

## **A gender analysis of work-family commitment and job satisfaction of university teachers in northern Karnataka**

**PG HOLEYANNAVAR and PB KHADI\***

**AICRP on Sesame and Niger, Main Agricultural Research Station**

**\*Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Rural Home Science**

**University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad 580005 Karnataka, India**

Email for correspondence: poojagsh@gmail.com

---

© Society for Advancement of Human and Nature 2018

Received: 19.5.2017/Accepted: 3.10.2017

---

### **ABSTRACT**

A gender analysis of work-family commitment and job satisfaction of university teachers was carried out on a sample of 165 teachers drawn from 3 cities of northern Karnataka. Teachers offering UG/PG courses in agriculture/science faculty belonging to assistant professor to professor and above cadre were randomly and proportionately selected. Results revealed that more than half of the state agricultural university (SAU) (54.5%) and about three-fourth of non-state agricultural university (non-SAU) teachers (74.5%) possessed high work-family commitment followed by moderate levels (45.5 and 25.5%) respectively. Significant interactionary effects of gender and cadre were 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. Majority of the SAU (90.9%) and non-SAU (87.3%) teachers expressed high level of job satisfaction. There was significant effect of gender; the male teachers (82.53) had higher job satisfaction compared to the females (77.66). The inter-actionary effects of gender and university were also significant indicating that the difference between gender was only among non-SAUs while among SAUs no significant difference between gender was observed on job satisfaction. Positive and significant correlation was observed between job satisfaction and work-family commitment of SAU teachers only indicating that more was the satisfaction derived from job higher was the work-family commitment and vice versa.

**Keywords:** Work-life balance; job satisfaction; science; agriculture; SAU; non-SAU

### **INTRODUCTION**

In the emerging complex scenario women have pivotal role to play. They can no longer be considered mere harbingers of peace but are emerging as a source of power and symbol of progress (Anand 2003). 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 (Juster 1985).

Job satisfaction is a general attitude of an individual towards his/her job. Positive attitude towards the job is equivalent to job satisfaction whereas negative attitude towards job is equivalent to job dissatisfaction. Due to men's strong commitment to work society permits them to let their job interfere with family life whereas women in paid employment generally feel a stronger commitment to the family domain than to work domain which may affect their job commitment or satisfaction. Women therefore may go to greater lengths or for the sake of higher positions or their family responsibilities may interfere unlike men. This would lead to gender imbalance in higher positions.

The present study was carried out to assess the work-family commitment and job satisfaction of university teachers, to compare the work-family commitment and job satisfaction of male and female

university teachers and study the interrelationship between work-family commitment and job satisfaction.

## METHODOLOGY

**Population and sample selection:** Out of 4 state agricultural (SAU) and 4 non-state agricultural (non-SAU) universities in northern Karnataka two each were purposively selected. In total 165 university teachers [50% of the male teachers (n= 105) and all the female teachers (n= 60)] who offered UG/PG courses in agriculture/science faculty and belonged to assistant professor to professor and above cadre were selected for data collection..

**Tools used:** The work-family commitment was assessed by the work-life balance scale developed by Fisher-McAuley et al (2003). The 15 items in this scale (10 negative and 5 positive) were divided into 3 dimensions of work-life balance: 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. The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they had felt in a particular way regarding their work and family life. For each statement scores 7, 4 and 1 were given for responses 'not at all', 'sometimes' and 'all the time' respectively for the negative items. For 5 items of the scale reverse scoring was done. The scores obtained for each of the statements were summated to get the dimension score as well as the total score for work-life balance. The total work-life balance score ranged from 15-105. Based on the scores obtained the teachers were categorized into low (15-45), moderate (46-75) and high (76-105) levels.

Job satisfaction scale developed by Kanungo (1982) was used to assess the job satisfaction. The respondents were required to indicate the degree of their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with each of the job qualities as one related to the present job. It was a 6 point scale consisting of 16 statements. The 6 answer categories were 'extremely satisfied', 'moderately satisfied', 'mildly satisfied', 'mildly dissatisfied', 'moderately dissatisfied' and 'extremely dissatisfied' with scoring of 6, 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively with a minimum score of 16 and maximum of 96. The total job satisfaction scores were calculated and categorization was made as low (16-42), average (43-69) and high (70-96) levels of job satisfaction.

**Data collection procedures:** The questionnaires were mailed/e-mailed/handed in person in three parts. Some case studies of teachers were also attempted upon. The university teachers were first approached in person in the respective cities and their consent was obtained.

**Statistical analysis:** Descriptive statistics were used to describe the work-family commitment and job satisfaction of university teachers. To study the relationship between work-family commitment and job satisfaction chi-square test and Karl Pearson's correlation coefficient were used. Analysis of variance technique was carried out to compare university, gender and cadre with work-family commitment and job satisfaction.

## RESULTS and DISCUSSION

The results of dimension-wise and overall work-family commitment of SAU and non-SAU teachers are represented in Table 1.

**Work interference with personal life (WIPL):** With respect to the first dimension of work-life balance ie work-interference with personal life (WIPL) more than half of the respondents in both SAU (55.5%) and non-SAU (58.2%) teachers revealed moderate interference of work with personal life followed by 44.5 and 41.8 per cent who depicted low interference respectively. None of the SAU and non-SAU teachers had high interference of work with personal life. There was no association between type of university and WIPL.

**Personal life interference with work (PLIW):** Regarding 2<sup>nd</sup> dimension ie personal life interference with work (PLIW) more than three-fourth of the university teachers of both SAU (76.4%) and non-SAU (78.2%) teachers highlighted low personal life interference with work followed by 23.6 per cent of SAU and 20.0 per cent of non-SAU teachers who showed moderate level of interference respectively. None of the SAU teachers revealed high whereas 1.8 per cent of non-SAU teachers had high PLIW. The association between personal life interference with work and type of university was not significant as shown by chi-square value (3.431).

**Work/personal life enhancement (WPLE):** With regard to work/personal life enhancement (WPLE) ie the last dimension of work-life balance very few of

Table 1. Work-family commitment of SAU and non-SAU teachers

| Work-family commitment                            | Category         | SAU (n= 110) |      | Non-SAU (n= 55) |      | Modified $\chi^2$   |
|---|------------------|--------------|------|-----------------|------|---------------------|
|   |                  | f            | %    | f               | %    |                     |
| Work interference with personal life (WIPL) score | Low (36-49)      | 49           | 44.5 | 23              | 41.8 | 0.111 <sup>NS</sup> |
|   | Moderate (22-35) | 61           | 55.5 | 32              | 58.2 |                     |
|   | High (7-21)      | -            | -    | -               | -    |                     |
| Personal life interference with work (PLIW) score | Low (20-28)      | 84           | 76.4 | 43              | 78.2 | 2.232 <sup>NS</sup> |
|   | Moderate (12-19) | 26           | 23.6 | 11              | 20.0 |                     |
|   | High (4-11)      | -            | -    | 01              | 1.8  |                     |
| Work/personal life enhancement (WPLE) score       | Low (4-11)       | 15           | 13.6 | 04              | 7.3  | 3.431 <sup>NS</sup> |
|   | Moderate (12-19) | 37           | 33.6 | 14              | 25.5 |                     |
|   | High (20-28)     | 58           | 52.7 | 37              | 67.3 |                     |
| Overall work-family commitment score              | 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

SAU (13.6%) and non-SAU (7.3%) teachers expressed low level on this dimension. However 52.7 and 33.3 per cent of SAU and 67.3 and 25.5 per cent of non-SAU teachers reported high and moderate levels of work/personal life enhancement respectively. There was non-significant association between WPLE and type of university.

**Overall work-family commitment:** The summation of the scores obtained for the three dimensions of work-life balance indicated the overall work-life balance of the SAU and Non-SAU teachers. It is evident from Table 1 that none of the university teachers was in low level of work-life balance. 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-life balance respectively. There was significant association between the overall work-life balance and type of university (cjh-value 6.177) at five per cent level. This indicates that higher percentage of non-SAU teachers was in high level of work-life balance. The probable reason may be the heavy workload in case of SAU teachers since they might have found it difficult to balance their work and family life as comfortably as non-SAU teachers could do as they had less workload in comparison to SAU teachers. The findings are in agreement with those of Gareis et al (2009) who found that respondents rated both kind of enrichment viz family-to-work and work-to-family enrichment more frequent than both kind 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. Greenhaus et al (2003) observed that for individuals who devoted substantial total time to work and family and those who spent more time on family than work experienced the highest quality of life followed by balanced individuals and finally by those who spent more time on work than family.

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 main effects of university, gender and cadre on work-family commitment. Findings are supported by the work of 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 inter-actionary 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 are 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 they had to perform dual roles

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

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

|                             | MSS     | F                   | SEm  | 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 | -     |

<sup>\*\*</sup>Significant at one per cent level, NS= Non-significant

single-handedly. The findings are in line with those of Davis et al (2008) who pointed out that gender and type of job moderated the association with positive work-family spillover. According to Reynolds (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.

**Job satisfaction:** The frequency distribution of job satisfaction of SAU and non-SAU teachers is given in Table 3. None of the university teachers showed low job satisfaction. Majority of the SAU (90.9%) and non-SAU (87.3%) teachers expressed high level of job satisfaction followed by 9.1 per cent and 12.7 per cent with average levels respectively. Type of university and job satisfaction were not significantly associated (chi-value 0.525). Similar observations were made by Voydanoff (2005) who studied social integration and job quality of 1816 respondents. The results revealed that there were relatively high levels of job satisfaction and moderate levels of job stress as indicated by mean values. Suchitra and Devi (2003) revealed that about half of the administrators/professionals had high job satisfaction followed by medium levels.

The comparison of job satisfaction of SAU and non-SAU teachers by gender is shown in Table 4. There was significant effect of gender; the male teachers (82.53) had higher job satisfaction compared to the females (77.66). Similar findings are reported by Alka and Asthana (2004) on teachers' job satisfaction in relation to their age, sex and teaching level that revealed that job satisfaction was affected by gender significantly. Male teachers were more satisfied than female teachers. The inter-actionary effect of gender and university was also significant indicating that the difference between gender on job satisfaction was observed only among non-SAU teachers wherein males were better than females. No such differences were seen in case of SAU teachers. Okpara et al (2005) reported similar findings that there were gender differences apparent in the job satisfaction levels of university teachers. Female teachers were more satisfied with their work and co-workers whereas their male counterparts were more satisfied with salary, promotion, supervision and overall job satisfaction.

**Interrelation between work-family commitment and job satisfaction:** The interrelationship between work-family commitment and job satisfaction of SAU

Table 3. Job satisfaction of SAU and non-SAU teachers

| Job satisfaction level | SAU (n= 110) |      | Non-SAU (n= 55) |      | $\chi^2$ value      |
|------------------------|--------------|------|-----------------|------|---------------------|
|                        | f            | %    | f               | %    |                     |
| Low (16-42)            | -            | -    | -               | -    | 0.525 <sup>NS</sup> |
| Average (43-69)        | 10           | 9.1  | 07              | 12.7 |                     |
| High (70-96)           | 100          | 90.9 | 48              | 87.3 |                     |

NS= Non-significant

Table 4. Comparison of job satisfaction of SAU and non-SAU teachers by gender

| University | Job satisfaction |       |      |        |       |      |       |       |      |
|------------|------------------|-------|------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
|            | Male             |       |      | Female |       |      | Total |       |      |
|            | n                | Mean  | SD   | n      | Mean  | SD   | n     | Mean  | SD   |
| SAU        | 65               | 81.33 | 1.21 | 45     | 82.06 | 1.45 | 110   | 81.70 | 0.94 |
| Non-SAU    | 40               | 83.72 | 1.54 | 15     | 73.26 | 2.52 | 55    | 78.49 | 1.47 |
| Total      | 105              | 82.53 | 0.98 | 60     | 77.66 | 1.45 | 165   | 80.09 | 0.87 |

|                     | MSS     | f                   | SEm. | CD   |
|---------------------|---------|---------------------|------|------|
| University          | 318.182 | 3.342 <sup>NS</sup> | 1.20 | -    |
| Gender              | 732.365 | 7.691**             | 1.21 | 3.34 |
| University x Gender | 968.015 | 10.166**            | 1.68 | 4.64 |

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

Table 5. Interrelation between work-family commitment and job satisfaction of SAU and non-SAU teachers

| Job satisfaction level | Work-family commitment |           |           |                              |                 |           |           |  |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|--|
|                        | SAU (n= 110)           |           |           | Modified $\chi^2$ (r-value)  | Non-SAU (n= 55) |           |           | Modified $\chi^2$ (r-value)                |
|                        | Low                    | Average   | High      |                              | Low             | Average   | High      |  |
| Low                    | -                      | -         | -         | 2.673 <sup>NS</sup> (0.199*) | -               | -         | -         | 1.280 <sup>NS</sup> (0.145 <sup>NS</sup> ) |
| Average                | -                      | 07 (70.0) | 03 (30.0) |                              | -               | 03 (42.9) | 04 (57.1) |  |
| High                   | -                      | 43 (43.0) | 57 (57.0) |                              | -               | 11 (22.9) | 37 (77.1) |  |

Figures in parentheses are per cent values, \*Significant at five per cent level, NS= Non-significant

and non-SAU teachers is depicted in Table 5. None of the university teachers was in low level of job satisfaction and work-family commitment. Most of the SAU teachers (70.0%) with average job satisfaction revealed average work-family commitment followed by high level (30.0%) whereas 57.0 per cent of them with high job satisfaction fell in high category of work-family commitment followed by average level. On the other hand 57.1 and 77.1 per cent of non-SAU teachers with average and high levels of job satisfaction

respectively showed high work-family commitment followed by average category. The job satisfaction showed positive and significant relation with work-family commitment of SAU teachers indicating that increase in the work-family commitment increased job satisfaction and increase in job satisfaction tended to increase commitments to work and family. The reason may be that teachers had psychological identification with job and family life. They performed family and job roles more or less competitively with available

resources by balancing the roles to fulfill the needs and expectations of job and family life and this balancing act brought about job satisfaction as they did not forego job to meet the family needs. The findings are in congruence with the work of Marks and MacDermid (1996) who revealed that balanced individuals experienced less role overload, greater role ease and less depression than their imbalanced counterparts. A balanced involvement in work and family roles may also reduce chronic work-family conflict. As balanced individuals are fully engaged in both the roles, they do not allow 'situational urgencies' to hinder job and family role performance chronically. Song et al (2008) pointed out that high amounts of spillover are conversely shown to be a result of increased job satisfaction, healthy communication patterns and cohesive family structures.

## CONCLUSION

On the whole majority of SAU and non-SAU teachers possessed high level of work-family commitment and job satisfaction. Male teachers with higher experience had higher work-family commitment and job satisfaction. Significant gender difference was observed in job satisfaction of non-SAU teachers while among SAU teachers no significant difference between gender was observed. There was a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and work-family commitment of SAU teachers only indicating that more is the satisfaction derived from job higher is the work-family commitment and vice versa.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad 2007. Work-family conflict, life-cycle stage, social support and coping strategies among women employees. *Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning* **3(1)**: 70-79.
- Alka and Asthana M 2004. Teachers' job satisfaction in relation to their age, sex and teaching level. *Indian Psychological Review* **62(4)**: 170-176.
- Anand N 2003. Working women: issues and problems. *Yojana* **47(3)**: 11-14.
- Davis KD, Goodman WB, Pirretti AE and Almeida DM 2008. Non-standard work schedules, perceived family well-being and daily stressors. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **70(4)**: 991-1003.
- Fisher-McAuley G, Stanton JM, Jolton JA and Gavin J 2003. Modeling the relationship between work/life balance and organizational outcomes. Poster presented at the Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial-Organisational Psychology, 12 April 2003, Orlando, FL.
- Gareis KC, Barnett RC, Ertel KA and Berkman LF 2009. Work-family enrichment and conflict: additive effects, buffering or balance? *Journal of Marriage and Family* **71**: 696-707.
- Greenhaus JH, Collins KM and Shaw JD 2003. The relation between work-family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **63**: 510-531.
- Juster FT 1985. Preferences for work and leisure. In: Time, goods and well-being (FT Juster and FP Stafford eds), Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, USA, pp 333-351.
- Kanungo RN 1982. Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **67(3)**: 341-349.
- Marks SR and MacDermid SM 1996. Multiple roles and the self: a theory of role balance. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **58**: 417-432.
- Okpara JO, Squillace M and Erondue EA 2005. Gender differences and job satisfaction: a study of university teachers in the United States. *Women in Management Review* **20(3-4)**: 177-190.
- Reynolds J 2005. In the face of conflict: work-life conflict and desired work hour adjustments. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **67(5)**: 1313-1331.
- Song Z, Foo MD and Uy MA 2008. Mood spillover and crossover among dual-earner couples: a cell phone event sampling study. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **93(2)**: 443-452.
- Suchitra D and Devi MS 2003. Job satisfaction of women employed in various occupations. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research* **20(3)**: 237-244.
- Voydanoff P 2005. Social integration, work family conflict and facilitation and job and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **67**: 666-679.
- Wierda-Boer HH, Jan RM, Gerris and Vermulst ADA 2008. Adaptive strategies, gender ideology and work family balance among Dutch dual earners. *Journal of Marriage and Family* **70**: 1004-1014.