of them (50.6%) reported low intensity, followed by moderate and high levels. Liat and Rayyan (2006) reported that both Jewish and Arab-Muslim women reported a high level of well being for life satisfaction and perceived stress.

The comparison of mean scores through Analysis of Variance of teachers by university, gender and cadre on work-family commitment is depicted in Table 2. There were no significant main effects of university, gender and cadre on work-family commitment. Findings are supported by Wierda-Boer *et al* (2008) who observed that men and women experienced similar levels of work-family balance, on an average they felt quite successful in combining these life domains. Whereas significant interactionary effects of gender and cadre were observed indicating that work-family commitment of male and female teachers differed by cadre. Males with professor and above cadre revealed higher work-family commitment than females, while no such trend was observed among Assistant and Associate professors. These results suggested that when men and women engaged in similar work and family roles they are almost equally committed to those roles, but for women the responsibilities are more in the family context as she has to perform dual roles single handedly. The findings are in-line with Davis *et al* (2008) who pointed out that gender and type of job moderated the association with positive work-family spillover. According to Jeremy (2005) work-to-life conflict is associated with different preferences among men and women, although men and women showed similar levels of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict.

#### ***Marital satisfaction***

The results of marital satisfaction of SAU and Non-SAU teachers are depicted in Table 3. Most of the respondents, teachers of SAU (83.8%) and Non-SAU (94.1%) had high level of marital satisfaction, whereas 16.2 per cent of SAU and 5.9 per cent of Non-SAU teachers indicated average level of marital satisfaction. The

association between type of university and marital satisfaction was not significant as shown by the chi square value 3.215. The results are supported by Voydanoff (2005) reported that the respondents showed relatively high levels of marital satisfaction and moderate levels of marital risk as indicated by mean values. Liat and Rayyan (2006) observed that both Jewish and Arab-Muslim women reported a high level of well being for three factors – life satisfaction, marital satisfaction and perceived stress.

The results of 3 Factor ANOVA revealed that there were no main and interactionary effects of university, gender and cadre on marital satisfaction, indicating that male and female teachers showed similar levels of marital satisfaction, regardless of their cadre and university (Table 4). Badyal (1984) reported that occupational status did not predict the change in the marital satisfaction of dual earning couples. Kate (2009) found that the employment status of couples did not significantly influence the relationship satisfaction of couples.

#### ***Interrelation of Work-Family Commitment and Marital Satisfaction***

Table 5 reveals the association between work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of SAU and Non-SAU teachers. None of them were in low levels of marital satisfaction and work-family commitment. Half of the SAU teachers in average levels of marital satisfaction (50% each) fell in average and high groups of work-family commitment respectively. More than half of the SAU teachers (55.4%) with high marital satisfaction had high work-family commitment followed by average category (44.6%). Cent per cent of Non-SAU teachers with average marital satisfaction had high work-family commitment. Three fourth of the Non-SAU teachers (72.0%) with high satisfaction in their marriage indicated high work-family commitment, followed by average levels. Work-family commitment revealed positive and highly significant correlation with marital satisfaction of SAU teachers (0.345) but non-significant among Non-SAUs (-0.105). As the work-life balance of teachers of SAUs increased they tend to find more satisfaction in their marriages because they are able to cope up well with the demands emanating from multiple roles in work and family contexts. Similar findings are reported by Frone *et al.* (1992) who concluded that balanced engagement in work and family roles is expected to be associated with individual well-being because such balance reduces work-family conflict and stress, both of which detract from well-being. Voydanoff (2005) reported that relationship between two affective resources (sense of community and support from friends) and marital satisfaction and risk are mediated by family-to-work conflict and facilitation.

#### **IV. Conclusion:**

On the whole, more than half of the SAU (54.5%) and about 3/4<sup>th</sup> of Non-SAU (74.5%) teachers possessed high work-family commitment. None of them were in low levels of work-family commitment. Significant interactionary effects of gender and cadre was observed, indicating that males with Professor and above cadre revealed higher work-family commitment than females, while no such trend was observed among Assistant and Associate professors. Most of the SAU (83.8%) and Non-SAU (94.1%) teachers had high levels of marital satisfaction whereas none of them were in low levels. There were no main and interactionary effects of university, gender and cadre on marital satisfaction. There was positive and highly significant relationship between work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of SAU teachers (0.345) but non-significant among Non-SAUs (-0.105), indicating that higher levels of marital satisfaction significantly increased the work-family commitment among SAU teachers.

#### **References**

- [1]. Ahmad, 2007, Work-family conflict, life-cycle stage, social support and coping strategies among women employees. *J. Human Resource. Adult Learn.*, 3(1): 70-78
- [2]. Badyal, P., 1984, The relationship between five demographic variables and marital satisfaction of men and women in dual earner marriages, Thesis Simon Fraser University.
- [3]. Davis, K.D., Goodman, W.B., Piretti, A.E. and Almeida, D.M., 2008, Non-standard work schedules, perceived family well-being and daily stressors. *J. Mar. Fam.*, 70: 991-1003.
- [4]. Fisher-McAuley, G., Stanton, J., Jolton, J., and Gavin, J., 2003, Modelling the relationship between work life balance and organisational outcomes. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial-Organisational Psychology*. Orlando, April 12, 2003, 1-26.
- [5]. Frone, M. R., Russell, M., and Cooper, L. M., 1992, Prevalence of work-family conflict: Are work and family boundaries asymmetrically permeable? *Journal of Organizational Behavior.*, 13: 723-729.
- [6]. Gareis, K.C., Barnett, R.C., Ertle, K.A. and Berkman, L.F., 2009, Work family enrichment and conflict : additive effects, buffering or balance. *J. Mar. Fam.*, 71: 696-707.
- [7]. Haynes, S.N., Floyd, F.J., Lemsky, C., Rogers, E., Winemiller, D., Heilman, N., Werle, M., and Murphy, T., 1992, Marital Satisfaction Questionnaire for Older Persons., *Psychological Assessment.*, 4(4): 473-482.
- [8]. Jeremy, R., 2005, In the face of conflict: Work-life conflict and desired work hour adjustments. *J. Mar. Family*, 67: 1313-1331.
- [9]. Kate, S., 2009, The relationship satisfaction of heterosexual couples in one low income, semi-rural western cape community, Thesis presented at the University of Stellenbosch.
- [10]. Liat, K. and Rayyan, F., 2006, Relationships between dual-earner spouses, strategies for coping with Home-Work demands and emotional well-being. *Comm. Work and Fam.*, 9(4): 457-477.

*Interrelation Of Work-Family Commitment And Marital Satisfaction Of University Teachers*

- [11]. Sweet, S. and Moen, P., 2007, Integrating educational careers in work and family: Women's return to school and family life quality. *Community, Work and Family*, **10**(2): 231-250.
- [12]. Voydanoff, P., 2005, Social integration, work family conflict and facilitation, and job and marital quality. *J. Mar. Family*, **67**: 666-679.
- [13]. Wierda-Boer, H.H., Jan, R.M., Gerris and Vermulst, A.D.A., 2008, Adaptive strategies, gender ideology and work family balance among Dutch dual earners. *J. Marr. Fam.*, **70**: 1004-1014.

**Table 1. Work-family commitment of SAU and Non-SAU teachers**

Work-family commitment	Category	SAU (n= 110)		Non SAU (n= 55)		Modified X <sup>2</sup>
		F	%	F	%	
	Low (15-45)	-	-	-	-	6.177*
Moderate (46-75)	50	45.5	14	25.5		
High (76-105)	60	54.5	41	74.5		

\* - Significant at five per cent level, NS- Non-significant

**Table 2. Comparison of work-family commitment of SAU and Non-SAU teachers by gender and cadre**

University	Gender/Cadre	Work-family commitment								
		Male			Female			Total		
		N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE
<b>SAU</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>80.63</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>75.94</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>78.55</b>	<b>1.50</b>
	Assistant Prof	11	72.81	3.10	15	80.20	2.66	26	76.50	2.04
	Associate Prof	26	76.15	2.02	16	77.43	2.57	42	76.79	1.63
	Prof	17	86.82	2.49	9	69.33	3.43	26	78.07	2.12
	Prof & Head	10	86.40	3.25	5	76.80	4.60	15	81.60	2.82
<b>Non-SAU</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>80.55</b>	<b>1.73</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>82.94</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>81.35</b>	<b>1.53</b>
	Assistant Prof	8	76.12	3.64	11	79.63	3.10	19	77.88	2.39
	Associate Prof	16	81.00	2.57	4	86.25	5.15	20	83.62	2.88
	Prof	10	83.10	3.25	-	-	-	10	83.10	3.25
	Prof & Head	06	82.00	4.20	-	-	-	06	82.00	4.20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>80.60</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>78.27</b>	<b>1.51</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>79.67</b>	<b>1.09</b>

**3 FACTOR ANOVA**

Variables	MSS	F	S.Em.	CD
University	20.372	0.192 <sup>NS</sup>	1.51	-
Gender	155.41	1.464 <sup>NS</sup>	1.51	-
Cadre	69.94	0.659 <sup>NS</sup>	3.52	-
University X Gender	0.012	0.000 <sup>NS</sup>	2.19	-
University X Cadre	200.38	1.888 <sup>NS</sup>	3.51	-
Gender X Cadre	737.713	6.950 <sup>**</sup>	3.55	6.958
University X Gender X Cadre	78.043	0.735 <sup>NS</sup>	3.75	-

\*\* - Significant at one per cent level, NS- Non-significant

**Table 3. Marital Satisfaction of SAU and Non-SAU teachers**

Marital Satisfaction	Category	SAU (n=99)		Non SAU (n= 51)		Modified X <sup>2</sup>
		F	%	F	%	
	Low (23-61)	-	-	-	-	3.215 <sup>NS</sup>
Average (62-101)	16	16.2	03	5.9		
High (102-141)	83	83.8	48	94.1		

NS- Non-significant

**Table 4. Comparison of marital satisfaction of SAU and Non-SAU teachers by gender and cadre**

University	Gender/Cadre	Marital Satisfaction								
		Male			Female			Total		
		N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE
<b>SAU</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>115.37</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>111.85</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>113.80</b>	<b>1.87</b>
	Assistant Prof	11	110.18	3.73	15	120.75	4.38	26	115.46	2.88
	Associate Prof	26	115.20	2.47	16	111.40	3.20	42	113.30	2.02
	Prof	17	119.58	3.00	9	114.25	4.38	26	116.91	2.65
	Prof & Head	10	118.90	3.92	5	101.00	6.19	15	109.95	3.66
<b>Non-SAU</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>117.92</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>118.12</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>117.99</b>	<b>1.89</b>
	Assistant Prof	8	119.25	4.38	11	115.25	4.38	19	117.25	3.09
	Associate Prof	16	118.62	3.09	4	121.00	6.19	20	119.81	3.46
	Prof	10	119.66	4.13	-	-	-	10	119.66	4.13
	Prof & Head	06	114.16	5.06	-	-	-	06	114.16	5.06
<b>Total</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>116.50</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>113.94</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>115.48</b>	<b>1.35</b>

**3 FACTOR ANOVA**

Variables	MSS	F	S.Em.	CD
University	24.800	0.161 <sup>NS</sup>	1.88	-
Gender	375.834	2.446 <sup>NS</sup>	1.91	-
Cadre	155.099	1.010 <sup>NS</sup>	4.34	-
University X Gender	79.593	0.518 <sup>NS</sup>	2.76	-
University X Cadre	190.002	1.237 <sup>NS</sup>	4.37	-
Gender X Cadre	388.223	2.527 <sup>NS</sup>	4.46	-
University X Gender X Cadre	486.150	3.164 <sup>NS</sup>	4.72	-

NS- Non-significant

**Table 5. Interrelation between work-family commitment and marital satisfaction of SAU and Non-SAU teachers**

Marital satisfaction	Category	Work-Family Commitment							
		SAU (n=99)			Modified X <sup>2</sup> (r value)	Non-SAU (n=51)			Modified X <sup>2</sup> (r value)
		Low	Average	High		Low	Average	High	
Low	-	-	-	0.159 <sup>NS</sup> (0.345 <sup>**</sup> )	-	-	-	1.142 <sup>NS</sup> (-0.105 <sup>NS</sup> )	
Average	-	08 (50.0)	08 (50.0)		-	-	03 (100.0)		
High	-	37 (44.6)	46 (55.4)		-	14 (28.0)	36 (72.0)		

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages, <sup>\*\*</sup>- significant at 0.01 level, NS- Non-significant