International Review of Business Research Papers
Vol 4 No. 4 Aug – Sept 2008 Pp.251-278

Relationship between Work and Family Satisfaction on Performance: A Case Study

Mourad Mansour* and Razali Mat-Zin**

This study is intended to investigate the perceived level of work and family satisfaction, on work performance of faculty members at the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM). The sample of this study was drawn from the Faculty Directory List of KFUPM. The questionnaire used for this study was borrowed mainly from the Work and Family Questionnaire (WHFQ) developed by Felstehausen et al. (1986). The WHFQ was used to measure work satisfaction, family satisfaction, and perceived effect of home and family on work performance. The Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ) developed by the researchers is intended to obtain data concerning personal, family, and occupational information. The findings of this study have shed some light and contribute to the cross-cultural literature on work and family related issues and should be of interest to researchers, policy makers, academic leaders and educators.

Field of Research: Human Resources Management

1. Introduction

Faculty in higher education are assuming multiple and complex roles in the University. They have to meet their job responsibilities in conducting research, teaching and advising, and serving on committees. They also find themselves expected to take care of their family commitments. Previous studies concerning the interrelationship of work and family (Burge and Culver, 1989; Felstehausen et al., 1986; Near and Sorcinelli, 1986; Schultz and Chung, 2000; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002; St. Johns, 2003) have shown consistently high positive relationships. Greenhaus (2002) indicated that work accomplishments can influence the quality of family life just as the characteristics of the family system can affect workers' performance. Burge and Culver (1989) also found that home and family life was a stronger predictor of work satisfaction than the reverse. The interrelationship of the two constructs (work and family) has been found to be even greater among university faculty than other occupational group samples (Sorcinelli and Near, 2002).

---

*Assistant Professor, College of Industrial Management, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals Saudi Arabia, E-mail: mmansour@kfupm.edu.sa
Tel: 966-3-860-1961
** Associate Professor, College of Industrial Management, King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia, E-mail: matali@kfupm.edu.sa
Note: This research work is funded by King F'ahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM) under Fast-Track Grant FT050023.

The high degree of spillover between work and non-work of university faculty has attracted the attention of many researchers who explored the influence of home and family on work performance (Schultz, 1975; Felstehausen, 1983; Burge and Culver, 1989; Schultz et al., 2002; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002). This study is attempted to determine the perceived effect of work and family variables on the performance of university faculty. In addition it sought to identify demographics variables that influence the perceived effect of home and family on faculty work performance.

2. Literature Review

The present study is based on multiple role theory. As a family member and as an employee, the university faculty members assume multiple roles. Many are partner in dual-career families. As a result, employed spouses often lack time and energy to perform their work, home, and family responsibilities satisfactorily. The multiple role pressures experienced by men and women often result in work-family conflict. Work family conflict was defined by Greenhaus (2002) “as the presence of role pressures from the work and family domains that are mutually incompatible in some respect.” He enumerated three forms of work-family conflict resulting from multiple role theory: a) time-based conflict, in which the time demands of the role interfere with participation in the other role; b) strain-based conflict, where the stress symptoms such as fatigue and irritability produced in one role intrude into the other role; and c) behavior-based conflict, in which behaviors that are functional in one role are dysfunctional in the other role. According to Greenhaus (2002), extensive work-family conflict affects and deteriorates satisfaction and quality of life; thus, additional research in several directions is necessary.

Similarly, Voydanoff (2002) indicated that role conflict results from performing multiple roles. She named two major types of role conflict, overload and interference. Overload exists when the total demands of multiple roles on time and energy are too great to perform the roles adequately or comfortably. Interference occurs when conflicting demands make it difficult to fulfill the requirements of multiples roles. Voydanoff described two types of interference. In the first instance, expectations of one role may conflict with those of another. In other words, role expectations may be contradictory or there may be a lack of consensus regarding expectations. The second type of interference is role incompatibility or the inability to perform the prescribed activities for both roles due to conflicts in the scheduling of demands.

Despite the recent surge of interests on work and family issues among leaders, family advocates and employers, little research have been conducted regarding the effect of home and family on employees’ work performance in the context of Saudi Arabia. The present study will use a university setting in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia as its unit of analysis. Other university faculty studies (Sorcinelli & Near, 2002; Schultz & Chung, 2000) have been conducted but only in the United

States. A significant thrust of work and family literature currently is in cross-cultural research (Goldsmith, 2002). The present study contributes to that body of literature as well. To develop the background information for the present study, literature related to work satisfaction, life satisfaction, the interrelationship between work and family life and the effect of home and family on work and work performance was reviewed. In the literature, job satisfaction is used interchangeably with work satisfaction. Home and family satisfaction has been included in those studies dealing with life satisfaction and referred to as life satisfaction, life away from work, or non-work life (Bryson et al., 2000).

A. Work Satisfaction

There is a general agreement in the literature that faculty members in colleges and universities are quite satisfied with the type of work they do (Bryson et al., 2000; Near and Sorcinelli, 1986; Schultz, 1975). Although married faculty members experienced more pressure and stress than single faculty members in accommodating both work and family responsibilities in their busy schedule, they did not show dissatisfaction with their jobs (Sorcinelli and Near, 2002; Taylor and Spencer, 1988). However, Schultz and Chung (2000) found that a majority of the 60 Midwestern university faculty who responded in their study were somewhat dissatisfied with their jobs. A nationwide survey of American teachers by the Carnegie Foundation (2005) showed that the degree of faculty satisfaction varied from campus to campus. Faculty members in research institutions were more satisfied than faculty members in liberal arts colleges. However, the factor that highly influenced satisfaction in research institutions was their perception of their university's support for academic freedom. At liberal arts colleges, the most influential factors on faculty satisfaction were their perceptions of the importance of their academic discipline and the prestige of their institution. Faculty members who were least satisfied believed their institution was having a difficult time financially.

Schultz and Chung (2000) found that the highest level of satisfaction for faculty at Iowa State University was related to the pride faculty felt in being associated with the institution. They reported that the satisfaction levels with responsibility, communication/ information and authority on the job were higher than for promotion/advancement and job pressure. Schultz (1975) conducted a national survey of home economics faculty who possessed doctoral degrees and held positions as associate professors or higher. She found that productivity and creativity on the job were related to faculty job satisfaction, whereas faculty performance on the job was influenced by self-concept and general life satisfaction. He further observed that primary job interest played an important role in the general satisfaction of home economics college faculty with administration and salary. Faculty whose primary job interest was administration experienced the most positive attitudes toward administration, where as faculty whose primary interest was research experienced the highest level of satisfaction with salary. Faculty who had published from three to five articles or eleven or

more articles were more satisfied with work, home and family, and life in general than faculty who had not published articles.

Differences in work satisfaction also have been found by researchers with respect to age, sex, parental status, number of children, rank and income. For instance, the Carnegie Foundation (2005) research discovered that men were more satisfied with their work than were women. The median age of the most satisfied faculty was 47.5 whereas the least satisfied group had a median age of 44.1 years. The Carnegie Foundation presumed that older faculty members were more satisfied because they were settled and less anxious about their jobs than were younger faculty members. Wangphanich (2003) reported that age, sex, and salary did not account for the differences in level of work satisfaction of faculty at Srinakharinwerot University, Thailand. There were, however, differences in work satisfaction and academic rank. Faculty members in the university were quite satisfied overall with their work. She noted that the high level of faculty satisfaction with their work might have been attributed to the difficulty in obtaining a faculty position.

There is consistency in the literature on reports regarding income. Income is frequently the lowest rated factor when faculty satisfaction is measured. Bryson et al. (2000); Carnegie Foundation (1985; 2005) and Crowter (1984) indicated that faculty members who received higher income were more satisfied than faculty who received lower incomes. Results of the 1985 Carnegie Survey showed that sixty percent of the faculty rated their salaries as either “poor” or “fair” and further commented that their salaries had not kept pace with inflation. The same observation was made by Greninger et al. (1986). The Carnegie Foundation (1985) reported other work variables perceived as sources of great dissatisfaction. Faculty, for instance, expressed displeasure concerning the conflicting priorities of their work responsibilities, the large amount of time spent on the department commitments, classroom preparation, teaching, and advising and counseling students. The report further indicated that untenured faculty were dissatisfied with tenure policies. More than two-thirds of the faculty in both two and four-year institutions were already tenured; therefore, untenured faculty will have to compete intensely with other untenured faculty to maintain a faculty position. Schuster and Bowen (2002) reported similar findings. They interviewed 532 faculty from thirty-eight diverse colleges and universities in the United States. They found tenure a great source of dissatisfaction and concern among their interviewees. Other sources of work dissatisfaction were fringe benefits, compensation policies, and work environment.

B. Life Satisfaction

There is an agreement in the literature that satisfaction with home , family, non-work or life overall is higher that work (Burge and Culver, 1989; Bryson et al., 2000). However, several studies indicated that women were less satisfied with their lives than men (Sorcinelli and Near, 2002). The factor that is often reported

as the major source of life dissatisfaction and role strain among wives is insufficient time to perform family responsibilities (Bryson et al., 2000; Crowter, 1984). Bryson et al., studied the influence of family size on family satisfaction of couples who were both professionals and members of American Psychological Association. They found that family size influenced satisfaction with time available for domestic activities. Wives were more dissatisfied with the amount of time they had for family responsibilities as their number of children increased. However, husbands' satisfaction with their home and family life was not related to number of children. Wives were less satisfied than their husbands with the opportunities available to interact with colleagues. Wives who were more recent graduates were more dissatisfied than their husbands, whereas among earlier graduates, husbands were more dissatisfied than wives. Those who had no children were more satisfied than those with children.

In the Schultz study (1975), faculty members who perceived their present health as excellent had higher mean scores for attitude towards life in general than faculty who perceived their present health as either good, fair or poor. Schultz and Chung (2000) reported faculty considered thei family life to be the most important and satisfying aspect of life whereas recreation and community life was considered the least important. Felstehausen et al. (1986) and St. John (2003) also found that home and family satisfaction was a greater source of satisfaction than work. The findings of Felstehausen et al. and St. John regarding family satisfaction are comparable. Both studies used the Work, Home and Family Questionnaire and examined their respondents' level of home and family satisfaction. Felstehausen, et al. based their findings on a survey of 1,762 statewide employees of various occupational groups in Texas. St John surveyed 194 secondary Consumer and Homemaking teachers in Florida. Both the Texas and Florida respondents reported a fairly high degree of satisfaction with their home and family life. The overall life satisfaction was higher (mean = 5.43) in the Florida sample than the Texas study (mean = 5.18).

Texas respondents' greatest sources of family satisfaction were personal and family health, emotional support from friends and children, and amount family members expressed affection. Florida respondents were most satisfied with emotional support from friends and church, with personal health, child care arrangements, and household equipments. Texas and Florida respondents perceived the following variables as the greatest sources of work dissatisfaction: amount of time for self, amount of recreation/free time, total family income, time together as family, and division of household duties.

C. Interrelationship of Work and Family

The last decade has revealed a growing interest in research and writing on the interrelationship of work and family. Perhaps the most apparent research finding is the high positive relationship found between work and family measures. Several studies have examined the strength of the relationship of work and family

factors for the populations being studied (King and Hautaluoma, 2005; Cripp, 2005; Schultz et al., 2002; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002; St. John, 2003; Felstehausen et al., 1986; Burge and Culver, 1989; Near and Sorcinelli, 1986). Schultz (1975) and Schultz et al. (2002) reported that home economics college faculty members' job satisfaction was related to home and family satisfaction. This concept was further tested and supported using samples from several academic colleges in large U.S. universities (Schultz et al., 2002; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002; Near and Sorcinelli, 1986) Near and Sorcinelli found the correlation of work satisfaction and life satisfaction of university faculty was higher than the average correlation of work satisfaction and life satisfaction reported by other researchers using occupational groups.

The interrelationship between work and life satisfaction of samples from varied occupational (Felstehausen et al., 1986; King and Hautaluoma, 2005) has has not been as high as it has been for secondary teachers (Burge and Culver, 1989; St. John, 2003) and college and university faculties (Near and Sorcinelli, 1986; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002). The interrelationship of work and non-work life of university faculty was well documented by Near and Sorcinelli (1986) and Sorcinelli and Near (2002). Both studies were based on data collected from 112 faculty, randomly sampled from one department in humanities, one in the natural sciences, and two professional schools. Collection of data was done by interview followed by a survey questionnaire. Near and Sorcinelli discovered that the correlation between job and life satisfaction for university faculty (.64) was much higher than the average correlation (.31) for 200 studies they reviewed.

Life satisfaction was measured by the average of two scores: first, the mean score on questionnaire responses to a ten-item scale and second, the score for a general question on overall life satisfaction responses on a five point scale. Job satisfaction was based on a five point scale rating score of 12 items, which included recognition within the university, discipline, and society; opportunity to pursue scholarly and teaching interest; interaction with colleagues and students and financial rewards. Non-work satisfaction was created by summing the faculty satisfaction scores on items such as: community, health, neighborhood, friends, standard of living, career opportunities for spouse, leisure time, non-work organizations, social interaction, house/apartment, housework/yard work, parents/siblings, children, marriage/current relationship, family life, and child care options.

Near and Sorcinelli (1986) used regression analysis to determine the inter-correlations of selected variables. They reported high correlations between: work satisfaction and life satisfaction (.64), work satisfaction and non-work satisfaction (.45) work satisfaction and number of years employed at the university (.52), non-work satisfaction and years employed at the university (.60). Near and Sorcinelli interpreted the high correlation found between work satisfaction and life satisfaction of academicians as a positive indication of spillover from work life to non work life or the reverse. They argued that an improvement in the quality of

work life would have direct effect on the quality of life, and any change that decreases the quality of work life would likely reduce the level of life satisfaction. Because non-work satisfaction is strongly related to work satisfaction, they predicted any improvement in community living conditions (e.g. quality of school system, increased social opportunities) would likely increase work and life satisfaction. They suggested further study to determine factors that cause some people to experience greater levels of spillover than others.

In 2002, Sorcinelli and Near re-examined their data from a different perspective. This time they studied differences in satisfaction associated with rank and gender of faculty members. They found that the correlation between life satisfaction and job satisfaction was highest for faculty members who were full professors, followed by assistant professors and lastly associate professors. They did report that assistant professors had indicated more negative spillover between work and family life than did associate and full professors. Sorcinelli and Near also found that the correlation between job and life satisfaction of male faculty was much lower (.54) than among female faculty (.75). Contrarily, the relationship between non-work and life satisfaction was .67 for men and .54 for women. The correlation of non-work satisfaction and job satisfaction was .33 for male and .55 for female faculty. The relationship between the two constructs was found significant for both men and women; however, the strength of the correlation between job and life satisfaction was higher for female faculty. They also observed that academic work both influences and is influenced y life outside of work, but some institutional structures and policies operate as though concerns about personal, family, and community life are separate from work life.

The relationship between life satisfaction and work satisfaction has been found (Couch and Felstehausen, 2004) to vary for men and women. Couch and Felstehausen based their observation on a statewide sample of male and female employees from various occupational groups and levels of responsibility in Texas. Life status was found to be a stronger predictor of family satisfaction for women, whereas the parent/child concern was a stronger predictor for family satisfaction of men. Family life satisfaction was found to be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction for women, but for men the two constructs seemed to influence each other equally. The findings of Sorcinelli and Near (2002) were similar. They found that women faculty were more likely to be affected by their home and family life in relation to the amount of satisfaction derived from their work. Schultz et al. (2002) asked their respondents if they could "turn off" personal and family like in the work place. Over one-third said yes, but the remaining respondents answered that they could not turn off home and family life, could to some extent, or were undecided. Schultz et al. also requested their respondents to identify work/family problems experienced among faculty or colleagues. Among the item listed were: marital problems, child care concerns, overload of outside activities, problems with adolescent children divorce, caring for elderly parents, financial problems and alcoholism.

Crowter (1984), Bryson et al. (2002) and Sorcinelli and Near (2002) interpreted the interrelationship of work and family variables as an indication of inter-role conflict. They argued that combining multiple roles such as family and work responsibilities can lead to strain or stressors such as overload or inter-role conflict and poor, inadequate role performance. The researchers added that having a family role (spouse, parent), although associated with inter-role conflict, may also be linked to better physical health. Due to the consistent and strong relationship of work and home and family variables, Burge and Culver (1989), Couch and Felstehausen (2004), and St. John (2003) asserted the need to focus current research on the interaction between work and home, rather than looking at these two constructs separately. Although Burge and Culver, Couch and Felstehausen, and St. John conducted their studies using different population groups, they all used the Work and Home and Family Questionnaire developed by Felstehausen et al. (1986). They noted that the level of home satisfaction was comparably higher than work satisfaction. Their findings, however, were supported by Sorcinelli and Near (2002) who used another instrument. In their study of faculty representing various discipline, Sorcinelli and Near found a higher correlation between work and life satisfaction than the average correlation of their review of studies using data from other population group.

D. Effect of Home and Family on Work Performance

Literature that examines the effect of home and family on work performance is uncommon. Paolucci and Ching (1982) explained that the influence of family in the work place is “less well understood or documented.” Crowter (1984), Felstehausen (1983), Felstehausen et al. (1986) and St. John (2003) documented the very limited research done on this topic. According to Felstehausen, existing data focus on absenteeism, thus suggesting the need for more information on how family situations affect work and job success. Schultz and Chung (2000) also acknowledged the lack of studies examining the impact of home and family variables on work satisfaction and research productivity of university faculty.

Bryson et al. (2000) examined the influence of family size on job satisfaction, domestic satisfaction and productivity. Their data were based on a survey of 196 couples in which both spouses were members of the American Psychological Association. Professional productivity was measured based on the number of published articles and the number of convention papers presented. Bryson, et al. described their sample as full-time employed primarily Ph.D. holders. The results of their study showed that wives were less satisfied and less productive (e.g published fewer articles and presented fewer convention papers). They also found that husbands and wives were influenced by family size in different directions. As family size increased, husbands’ satisfaction with rate of advancement increased whereas wives’ satisfaction decreased. They explained that the child bearing and number of children had its greatest effect on the employment status of the wives, whereas the husbands were relatively

unaffected. Wives were most dissatisfied with the amount of time available for domestic as well as professional responsibilities. Wives also expressed lack of time to interact with colleagues, pursue long-range job goals and perform tasks such as writing articles and presenting papers at conventions. Both husbands and wives reported less freedom to pursue long-range job goals as family size increased. This indicates that respondents with children refrained from making future work plans without consideration of other family members.

Grant et al. (1990) confirmed the hypothesis that the effect of parental status is gender specific with parenthood reducing women's but not men's work involvement. However, there was no indication that women felt frustrated by the diminished career involvement or oppressed by domestic tasks. They indicated that mothers preferred to reduce their work involvement and expressed high satisfaction with their parenting responsibilities. On the other hand, Rahat (2000) observed that women who received encouragement and support from significant people in their lives became more involved with their career and professional development. Gould and Werbel (2000) learned that family financial requirements motivated employees from a large southern municipality to become more involved in the jobs. Results of their analysis also showed that husbands who were sole family earners had more involvement in their work and organization than did males with employed spouses. Among subjects whose spouses were employed, job involvement and organizational identification were found to be higher for subjects with children than it was childless subjects.

According to Sorcinelli and Near (2002) women faculty were more likely to report negative spillover. Common worries were lack of social opportunities in a small community or need to curtail social and leisure activities such as hobbies, exercise and civic activities in order to advance a career. They also found significant differences associated with academic rank in the kind of spillover reported for the family-work linkage. Assistant professors reported more negative spillover between work and family life than did associate and full professors. Assistant professors expressed more negative spillover between work and leisure activities than did faculty at other ranks. A national survey of college and university administrators conducted by Bird and Ford (2000) revealed that husbands who participated in child care indicated greater role strain than those who did it not. Husbands helped more in child care than in food-related and cleaning tasks. Wives experienced more role strain as the number of children increased. They explained that this is likely due to the increased time and energy demands created by additional children which concomitantly reduce available time for household responsibilities and for professional activities.

Felstehausen et al. (1986) surveyed statewide employees of various occupational groups. They found that the influence of home and family on work performance was primarily positive. Home and family factors that had the most positive effect on work performance were: (1) personal health and health of family members; (2) emotional support of spouse, children, and family members;

(3) emotional support of spouse, children and friends; (4) amount of affection expressed by family members; (5) child care arrangements; (6) children's school performance. Contrarily, the most negative influences of home and family on work performance were amount of time for self and amount of recreation or free time. Other factors such as total family income, time together as family, services from community resources, family schedule, division of household duties, and sense of control over life events were contributors to the negative influence of home and family on work performance.

St. John (2003) conducted a similar study by using the instrument developed by Felstehausen et al. (1986). She surveyed Florida Consumer and Homemaking teachers using a mailed a questionnaire. The Work Home and Family Questionnaire included 28 factors on their work performance. The grand mean was computed from all responses of the 28 items measuring the degree of impact that home and family life had on work performance. In addition to the 28 home and family items, a global question was used to get the respondents' perception of the overall impact of home and family on their work performance. St. John findings were similar to those of Felstehausen et al. The most positive impact of home and family on work performance was emotional support from friends, church, and relatives along with personal health, child care arrangement, emotional support from children and spouse, children's school performance, health of family members, family's daily diet, and household equipment. Contrarily, the amount of time for self, family income, family schedule, and division of household duties were listed as having the least positive impact on work performance. St. John summarized that the impact of home and family on work performance of Florida Consumer and Homemaking teachers was quite high with a grand mean of 5.46 and supported by the overall mean of 5.77 on a seven point Likert-type scale.

There is general agreement in the literature that employees are more satisfied with their home and family life than with their work life. However, the majority of the respondents were quite satisfied with their work lives. Studies on the interrelationships of work and family have consistently indicated a strong positive linkage between these two constructs. Researchers have interpreted this high relationship as an indication of a strong carry-over of one construct to the other. Recent studies on work and family have concentrated on the effect of work and family life. Although the effect of home on work performance has been mentioned in literature related to work and family or dual-career couples, empirical research on the influence of home and family on work has been very limited. Results of studies investigating the effect of home and family on work were found to have higher coefficients than the reverse (Burge and Culver, 1989; Couch and Felstehausen, 2004; Sorcinelli and Near, 2002). Further research has been suggested to find explanations for this discrepancy and to identify specific variables that influence work and work performance of employees.

The following null hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1**:** *The mean level of work satisfaction is not significantly different across college affiliations (professional discipline areas) of faculty members under study*.

Hypothesis 2: *The mean level of home and family satisfaction is not significantly different across college affiliations (professional disciplines) of the faculty members under study.*

Hypothesis 3: *There is no significant linear relationship between work satisfaction and family satisfaction of faculty members under study.*

Hypothesis 4: *There is no significant linear relationship between respondents' perceived effect of work on work performance and perceived effect of home and family on work performance.*

3. Methodology

A. Sample

Based on the most current *Faculty List* provided by the Deanship of Personnel Affairs at KFUPM, the data used for the study were gathered from a sample of faculty members who were recorded as full time faculty members at KFUPM during the data collection period. Four hundred respondents were randomly selected from the total population of six hundred and twenty one (621) who were eligible for the study and were provided with the instrument. Three-hundred and twenty-one (321) returned the completed, usable questionnaires which provided 80.25 percent response rate.

B. Selection of Instruments

Two instruments were used to gather information for the study. The first instrument is the Work and Home and Family Questionnaire (WHFQ), and the second was the Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ). The WHFQ comprised of two sections: The work variables section and the home and family variables section. The BIQ included personal, family, and occupational information, as well as stress variables. The WHFQ and the stress section of the BIQ were part of the Work, Home and Family Questionnaire developed by Felstehausen et al. (1986). They have grouped the original WHFQ into four major sections: personal and family data, stress factors, work hours schedule, and conditions relating to work and family environments. In the present study, the section on conditions relating to work and family environment was entitled Work, Home and Family Questionnaire (WHFQ) whereas the stress factors were included in the Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ) and were treated as independent variables.

Each section of the work, family and stress portions begins with an introductory "major" question of which the variables form the components. At the end of the variable list is the "global question" which is an overall question giving the respondents a follow-up opportunity to summarize his/her reactions to the variables. The content of the home and family section included 18 specific home and family variables. Felstehausen, et al. acknowledged the use of the literature and instruments of Schultz (1975) as their guide in developing the format of the instrument. There were two major questions and two global questions asked in this section. The first major question asked respondents to indicate on a seven point Likert-type scale from "very satisfied" (7) to "very dissatisfied" (1) their level of satisfaction for each of the 28 home and family variables. Similarly, the second major question asked respondents to indicate their perception of its effect on their work performance on a scale from "very positive" (7) to 'very negative" (1).

At the end of the Home and Family Section, two global questions were added. The first question asked to determine the overall satisfaction of respondents with their home and family life on a scale from "very satisfied" (7) to "very dissatisfied" (1). The second global question was asked to determine the respondents' overall perception of the effect of their home and family life on their work performance using a scale ranging from "very positive" (7) to "very negative" (1). The work section included 18 specific variables related to work environment. Felstehausen et al. cited the work environment scale of Near and Sorcinelli (1986) as a great influence on its development. Like the home and family section, the work section had two major and two global questions. The first major question asked the respondents to indicate their level of satisfaction for each of the 18 variables by using a seven point Likert-type scale ranging from "very satisfied" (7) to "very dissatisfied" (1). Likewise the second major question asked respondents to indicate the perceived effect of each variable on their work performance on a scale from "very positive" (7) to "very negative" (1).

Two questions of the original WHFQ were changed. The original question 2 asked respondents to indicate how work factors affect the quality of their home life. Since the purpose of this study is to determine the perceived effect of work and family on work performance of university faculty, question 2 were changed to "what effect do you think it (each variable) has on your work performance?" The global question, which asked respondents to indicate the overall effect these work variables had on the quality of their home life, was changed to "Overall, what effect do you think your work has on your work performance?" The second instrument is the Background Information Questionnaire (BIQ). Items in the BIQ are designed to obtain selected personal, occupational and family information. In addition, twelve items and two write-in spaces were included to gather data regarding perceived family stressors. Data collected from the BIQ were used to describe characteristics of the sample.

C. Reliability of the Instrument

Although the Work and Home and Family Questionnaire has been tested and reliability scores reported were very high (Cripp, 2005;Burge and Culver, 1989; Felstehausen et al., 1986), a reliability test was computed for the sample of the present study. Based on Cronbach's alpha, the reliability coefficient scores obtained for the four measures were as follows:
Work Satisfaction = 0.920
Home and Family Satisfaction = 0.972
Perceived Effect of Work Satisfaction on Work Performance = 0.937
Perceived Effect of Home and Family on Work Performance = 0.936

This study support previous research with regard to the high reliability of the instrument used.

D. Collection of Data

The following materials were distributed to the respondents: (1) cover letter; (2) agreement form; (3) and the questionnaire**.** The cover letter emphasized the importance of each individual response and assured the respondents of anonymity and confidentiality for all their answers. The signed agreement form was the only basis for identifying faculty members who completed the questionnaire or choose not to participate. No identification marks were placed on the questionnaires and the agreement forms were collected separately by the person collecting the data.

4. Findings

The main purpose of this research was to determine the relationship between the perceived effect of work on work performance and the perceived effect of home and family on work performance of faculty at KFUPM. It also sought to identify demographic variables that have influence on the perceived effect of home and family on faculty work performance.

A. Demographic Variables

The description of the sample is based on the ten variables selected for analysis in the study. Table 1 presents the distribution of selected demographic variables. The distribution of respondents by age showed that the majority (55.8%) were between 41-50 years old and 96.3 % are married. The highest degree completed by 92.5% of the faculty was Ph.D degree. Six respondents (1.9%) were still in the process of pursuing their Ph.D degrees and 5.3% are Masters degree holders. Slightly more than half (51.4%) of the respondents reported having the rank of Assistant Professor, 23.7% as Associate Professor and 15.9% at the rank of Full Professors.

The majority (32.1%) has been employed by KFUPM for the duration of between 1-5 years followed by 29.9% for 6-10 years period. Interestingly, there were 11 (3.4%) of the respondents who have been working with KFUPM for such a long period of time (26-30 years). Slightly more than one-third of the respondents (37.1%) who had six members of the family; 27.5% with five; and 15% with four. The present employment status of the respondents clearly indicated that the majority (70.1%) were employed on contractual basis and 29% are permanent status. Since the expatriates (non-Saudis) were hired on contractual employment, they (72.3%) comprised the total sample versus 27.7% Saudis faculty. Response to the item "College affiliation" was used to determine the professional discipline areas of respondents by College affiliation. Being the two largest Colleges on campus, 28.7% of the respondents were from College of Engineering, followed by College of Sciences (28.3%).

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents Based on Selected Demographic Variables

Variable	Count	%	Variable	Count	%
Age			***Marital Status***		
20-30	1	0.3	Single	0	0
31-40	67	20.9	Married	309	96.3
41-50	179	55.8	Separated	0	0
51-60	70	21.8	Widowed	0	0
61-70	4	1.2	Other	1	0.3
Over 70	0	0	NA	11	3.4
Education			***Number of Family Members***		
Bachelor	0	0	1	1	0.3
Working on Master	0	0	2	4	1.2
Master	17	5.3	3	13	4
Working on Doctorate	6	1.9	4	48	15
Doctorate	297	92.5	5	88	27.5
Other	0	0	6	119	37.1
NA	1	0.3	7	27	8.5
			Over 7	13	4
			NA	8	2.4
Yearly Income*			***KFUPM Experience***		
< SR 70,000	8	2.4	01-05 Years	103	32.1
SR 70,000-99,999	34	10.6	06-10 Years	96	29.9
SR 100,000-149,999	151	47.1	11-15 Years	50	15.6
SR 150,000-199,999	81	25.2	16-20 Years	34	10.6
SR 200,000-249,999	22	6.9	21-25 Years	22	6.8
Over SR 250,000	7	2.2	26-30 Years	11	3.4
NA	18	5.6	NA	5	1.6

Employment Status			***College Affiliation***		
Permanent	90	28	College of Industrial Management	40	12.5
Temporary	1	0.3	College of Sciences	92	28.3
Contract	225	70.1	College of Computer Sc. and Eng.	91	22.7
Other	2	0.6	College of Environmental Design	25	7.8
NA	3	1	College of Engineering	73	28.7
Nationality			***Rank***		
Saudi	89	27.7	Professor	51	15.9
Expatriate	232	72.3	Associate Professor	76	23.7
			Assistant Professor	165	51.4
			Instructor/Lecturer	27	8.4
			Other	2	0.6

B. Correlation Analysis: Hypotheses Testing

i) *Hypothesis 1*: *The mean level of work satisfaction is not significantly different across college affiliations (professional discipline areas) of faculty members under study*.

The null hypothesis, denoting that the mean level of work satisfaction would not vary across faculty professional discipline areas in the university was tested using one-way analysis of variance. The work satisfaction grand mean (WGRAND) and work satisfaction globe mean (WGLOBE) were used separately as measures of the level of work satisfaction. The response for the item "College Affiliation" was used for the professional discipline areas. The detail statistical data is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2: One Way ANOVA for the Mean Level of Work Satisfaction across College Affiliations (Professional Discipline Areas)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	F-Ratio	Sig.
WGRAND	9.805	5	1.961	.460	0.31	.806
WGLOBAL	13.317	5	2.663	.649	0.53	.662

$p < .05$

The computed standard error of the mean for each of the college/unit groups were as follows: (a) 0.20 each for Group 2 (College of Sciences); Group 4 (College of Environmental Design); and Group5 (College of Engineering), and 0.17 and 0.15 respectively for Group 1 (College of Industrial Management) and Group 3 (College of Computer Science and Engineering). The total standard error was .08 indicating a very small variability. The F-ratio between GRAND and professional discipline area was 0.31, whereas the F-ratio between

WGLOBE and professional discipline area was 0.53 These findings indicate that the observed differences in the mean level of faculty work satisfaction across professional discipline areas in the university were not significant at the pre-set $p < .05$ level. ***Hypothesis 1*** was retained.

ii) *Hypothesis 2*: *The mean level of home and family satisfaction is not significantly different across college affiliations (professional disciplines) of the faculty members under study.*

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the null hypothesis that the mean level of home and family satisfaction would not vary across faculty professional discipline areas in the university. The family satisfaction grand mean (FGRAND) and family satisfaction globe mean (FGLOBE) were used separately as measures of the level of "College Affiliation" was used for the professional discipline area. The observed group means for the level of home and family satisfaction using FGRAND was lowest (5.20) for Group 5 (College of Engineering) whereas the highest (3.01) was for Group 4 (College of Environmental Design). However, neither the calculated F-ratio for FGRAND or FGLOBE and college affiliation (professional discipline areas) was significant at the pre-set $p< .05$ level. The F-ratio for FGRAND and professional discipline area was 0.31, whereas the F-ratio for FGLOBE and professional discipline area was 0.37. These coefficients were too small to support the rejection of the null hypothesis. Therefore, ***Hypothesis 2*** was retained.

Table 3: One Way ANOVA for the Mean Level of Home Family Satisfaction across College Affiliations (Professional Discipline Areas)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	F-Ratio	Sig.
FGRAND	26.233	5	5.247	1.188	0.31	.315
FGLOBAL	32.287	5	6.457	1.474	0.37	.198

$p < .05$

iii) *Hypothesis 3:* *There is no significant linear relationship between work satisfaction and family satisfaction of faculty members under study.*

Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to determine if there was a linear relationship between work satisfaction grand mean (FGRAND) and family satisfaction globe mean (FGLOBE) were used separately to measure home and family satisfaction. Similarly, work satisfaction was measured by the work satisfaction grand mean (WGRAND) and work satisfaction globe mean (WGLOBE). Table 4 shows the significant ($p<.001$) positive correlation coefficients for the pairs of the home and family grand and globe means. The highest correlation coefficient (0.62) was found between FGRAND and WGRAND. A similar but slightly weaker correlation was found between FGLOBE and WGLOBE (.54). These results indicate that respondents who had a high

level of satisfaction with family also had a high level of satisfaction with the work variables or the reverse.

Table 4: Pearson Product Moment Correlation between Work and Family Satisfaction Based on the Constructs' Grand Mean and Global Scores

	WGRAND	WGLOBE
FGRAND	.62**	.52**
FGLOBAL	.48**	.54**

** p<.001

iv) ***Hypothesis 4:*** *There is no significant linear relationship between respondents' perceived effect of work on work performance and perceived effect of home and family on work performance.*

Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to test the null hypothesis denoting that there is no significant relationship between the perceived effect of work on work performance and perceived effect of home and family on work performance. The grand mean of the perceived effect of home and family on work performance (FGRAND) and the score of the overall perceived effect of work on work performance (FEGRLOBE) were used to measure perceived effect of home and family on work performance. Perceived effect of work on work performance was measured y the grand mean of the perceived effect of work perceived effect of work on work performance (WEGRAND) and the score of the overall perceived effect of work on work performance (WEGLOBE). High positive correlation coefficients were obtained for FGRAND and WEGRAND and for FEGLOBE and WEGLOBE (r=0.66 and r=0.53 respectively) as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Pearson Product Moment Correlation of the Measure for Perceived Effect of Work and Family on Work Performance

	WEGRAND	WEGLOBE
FEGRAND	.66**	.63**
FEGLOBAL	.47**	.53**

** p<.001

5. Summary, Discussions And Recommendations

A. Summary

The purpose of the study was to investigate the perceived level of work satisfaction, family satisfaction effect of work on work performance, and effect of home and family on work performance of faculty members at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals, Saudi Arabia. The study also investigated

whether selected variables influenced level of work satisfaction, family satisfaction or perceived effect of family on work performance. The data for the research were primary data obtained from responses to two instruments. The first instrument was the *Work and Home and Family Questionnaire* (WHFQ) developed by Felstehausen et al. (1986) and the second was the *Background Information Questionnaire* (BIQ) developed by the researcher. The WHFQ was used to measure work satisfaction, family satisfaction, and perceived effect of home and family on work performance. It also included an adapted measure of the perceived effect of work on work performance. The reliability coefficient scores obtained for the four measures were 0.92, 0.97, 0.93, and 0.93 respectively. The BIQ was designed to obtain personal, family, and occupational data as well as the perceived stress level of selected family related variables. The measure for the stress level was adapted from the WHFQ of Felstehausen et al. (1986).

The sample for the study was drawn from the faculty members at the King Fahd University of Petroleum and Mineral (KFUPM) in Saudi Arabia. Four hundred respondents were randomly selected from the total population of six hundred and twenty one (621) who were eligible for the study and were provided with the instrument. Three-hundred and twenty-one (321) returned the completed, usable questionnaires which provided 80.25 percent response rate. Analysis of data was performed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX). Sub-program frequencies were used to obtain basic statistics for all variables. Factor analysis with principal component analysis and varimax rotation was used to generate subscales from the four home and family measures. Sub-program reliability was used to obtain Cronbach's alpha for the home and family scales and subscales. One-way analysis of variance and Pearson product moment correlation were used to test the hypotheses.
The characteristics of a typical faculty respondent in the study were: married (96.3%), between the ages of 31 to 60 (98.5%), holder of a Ph.D degrees (92.5%), and employed for 6–20 years of employment at the university (51.6%). The faculty members' job responsibilities included a combination of two or more of the following job activities: administration, instruction, research, extension, advising or counseling, committee service, and management of a university or college projects.

On the basis of the analyses of the responses received, several conclusions can be drawn:

1. Faculty respondents perceived their working lives as moderately stressful (grand mean = 3.24) and the effect of the stressful situation(s) on their work performance as negative. Three hundred and eight (77%) of the faculty members checked one or more stressors. The stressors perceived as sources of greatest stress included: "Balancing Work and Family Responsibilities" followed by other stressors as follows: "Financial Problems" (5.33); "Health of Family Members" (4.18); "Recent Death of

Family Member" (4.08); "Problem With Children" (2.71); "Legal Difficulties" (2.68); and "Divorce and Separation" (1.58).

2. The grand mean score (WSGRAND) for the 18 work satisfaction variables were slightly skewed to the dissatisfactory side of the scale (3.92). The mean for the faculty rating for their overall work dissatisfaction (WSGLOBE) was 4.64, signifying the faculty respondents were moderately dissatisfied with their jobs. The three most dissatisfying aspects of work environment were: "Fringe benefits; "Opportunity for advancement;" and "Salary of Pay." On the other hand, work related aspects rated "very satisfied" were "Parking arrangements;" "Friendship at work;" "Flexibility of work schedule;" and "Amount of control over your work."
3. Respondents perceived the effect of the 18 work satisfaction variables on their work performance as negative. The mean responses for the 18 work variables ranged from 5.71 to 2.54. The work satisfaction item perceived by faculty respondents as having the most negative impact on their work performance was "Fringe Benefits" (mean = 5.71). The grand mean for the perceived effect of work on work performance (WEGRAND) was 4.17. The respondents' global perception of the effect their work satisfaction level had on work performance was based on their responses to the question, "Overall, what effect do you think your work has on your work performance?" The mean of the global perception of faculty respondents regarding the effect of the 18 work related variables on their work performance (WEGLOBE) was 4.73, which is quite at the close level to the WEGRAND.
4. The mean response for the 18 items of Home and Family Satisfaction Scales clearly indicated that the faculty members were quite dissatisfied with their home and family situations. The grand mean score of the 18 Home and Family variables (HFGRAND) was relatively low indicating that the faculty respondents are moderately satisfied. However, the mean score for overall Home and Family Satisfaction scale (HFGLOBE) was relatively higher, 4.43 which suggests that the faculty respondent are quite dissatisfied. The variables rated the most satisfying in the respondents' home and family life were: "Emotional support from spouse"; "Emotional support from children"; "Personal health"; "Health of family members"; "Communication among family members"; "Division of household duties"; and "Division of parenting responsibilities". Comparatively, the variables rated most dissatisfying variables were: "Housing conditions;" "Household equipments; "Amount of time for self; "Time together as a family;" and " Services from community resources."
5. The faculty respondents perceived the impact of the 18 Home and Family variables on work performance to be moderately negative. The means ranged from a high of 5.50 to a low of 2.20. The grand means for the 18 variables illustrates the response categories of the faculty revealing that 73% found difficulty in combining work activities and family responsibilities.

6. Variation in level of work satisfaction and family satisfaction was not a function of faculty affiliation to a particular discipline area. Results of one-way analysis of variance for measures of family and work satisfaction and college/unit affiliation were not significant at the .05 level.
7. Pearson product moment correlation revealed a high positive linear relationship between measures of work and family satisfaction. The correlation coefficient for FGRAND and WGRAND was .62, whereas the correlation for FGLOBE and WGLOBE was .54. Both coefficients were significant at the $p<.001$ level.
8. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients obtained from all pairs of work and family factors/clusters were positive and significant at the $p < .001$ level. The highest correlation coefficient existed between work factor 2 with family factor 1 ($r = .52$) and family factor 5 ($r = .52$), whereas family factor 5 with work factor 3 had the lowest coefficient ($r = .30$).
9. Pearson product moment correlation showed a significant positive coefficient at $p<.001$ for the grand mean of the perceived effect of family on work performance (FEGRAND) and the grand mean of the perceived effect of work on work performance (WEGRAND) ($r = .66$)
10. A significant correlation n coefficient was computed for the globe mean of the perceived effect of home and family on work performance (FEGLOBE) and family on work performance (FEGLOBE) and the globe mean of the perceived effect of work on work performance (WEGLOBE) ($r = .53$)
11. A high positive relationship existed between the extracted factors/clusters for perceived effect of home and family on work performance and perceived effect of work on work performance. Each of the four factors/clusters generated from the 18 measures for perceived effect of home and family on work performance was correlated with each of the three factors/clusters extracted from the 18 measures for perceived effect of work on work performance. The obtained correlation coefficients for all pairs of measures were significant at the $p<.001$ level. The highest linear relationship was found between work effect factor 2 and family effect factor 2 ($r = .67$), whereas family effect factor 3 and work effect factor 1 had the lowest linear relationship ($r = .46$).

B. Discussion

The result of this exploratory study will be discussed and compared to other research studies and theories cited in the review of literature. In general, the faculty respondents in the study were satisfied with their work and family lives. They also perceived various aspects in their work and family lives as sources of positive influence on their work performance. Findings of this study support previous research (Burge & Culver, 1989; Felstehausen et al., 1986; Schultz & Chung, 2000; Sorcinelli & Near, 2002; St. John, 2003) which found work life satisfaction as a whole to be a greater source of satisfaction than s home and family life satisfaction. The grand mean score for the 18 work satisfaction variables was higher than the grand mean score for the 18 home and family

satisfaction variables. In fact, the score obtained from the one item global question of faculty overall satisfaction with work life was even higher.

The faculty respondents were not as satisfied with their work as they were with their family life. Both the work satisfaction grand mean and globe mean were above the moderate level (4.0 on a seven point Likert-type scale) indicating that, generally speaking, faculty were not quite satisfied with their work life. The findings of the study support numerous studies cited (Bryson et al., 2000; Carnegie Foundation, 2005; Near & Sorcinelli, 1986; Schultz, 1975; Sorcinelli & Near, 2002; Taylor & Spencer, 1988) in which it was found that faculty members in colleges and universities were generally not satisfied with their work especially with regard to "fringe benefits", "salary or pay" and "opportunity for professional advancement." The respondents in the present study expressed greatest dissatisfaction with fringe benefits, salary, opportunity for professional advancement and job security.

The work and family satisfaction levels of the faculty in the present study were comparable with the findings of Felstehausen et al. (1986) and St. John (2003). Felstehausen et al. surveyed 1,762 statewide employees of various occupational groups in Texas, whereas St. John surveyed 194 secondary consumer and Homemaking teachers in Florida. The work, Home and Family Questionnaire was used in both studies. In spite of rating variations, the three studies had similar rankings for the following work variables: "Opportunity to work independently," "Amount of control over how job is done," "Variety of work tasks," "opportunity for advancement," "Fringe benefits," and "Salary or pay." The Texas and KFUPM respondents agreed that "Fringe benefits" was the greatest source of work dissatisfaction. "Friendship at work" and " Flexibility of work schedule" were sources of least work dissatisfaction in the three studies. The Texas and Florida studies resulted in greater similarity in ratings for home and family satisfaction and perceived effect of family on work performance. The Florida sample reported the greatest satisfaction with "Emotional support from friends," "Resources from community services", and "Personal health". Texas employees reported "Personal health" and "Family health" and "Emotional support form children" as the highest source of satisfaction. The KFUPM sample indicated greatest home and family satisfaction from "Emotional support of spouse," "Emotional support from children", "Personal health", and "Health of family members". Respondents from the three studies were similar in their ratings of "Amount of time for self," and "Time together as a family" as the third and second most ranked factors contributing to home and family dissatisfaction.

The Florida and Texas sample groups perceived the "Division of household duties" and "Division of parenting tasks" as having the most negative effect on their work performance. Contrary to the two U.S. sample groups, the KFUPM sample perceived "Housing conditions" and "Household equipments" as sources with the most negative effect on work performance. These variations could be due to the fact that the samples in two US sample groups were living in their own

houses; while majority of respondents in KFUPM were staying in houses provided by the university. There is a strong likelihood that the housing conditions and facilities are much more inferior in the case of KFUPM as compared to US samples. The dissimilarity of the Texas and Florida studies with the present research may be due to occupational, environmental and/or cultural factors as cited by many researchers such as Kanter (1977) and Razali (2006). Although the need for belongingness, recognition and dignity is universal (Maslow, 1970), some cultures rank them higher than others. To KFUPM sample the value of familism and personalism are very high on their value list. Family matters tend to take precedence over work. KFUPM respondents work to meet the needs of the family. The greater the financial contribution he provides to the family, the more recognition and support he obtains in return from the beneficiaries. Ability to maintain smooth personal relations within the family or work area also is highly valued (Razali, 2006).

It was observed that those who found home and family life satisfactory also indicated a positive effect of family on their work performance. Likewise those who indicated dissatisfaction with various family variables also perceived a negative effect on their work performance. Other home and family variables were reported by the respondents of Schultz, Chung, and Henderson which had impact either on their own work or the work of their colleagues. These included problems with adolescent children, divorce, caring for elderly parents. In the present study, "Emotional support from children" and "Emotional support from spouse" were reported by nearly two-thirds of the faculty as two factors which contributed least to the sources of family influence on work performance. There is agreement in the literature (Felstehausen et al., 1986; Schultz et al., 2002; St. John, 2003), that individuals who were dissatisfied with their family life were less likely to respond that their family life influenced their job performance in a positive way. These same individuals were more likely to report that their family life influenced their job in a negative way.

Work environment has been generally accepted to have some impact on work performance and possible effects were investigated in the present study. It was found that overall, the perceived effect of selected work variables on work performance was positive. The greatest source of positive effect on work performance was "friendship at work" whereas "fringe benefits," "working conditions/physical environment," likelihood of transfer," and "salary" were the lowest sources of work satisfaction and were perceived as having the most negative effect on work performance. However, "working conditions/physical environment" and "likelihood of transfer" were perceived to have greater negative effect on work performance than salary. McGee and Ford (1997) who surveyed faculty members form four year colleges and universities in the United States and Canada found that the physical environment had a significant influence on faculty work performance. For instance, faculty in an environment which had resources that support research activities such as library and computer facilities had done more research than faculty in institutions with limited resources for research.

The results from a national survey of college faculty conducted by Carnegie Foundation (2005) showed that faculty perception of the importance of their academic discipline was the highest ranking factor in determining faculty satisfaction. An attempt was made in this study to examine whether or not affiliation to a particular discipline area or College would result in significant mean differences in faculty work or family satisfaction. However, the mean differences among the Colleges affiliations were not significant at the .05 level. Results of the present study further confirmed previous findings of the strong positive correlations between work and family life (Burge & Culver, 2000; Cripp, 2005; Felstehausen et al., 1986; King & Hautaloma, 2005; Near & Sorcinelli, 1986; St. John, 2003). High positive linear relationships were found for all pairs of measures for work and family. Work satisfaction correlated with home and family satisfaction. Likewise, perceived effect of work on work performance was positively correlated with perceived effect of home and family on work performance. Factors/clusters extracted from the numerous variables of the four constructs were all positively correlated and found to be significant. The results reinforced the theory that work and family are not two separate entities (Kanter, 1977; Voydanoff, 2002), but rather they are intertwined. Findings of the present study serve as evidence of the universality of the interrelationship of the work and family domains. Researchers of work and family have argued that the high interrelation of measures on home and family domains is an indication of role conflict and role strain (Greenhaus, 2002; Voydanoff, 2002).

a) have large families (Bird & Ford, 2000; Bryson, Bryson, & Johnson, 2000; Cripp, 2005; Andres, 2005);
b) Have preschool age children (Greninger et al., 1986; Schultz, Chung & Henderson, 2002; Crowter, 1984);
c) Are wives or mothers (Bird & Ford, 2000; Crowter, 1984; Grant et al., 1990; Schultz, 1975; Gould et al., 2000);
d) Are single parents (Bryson, Bryson, & Johnson, 2002; Voydanoff, 2002; Taylor et al., 1988).

Since university faculty home and family domains have higher inter-correlations as compared to other occupational groups (Sorcinelli & Near, 2002), it was though that faculty respondents might experience greater difficulty and stress in balancing their work and family responsibilities. The results of the data analysis in the present study supported the above assumption. For the sample as a whole, the task combining multiple roles was perceived as very difficult. Of the 321 respondents who reported having experienced difficulty in balancing work and family responsibilities, 234 (73%) rated the difficulty above the moderate level on a seven point Likert-type scale. However, 87 (27%) of the respondents perceived it as less difficult. This finding is consistent with Felstehausen et al. (1986) and St. John (2003), but it is quite interesting considering the fact that most of the faculty respondents indicated a heavy work load. Almost all respondents indicated that they carried out a combination of at least two or more of the following university functions: instruction, research,

advisement/counseling, committee works, community services, and management of a college or university project. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents had four or more household members.

C. Recommendations

i) Managerial and Policy Implications

Like most studies the results and conclusions presented in this study must be viewed within the context of several limitations. The sample was limited only to one university in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. Findings based on more diverse samples might yield different results. Caution is necessary in generalizing to groups who differ in level of education or who work in other geographic or organizational settings. The Saudi cultural orientations or value system of making pleasantly agreeable responses regardless of true feelings or thoughts may have distorted the results. The researchers have no way of knowing how closely the responses match the true feelings and thoughts of the faculty members under study.

In spite of the above limitations, the results provide important managerial and policy implications for university's administrators, educators and other professionals. Among others are:

1. Awareness on the part of KFUPM administrators regarding sources of greatest dissatisfaction and stress, especially in situations which they control, may result in academic decisions which might improve faculty morale, satisfaction and performance of the faculty staff. Based on the above findings, it is timely for the KFUPM management to seriously consider reviewing the "Fringe benefits" and "Salary and pay" of the faculty members so that these two aspects would be comparable if not better than other universities within the Middle Eastern region. Lack of serious efforts in this regard might create a situation where their would be a high turnover among the faculty members in KFUPM (especially the expatriates) who look for greener pastures in other universities;
2. With regard to "Opportunity for advancement," it is very clear that KFUPM is encouraging and provide avenues for faculty to pursue career advancement within the university. The fact that majority of respondents considered this aspect as one of the factors which lead to work dissatisfaction could be due to the process of applying for promotion. The present system for promotion is highly time-consuming and tedious. The management of KFUPM should be creative enough to develop a new system where the entire process could be expedite and manifest high level of professionalism and transparency;
3. Academicians may be encouraged to become more productive at the work place if work and family variables that perceived at the work if work and family variables that are perceived to have a negative effect on work performance are ameliorated. Likewise work and family variables perceived

as sources of positive effect on work performance should be reinforced or intensified. For example, based on the findings the two factors which contributed to family dissatisfaction among the respondents were "Housing conditions," and "Housing equipments". Thus, the management of the University particularly, the Housing Department should be more assertive in their efforts to upgrade the conditions of the houses especially the old ones; and refurnished them with better facilities and equipments;

4. Findings may also be used by administrators, faculty and other professionals in KFUPM as a basis for developing training programs to enhance coping skills/strategies for individuals who are faced with the challenges of multifaceted roles. Managing time, money, and energy will be particularly challenging in the future for faculty. For example, Schultz et al. (2002) pointed out that individuals who must combine work and family roles need help in developing time, money, and energy management skills so that quality time is available for family activities or work responsibilities. Equipping individuals with management skills and coping strategies for their multiple roles may help them have a more productive, less stressful, happy work and family life. The Department of Academic Development (DAD) in KFUPM should design some training programs focusing on some of these issues and topics.

References

Andres, T. D. 2005. Management by Filipino values: A sequel to understanding Filipino values. Quezon: Philippines. New Day.

Bird, G. W. & Ford, R. 2000. Sources of role strain among dual-career couples. Home Economics Research Journal, 14(2), 187-194.

Bryson, R. , Bryson. J.B. & Johnson, M.F. 2000. Family size, satisfaction, and Dual-career couples. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 3(1), 67-77.

Burge, P. L. & Culver, S. M. 1989. The reciprocal relationships between work and home satisfaction for home economics teachers. Home Economics Research Journal, 17 (4), 337-349.

Carnegie Foundation. 2005. The satisfied faculty. Change, 18 (2), 31-34.

Carnegie Foundation. 1985. The faculty: deeply troubled. Change, 17(5), 31-34.

Couch, S. & Felstehausen, G. 2004. Family relationships/child development. Paper Presented at the Meeting of American Home Economics Association Convention, 11-13 July.

Cripp, J. S. 2005. The relationship between family life satisfaction and job satisfaction for employed Hispanic and Anglo women. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Technology University.

Crowter, A.C. 1984. Spillover from family to work: work family interface. Human Relations, 37, 425-447

Felstehausen, G. 1983. Quality of life and job performances: An analysis of relationship between selected measures Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Felstehausen, G., Glosson, L. , & Couch, A. S., 1986. A study to determine the relationship between the workplace and the home: Final report. Lubbock, Texas University, College of Home Economics, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 890).

Goldsmith, E. 2002. Work and family: Theory and application. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality. 3 (4), 60-69.

Gould, D. & Werbel, J. D. 2000. Work involvement: A comparison of dual wage earner and single wage earner families. Ames Psychology Association, 68 (2), 313-319.

Grant, L. Simpson, L.A. & Rong, X. L. 1990. Gender, parenthood, and work hours of physicians. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52 (1), 39-49

Greenhaus, J. H. 2002. The intersection of work and family roles: Individual, Interpersonal;, and organizational issues. In E. Goldsmith (Ed), Work and family: Theory, research and application (Special Issue). Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3 (4), 23-44.

Greninger, S.A., Hampton, V. L., Kitt, K.A. & Durett, M.E. 1986. Higher Education home economics program in changing economics environment. Home Economics Research Journal, 14(3), 271-278.

Kim, J. O., Muller, C. W. 1978. Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practice Issues. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kanter, R. M. 1977. Work and family in the United States: A critical review and agenda for research and policy. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

King, W. L & Hautaluoma, J.E. 2005. Comparison of job satisfaction, life satisfaction and performance of over-educated and other workers. Journal of Social Psychology, 127, 421-433.

Maslow, A. 1970. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper Row.

McGee , G. W. & Ford, R. C. 1997. Faculty research productivity and intention to change positions. Review in Higher Education, 24(3), 1-16.

Near, J. P. & Soccinelli, M. D. 1986. Work & life away from work: Predictors of faculty satisfaction. Research in Higher Education, 25(4), 377-391.

Paolucci, B. & Ching, D. 1982. Myths and realities of work and family: Implications For home economics educators. In H.T. Spitze (Ed.) Proceedings Silver Jubilee Conference. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics (pp.44-50). Champaign, Illinois: American Home Economics Association.

Rahat, I. 2000. Women administrators' career paths in higher education: Experience and perspectives. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50(5), 1157-A.

Razali, M.Z. 2006. The relationship between family and career-related factors and organizational commitment: A case of Malaysian managers**.** Cambridge Business Review, vol. 1, 324-336.

Schultz, J. B. 1975. Job satisfaction, Life satisfaction, and self-concept of home Economics college faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

Schultz, J.B. & Chung, J.L. 2000, Impact of home and family Satisfaction on job satisfaction and productivity of faculty. Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Annual Meeting, Dallas, Texas.

Schultz, J. B. Chung, Y.L. & Henderson, C. G. 2002, December). Work/family concerns of university faculty. In E. Goldsmith (Ed.), work and family: Theory, research and application (Special Issue). Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3(4), 249-264.

Schuster, J. H. & Bowen, H. R. 2002. The faculty at risk. Change, 17(5), 13-21.

Sorcinelli, M. D. & Near, J. P. 2002. Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. Journal of Higher Eduction, 60(1), 59-80.

St. John, N. W. 2003. The relationships of work, home and family to the satisfaction of Florida home economics teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Taylor, C. T. & Spencer, B. A. 1988. Lifestyle patterns of University Women: Implications for family/career decision modeling in E. Goldsmith, (Ed.), Work And family: Theory, research and application (Special Issue). Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3(4), 265-278.

Voydanoff, P. 2002. The implications of work family relationships for productivity. Scarsdale, N. Y.: Work in American Institute.

Wangphanich, P. 2003. Job satisfaction of faculty members at Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.