

## RELATING INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHICS, WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT AND DECISION MAKING STYLES OF FACULTY MEMBERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION SECTOR OF PAKISTAN

RANA RASHID REHMAN<sup>1</sup> AND AJMAL WAHEED KHAN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Management Sciences, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

[Rashidrehman29@gmail.com](mailto:Rashidrehman29@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>School of Management Sciences, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

[Awkhan2@yahoo.com](mailto:Awkhan2@yahoo.com)

**ABSTRACT.** *This study examines the work-family conflict and decision making styles of faculty members in higher education sector of Pakistan. This describes the impact of work-family conflict on decision making styles of faculty members. Study also highlighted the role of individual demographics in predicting the work-family conflict and decision making styles. Three hypotheses are generated for the present research work including; (i), work-family conflict has significant impact on the decision making styles of faculty members; (ii), there is significant difference of work-family conflict of faculty members based on gender, marital status and university sector; and, (iii) there are significant differences of preferred decision making styles of faculty members based on gender, marital status and university sector. Questionnaire method is utilized to collect data from the targeted sample. A total of 489 questionnaires were distributed from which 352 received back with a response rate of 72%. Simple linear regression analysis is utilized to test hypotheses  $H_1$  while  $t$ -test analysis, Mann Whitney  $U$  test, ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis test are used to study hypotheses  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ . Results of the regression analysis for hypothesis  $H_1$  suggest that work-family conflict negatively predicts rational and intuitive decision making styles and positively predicts avoidant and spontaneous decision making styles while no association found with dependent decision making style. Comparative analysis based on individual demographics for hypotheses  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  describes that gender; marital status and sector of employment of faculty members influence their work-family conflict and decision making styles. All of the hypotheses were partially supported based on the current research findings. This research work describes both academic and professional issues and its findings can be comprehensively utilized for the betterment of higher education sector of Pakistan.*

**Keywords:** *Demographics, Work-Family Conflict, Decision Making Styles, Higher Education*

**1. Introduction.** Education has got its importance for individual development in this present age. The core function of the higher education institutions around the world, is to develop the people mentally and spiritually so, they become useful resource for the country in terms of country development and prosperity. In case of Pakistan, there are about 150's higher education institutions ([www.hec.gov.pk](http://www.hec.gov.pk)) which are departing quality education to their customers for the sole purpose of country development. However, the rapid change in economic development during last few years has

led the organizations towards several challenges. Every organization is tried to meet these challenges for sustainable development. To meet upcoming challenges and changing world scenario, organizations lead towards the change in organizational structures and culture. Due to which, work setups also changes such as downsizing, acquisitions, mergers and technological changes.

In the similar pattern, changing in work set up lead the employees towards complex jobs to perform as they are more involved in their jobs compared to last decades. The demanding jobs, long working hours, struggling job tasks, work pressure and use of rapidly changing technology make it difficult for working individual to maintain a balance between work and family life. Creating a balance with family and job responsibilities is a dilemma for the employees and almost impossible due to tempestuous work environment, and rapid economic development across the world which resulted in high demanding jobs and long working hours. This state of affairs leads towards a greatest challenge i.e., work-family conflict for human resource management. Work-family conflict can be defined as incompatibility between work and family life or as push and pull between family and work responsibilities.

In the span of life, a working individual perform dual type of role which include role from family as being father / mother, sibling, friend, spouse etc., and role from work such as being employer, worker etc. In performing these roles, individuals have to take many routine decisions as well as strategic decisions which have long lasting impact on their role performances. However, a quality decision making by an individual leads him / her towards satisfied life while poor decision making in performing work or non-work roles may result in certain incompatibilities such as work-family conflict.

## **2. Literature Review**

**2.1. Work-Family Conflict (WFC).** Conflict occurs in all life activities and becoming devastating part of them. Conflict then is an inconsistency that could occur between people or entities like groups and organizations or may exist between man and man, man and woman, man and his own self, and man and social groups, nature etc. Amongst this work-family conflict results from an imbalance between work and family life. More than 75 years ago, many employees in the US were only conscious about their working hours, however since World War II, largely because of labor unions, employees became more conscious of working fewer hours and better pays (Schor, 1991). While during the last few years employees are demanding even fewer work hours because they want to get balance their work and family life (Akintayo, 2010). Working overtime incurs cost on family life (Cole, 2004) or if the work is demanding, it may results in negative family outcomes and vice versa (Adebola, 2005). Both Americans (Frone, Russel & Cooper, 1992) and European (Kinnunen & Maunao, 1998) employed parent's experience 40% to even 78% work-family conflict in certain aspects.

In the literature, work-family conflict is defined in different ways and one can categorizes them in two group of definitions i.e., (i) Work-family conflict can be defined as a source of stress that shows a lack of overall fit between work and family life (Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996; Frone et al., 1992; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997); and, (ii) work-family conflict is a form of inter-role conflict in which role pressures from the work and family spheres are jointly inconsistent in some ways (Flippo, 2005; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

In the last few years, a great deal of attention has been given to learn more about work-family conflict and its influence on various outcomes (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999). Netermeyer et al. (1996) define work-family conflict by identifying the three forms of it as a form of inter-role conflict in which time devoted to job, general demands of job and strain produced by the job hinder with family related responsibilities. Most common typologies classify work-family conflict in three forms which includes (a) time; (b) behavior; and, (c) strain based work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Stephens & Sommer, 1996; Carlson, 1999).

As described earlier, during last few years a great pact of attention according to Carlson and Perrewe (1999) has been given to study work-family conflict and its sway on various outcomes. Work-family conflict is reflected as a potential source of stress that has negative impact on behavior and well-being (Geurts, Kompier, Roxburgh & Houtman, 2003). A cross sectional study by Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) identified that work-family conflict associated with various negative work and stress related outcomes. Researchers such as Amstad, Meier, Fasel, Elfering, and Semmer (2011); Bellavia and Frone (2004) categorize the consequences of work-family conflict in three ways i.e., (a) family related; (b) work related; and, (c) domain unspecific outcomes. Both directions i.e., WIF and FIW of work-family conflict are

linked with family related outcomes such as family satisfaction (Cardenas, Major, & Bernas, 2004), family related stress (Swanson & Power, 1999), decrease in family well-being (Burke, 1988), marital satisfaction (Voydanoff, 2005). Work related outcomes such as job satisfaction (Burke, 1988; Frone et al., 1992; Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Kiewitz, 1999), organization commitment (Aryee, Srinivas, & Tan, 2005), absenteeism (Kirchmeyer & Cohen, 1999), intention to quit (Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001), turnover (Burke, 1988, Frone et al., 1992) work-related strain (Netemeyer, Alejandro, & Boles, 2004), occupational burnout (Peeters, Montgomery, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2005, Frone et al., 1992) and organizational citizenship behavior (Netemeyer, Maxham & Pullig, 2005). Lastly, domain unspecific outcomes of work-family conflict also found to be related with both direction of work-family conflict such as psychological strain (Kelloway, Gottlieb & Barham, 1999), life satisfaction (Frone et al., 1992; Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003), depression (Vinokur, Pierce & Buck, 1999), somatic complaints and abuse (Peeters, Jonge, Janssen & Linden, 2004; Grzywacz & Bass, 2003). However, little attention has been given to study work-family conflict in relation to individual or group decision making behavior for comprehensive understanding that is; how work-family conflicts can affect individual / group decision making behaviors.

In addition to this, researchers claim that other demographical characteristics of an individual such as gender (Parasurman & Simmers, 2001; Loerch, Russell, & Rush, 1989; Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991; Wallace, 1999; Behson, 2002; Nielson, Carlson, & Lankau, 2001) and marital status (Akintayo, 2010; Rehman & Waheed, 2012) also have an effect on work-family conflict. Though, catholic work-family conflict reduces the quality of employees' lives and their relationships with other family members (MacDermid, 2005).

**2.2. Work-Family Conflict and Decision Making.** Individuals and couples often develop habits for how they will respond to work-family conflict that arises in everyday life (Medved, 2004). However, not every decision to settle work-family conflict is covered by these routine decisions. When an individual establish an ongoing and complex nature of work-family conflict related decision making and the influence of these decisions (Medved, 2004; Shumate & Fulk, 2004), researchers may provide value to explore these decisions made by individual on that particular incidents of work-family conflict. Past researches such as Greenhaus and Powell (2003); Netemeyer, Boles, and McMurrian (1996) have focused on the phenomenon of ongoing work-family conflict and the decision processes through which people manage work-family conflict incidents (Greenhaus & powell, 2006) while slight attention has been given to after work-family conflict impact on individual decision making processes. Although, many researchers for example, Carlson and Perrewe (1999); Greenhaus and Parasuraman (1994); Thompson, Beauvais and Lyness (1999) argue that ongoing support from role sender diminishes the level of work-family conflict but little is known about how the work-family conflict afterwards affects individual decision making.

Basically, term decision making is repeatedly utilized in career development and behavioral studies than decision making literature (Scott & Bruce, 1995). Keegan (1984) applied this term in to management as a psychological contribution towards decision making. Decision making have been defined in terms of individual phenomena of selection to achieve desired state of affairs (Shull, Delbeq & Cummings, 1970) or a process of choosing among alternatives (Miller & byrners, 2001; Gupta & Khanna, 2004). In management perspective, Decision making have been studied at three levels i.e., (a) individual for example, Tversky and Kahneman (1974) used individual level approach by determining the effect of personal cognitive biases and heuristics on one's choices; (b) group for example, Schweiger, Sandberg and Ragan (1986) take group approaches towards decision making; and, (c) organizational level for example, Miles and Snow (1978) typology of defenders, prospectors, analyzers and reactors recommend that it is appropriate for organizational level decision making. However, it is generally discussed that individual decision making is most important to study because its individuals behaviors which leads towards effective group level decision making and ultimately, towards successful organizational level decision making. Harren (1979) and Driver (1979) argue that individual model of defining, interpreting and reacting to decisional tasks denotes his / her decision making styles (DMS).

In relation to decision making literature, several studies acknowledged the factors that influence decision making behavior of an individual. Rowe and Boulgarides (1992) identified that individual personal needs such as security, support, recognition and awards have an impact on decision making process of an individual. Furthermore, researchers for instance, Ali (1989); Ali and Al-Shakis (1985); England, Dhirga and Agarwal (1974); Flowes, Hughes, Myers and Myers (1975) and Goodale (1973) summarize that national origin, type of industry, organization type and size, education, socioeconomic status and management level influence decision making style of an individual. Schwella and Ballard (1996) classify decision making on the basis of organizational sector and claims that decision making in public sector is highly complex and unpredictable in nature as compared to private sector organizations while Schmidt

and Posner (1982) argue that public sector workers are more inclined towards feelings and impression rather than reasoning and enquiry. Nature of task also influence decision making style as Spice and Sadler (2005) determine that choice of decision making depends upon the type of decision; people used intuitive decision making in familiar task while rational decision making in unfamiliar tasks. Many researchers found that personal factors such as cultural background (Brew, Hesketh & Taylor, 2001; Yi & Park's, 2003; Mau, 2000; Weber & Hsee, 2000), Gender difference (Brenner & Bromer, 1981; Loden, 1985; Hablemitoglu & Yildirim, 2008), Aging (Kim, Hasher & Zacks, 2007; Chen & Sun's, 2003), experience (Bergstrand, 2001; Callan & Proctor, 2000; Muchinsky, 2007) and emotional status (Spice and Sadler, 2005) influence decision making of an individual. However, much remains to be done to get comprehensive understanding of the relationship between individual's decision making behavior and role of emotions in this regard.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Hypotheses

Based on the review of literature above, this study has following hypotheses:

- H<sub>1</sub>: Work-family conflict has significant impact on the decision making styles of faculty members.
- H<sub>2</sub>: There is significant difference of work-family conflict of faculty members based on gender, marital status and university sector.
- H<sub>3</sub>: There are significant differences of preferred decision making styles of faculty members based on gender, marital status and university sector.

**3.2 Sample:** Information regarding participants (Table 1) denotes that seventy-two (72.2%) percent of the respondents are male while rest i.e., 27.8 percent are the female faculty members. Since the country like Pakistan, there is little strength of females which are working in higher education sector. Similarly, they consist of 47.4 percent of single status, 50.9 percent married and 1.7 percent of others status including divorced, widows and separated faculty members.

Respondent's data further identify that there are 47.2 percent lectures, 30.7 percent assistant professor, 13.9 percent of associate professors and 8.2 percent are serving as full professors including 76.7 percent from public sector universities and remaining 23.3 percent are associated with private sector universities. Comparatively, a smaller amount of participants from the private sector universities are due to less number of private sector universities chartered by federal government in Pakistan.

**Table 1**  
*Demographical Characteristics of the Respondents*

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	254	72.2
Female	98	27.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Marital Status		
Single	167	47.4
Married	179	50.9
Others	6	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Job Position		
Lecturer	166	47.2
Assistant Professor	108	30.7
Associate Professor	49	13.9
Professor	29	8.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.0</b>
University Sector		
Public	270	76.7
Private	82	23.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Sample Size = 352

### 3.3 Measurements

**3.3.1 Work-Family Conflict Scale.** This is an 18 items scale developed by Carlson (2000) which measures work-family conflict construct. Results of the reliability tests show that work-family conflict scale has alpha reliability of 0.770. Each item is measured on 5 point Likert rating scale with 1 representing strongly disagree to 5 representing strongly agree.

**3.3.2 Decision Making Styles Scale.** This is a 25 items adapted scale originally developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) which measures the individual decision making styles. Decision making styles scale have alpha reliability of 0.595 for rational; 0.619 for intuitive decision making style; 0.574 for dependent decision making styles; 0.611 for avoidant decision making style and 0.610 for spontaneous decision making style. Five items are utilized to measure each decision style that is rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous decision making style. All the responses are measured using 5 point Likert scale with 1 representing strongly disagree to 5 denoting strongly agree with the given item.

**3.3.3 Individual Demographics Scale.** In order to collect respondent's personal characteristics and to make necessary comparisons, this study also measures the respondent's gender, marital status, job position and sector of employment based on the standard discrete scales.

**3.4 Procedures.** All respondents were approached through university administration and appointments were taken from the faculty members. After concisely explaining the nature of the study, researcher solicited individual's voluntary consent prior to handing them the packet of scales to complete. Most of the faculty members respond within couple of hours after the questionnaires distributed to them while others were collected back within three to four days from the day they were distributed. Respondents who declined not became part of the sample. All the questionnaires were self-administered and completed at respondent's leisure. Issues pertaining to scales items were addressed and necessary clarification were given to the respondents.

## 4. Results

**4.1 WFC and Decision Making Styles.** To study the impact of work-family conflict on decision making styles ( $H_1$ ) of the faculty members, simple linear regression model is utilized. The results of the regression analyses are depicted in Table 2.

**4.1.1 WFC and rational decision making style.** Regression equation is calculated by taking work-family conflict as predictor variable and rational decision making style as criterion variable. Results of the regression analysis suggest that 4.2% variance in rational decision making style is explained by work-family conflict as  $R^2 = .042$ ,  $F(1, 351) = 16.048$ . It is determined that work-family conflict has negative impact on rational decision making style of an individual. The regression equation 1 for this relationship suggest that the rational decision making style will decrease by 0.082 with per unit increment in WFC.

$$\text{Rational DMS} = 19.353 - 0.082 \text{ WFC} \quad (1)$$

**4.1.2 WFC and intuitive decision making style.** In the same, results of the regression analysis calculated by taking work-family conflict as predictor and intuitive decision making style as criterion variable suggest that work-family conflict negatively predicts intuitive decision making style as  $\beta = -.049$ ,  $t(351), p = .005$ . Results of the analysis further reflects that WFC caused significant variance of 1.9% in dependent decision making style as  $R^2 = .019$ ,  $F(1, 351) = 9.148$ ,  $p = .005$  and regression equation for intuitive decision making style are depicted in equation 2.

$$\text{Intuitive DMS} = 14.018 - 0.049 \text{ WFC} \quad (2)$$

**4.1.3 WFC and dependent decision making style.** Regression analysis is calculated by considering work-family conflict as independent and dependent decision making style as dependent variable. Results of the analysis indicates that work-family conflict has no influence on dependent decision making style as  $\beta = -.006$ ,  $t(351), p = .624$  as depicted in Table 2.

**4.1.4 WFC and avoidant decision making style.** Taking the same predictor and criterion variables for the regression analysis, equation is calculated for avoidant decision making style as shown in equation 3.

$$\text{Avoidant DMS} = 8.775 + 0.142 \text{ WFC} \quad (3)$$

Regression equation suggest that work-family conflict significantly and positively predicts avoidant decision making style such as one unit increase in WFC caused 14.2% increase in avoidant decision making style as  $\beta = .142$ ,  $t(351)$ ,  $p = .000$ . Statistical data for the regression analysis further reflects that a total of 14.4% variance in avoidant decision making style is explained by WFC as  $R^2 = .152$ ,  $F(1, 351) = 64.101$ ,  $p = .000$ .

**4.1.5 WFC and spontaneous decision making style.** Further to WFC as predictor variable for decision making styles, it is determined that work-family conflict also positively predicts spontaneous decision making style. Regression equation for this decision making style is given in equation 4.

$$\text{Spontaneous DMS} = 11.825 + 0.121 \text{ WFC} \quad (4)$$

From the equation, it is concluded that work-family conflict caused 12.1% increase in spontaneous decision making style with per unit change in WFC as  $\beta = .121$ ,  $t(351)$ ,  $p = .000$ . A total of 10.3% variance in spontaneous decision making styles is explained by WFC as  $R^2 = .103$ ,  $F(1, 351) = 41.153$ ,  $p = .000$ .

**Table 2**  
*Regression Analysis of Work-Family Conflict and Decision Making Styles*

Model		SE	B	T	F	R <sup>2</sup>	p
Constant	19.353	1.214		15.937	16.408	.042	.000
Rational	-.082	.020	-.212	-4.051			
Constant	14.018	1.040		13.475	7.948	.019	.005
Intuitive	-.049	.017	-.149	-2.819			
Constant	8.886	.754		11.791	.241	-.002	.624
Dependent	-.006	.013	-.026	-.491			
Constant	8.775	1.066		8.232	64.101	.152	.000
Avoidant	.142	.018	.393	8.006			
Constant	11.825	1.137		10.404	41.153	.103	.000
Spontaneous	.121	.019	.324	6.415			

*Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352*

**4.2 WFC and Demographical Characteristics.** The hypothesis H<sub>2</sub> entails that there is significant differences of work-family conflict of faculty members exist based on gender, marital status and university sector. It is clear from Tables 3, that gender of an individual has no impact on the level of work-family conflict of faculty members in higher education sector of Pakistan as  $p > 0.05$ .

**Table 3**  
*T-test Analysis of Work-Family Conflict based on Gender Differences*

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	p
Work-Family Conflict	Male	254	59.5039	8.44126	.092	.927
	Female	98	59.4082	9.45400		

*Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352*

**Table 4***Mann-Whitney Test of Decision Making Styles based on Gender Differences*

	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>p</b>
Rational DMS	Male	254	171.93	.173
	Female	98	188.35	
Intuitive DMS	Male	254	169.57	.038
	Female	98	194.46	
Dependent DMS	Male	254	176.61	.974
	Female	98	176.22	
Avoidant DMS	Male	254	177.30	.811
	Female	98	174.43	
Spontaneous DMS	Male	254	181.26	.155
	Female	98	164.15	

*DMS = Decision making style, Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352*

It is further clear from Tables 5, that that there is no significant differences exist among single male (M = 58.48, SD = 8.65), married male (M = 60.25, SD = 8.66) and other male (M = 63.83, SD = 10.26) status faculty members based on the level of work-family conflict as  $F = 2.567, p = .078$ .

**Table 5***One-way ANOVA Analysis of Work-Family Conflict based on Marital Status*

	<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>
Work-Family Conflict	Single	167	58.4850	8.6538	2.567	.078
	Married	179	60.2570	8.6609		
	Others	6	63.8333	10.2648		

*Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352***Table 6***Kruskal-Wallis Test of Decision Making Styles based on Marital Status*

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>p</b>
Rational DMS	Single	167	187.29	.034
	Married	179	164.34	
	Others	6	238.92	
Intuitive DMS	Single	167	184.54	.195
	Married	179	167.72	
	Others	6	214.67	
Dependent DMS	Single	167	178.46	.449
	Married	179	173.08	
	Others	6	223.92	
Avoidant DMS	Single	167	164.62	.107
	Married	179	186.83	
	Others	6	198.92	
Spontaneous DMS	Single	167	162.13	.034
	Married	179	188.63	
	Others	6	214.67	

DMS = Decision making style, Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352

Result of the analysis shows that there is statistically significant difference prevails between male and female faculty members as shown in Tables 7. Public sector employees (M = 60.46, SD = 8.51) faces high level of work-family conflict as compared to private sector faculty members (M = 56.23, SD = 8.64) as  $t = 3.926$ ,  $p = .000$ . The hypothesis H<sub>2</sub> is partially supported by the findings of the tests of differences.

**Table 7**  
*T-test Analysis of Work-Family Conflict based on University Sector*

	University Sector	N	Mean	SD	t	p
<b>Work-Family Conflict</b>	Public	270	60.4630	8.5183	3.926	.000
	Private	82	56.2317	8.6442		

Significance level is at 0.05, S

**Table 8**  
*Mann-Whitney Test of Decision Making Styles based on University Sector*

Variables	University Sector	N	Mean	p
Rational DMS	Public	270	166.50	.001
	Private	82	209.41	
Intuitive DMS	Public	270	167.10	.002
	Private	82	207.44	
Dependent DMS	Public	270	167.83	.003
	Private	82	205.04	
Avoidant DMS	Public	270	189.06	.000
	Private	82	135.16	
Spontaneous DMS	Public	270	190.40	.000
	Private	82	130.73	

DMS = Decision making style, Significance level is at 0.05, Sample Size = 352

**4.3 DMS and Demographical Characteristics.** The hypothesis H<sub>3</sub> entails that there is significant differences exist among decision making styles of faculty members based on gender, marital status and university sector Mann-Whitney test is utilized to study the degree of differences of faculty decision making styles based on gender and university sector while Kruskal-Wallis test is employed to study the differences based on marital status. It is clear from Table 4, that no significant differences based on gender differences exist among rational, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous decision making styles of members of faculty. Analysis further shows that female faculty members utilize more intuitive decision making style as compared to male faculty members as significance level is less than 0.05 for this test.

With regards to marital status , It is determined that there is significant difference exist among single, married and other status faculty members based on rational ( $p = 0.34$ ) and spontaneous ( $p = .034$ ) decision making styles while no differences exist based on intuitive ( $p = .195$ ), dependent ( $p = .449$ ) and avoidant ( $p = .107$ ) decision making styles. It is concluded from Table 6, that other status faculty members employ more rational and spontaneous decision making style other than married and single status faculty members.

From Table 8, it is analyzed that faculty members working in private sector universities are more frequently use rational, intuitive and dependent decision making styles as compared to public sector employees. Results shows that avoidant and spontaneous decision making styles are more frequently used styles in public sector faculty members as compared to private sector faculty members. The findings of the differences tests suggest that hypothesis H<sub>3</sub> is partially supported.



**5. Discussion:** This research work is proposed to study the impact of work-family conflict on individual's decision making styles in higher education sector of Pakistan. In addition, individual's demographical information is utilized to study the potential differences based on the study variables including work-family conflict, decision making styles. At first, no gender differences are examined based on work-family conflict in general as  $t(351) = .092, p = .927$ . Findings of the current study are not supported by the previous researcher such as Parasurman & Simmers (2000); Loerch, Russell, and Rush (1989); Wallace (1999); Behson (2002) and Nielson, Carlson, and Lankau (2001) who argues that work-family conflict has significant differences based on gender. In Pakistan, there is system of joint families and people love to share their work within their family members therefore, there is less chances for either of the gender to experience highly intense work-family conflict as other members of the family provide support to each other. With regards to decision making styles, this study investigate that female ( $M = 194.46$ ) faculty members used high level of intuitive decision making style as compared to males ( $M = 169.57$ ) though none of the difference are found between male and female members of faculty based on rational ( $p = .173$ ), dependent ( $p = .974$ ), avoidant ( $p = .811$ ), and; spontaneous decision making style ( $p = .155$ ). It is clear from the given literature that very low amount of research have been done in the past to study the demographical differences based on decision making styles. Although, this study signifies that intuitive decision making style is the more prevailing decision style in females as compared to male individuals though further research studies are needed to validated the findings of the current research work.

To study the potential difference based on marital status, ANOVA analysis and Kruskal-Wallis test is employed according to the appropriateness of the data. It is analyzed that no potential differences among single, married and others status individuals are found based on work-family conflict as  $F(1, 351) = 2.567, p = .078$ . This study partially supported the findings made by (Akintayo, 2010; Rehman & Waheed, 2012) that work-family conflict is influenced by marital status of an individual. Considering decision making styles to diagnose the degree of differences among single, married and others status faculty members, It is concluded that others status faculty members are highly employed rational decision making styles than their counter parts, and afterward single status are on second that utilize high rational decision making styles as compared to married faculty members. It is further found that others status individuals also make use of spontaneous decision making style than single and married individuals while the married individuals employed spontaneous decision making style in greater frequency as compared to single status individuals. However, this study reveals no significant differences of marital status based on intuitive, dependent and avoidant decision making styles.

In order to highlight the potential differences based on sector of employment, t-test and Mann Whitney U test is utilized. It is determined that public sector faculty members experiences high level of work-family conflict ( $M = 60.46, SD = 8.51$ ) as compared to private sector faculty members. Findings of the present research contradicts with the findings made by Rehman and Waheed (2012) who argued that no difference is exist between public and private sector faculty members. Though the findings made by these researchers was based on smaller sample size which may be in result of no significant difference based on sector of employment. With regards to decision making styles, faculty members employed in private sector universities are utilize high level of rational ( $M = 209.41$ ), intuitive ( $M = 207.44$ ) and dependent ( $M = 205.04$ ) decision making styles than the rational ( $M = 166.50$ ), intuitive ( $M = 167.10$ ) and dependent ( $M = 167.83$ ) decision making style employed by public sector employees. In private sector universities of Pakistan, there is high level implementation of rules and regulations as compared to public sector and members of faculty in private sector have to follow them with minimal chances of errors. Therefore, faculty members employed in private sector universities have to utilized positive styles of decision making including rational, intuitive and dependent decision making style to get minimal errors in decision making. In addition, it is further identified that public sector individuals employed high level of avoidant ( $M = 189.06$ ) and spontaneous ( $M = 190.45$ ) decision making style than their counterparts.

**6. Conclusions and Recommendations:** It can be concluded from the present research work that work-family conflict is an important determinant of faculty decision making behaviors working in higher education sector of Pakistan. This highlights that work-family conflict is a negative predictor of individual decision making behavior as it inversely predict rational and intuitive decision making styles. The study findings also clarifies that work-family conflict results in the high usage of avoidant and spontaneous decision making styles by an individual which ultimately declines the quality of decision making. This signifies the importance of faculty training needs regarding the effective management of individual's conflicts.. In addition, this study also highlights the importance of individual's demographics including gender, marital status and sector of employment in predicting work-family conflict and decision making behavior therefore, the university administration should consider the findings of the present study during the phase of policy

making for different groups of faculty members. This is identified that individual conflicts more specifically the work-family conflict effects faculty decision making processes which ultimately effects their teaching quality. Based on this, the findings of this study can be useful to improve the teaching quality of faculty members by assessing and providing necessary trainings programs which ultimately increases the overall quality of higher education institutions in Pakistan.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Akintayo, D. I. (2010). Work-family conflict and organization commitment among industrial workers in Nigeria. *Journal of Psychology and counseling*, 2(1), 1-8.
- [2] Adebola, H. E. (2005). Emotional expression at workplace: Implications for work-family role ambiguities. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(21), 102-115.
- [3] Cole, D. W. (2004). Social reflection on women playing dual roles: An assessment of women in leadership positions. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 7(2), 126-132.
- [4] Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Cooper M. L. (1992) Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 65-78.
- [5] Kinnunen, U. & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict among employed women and men in Finland. *Human Relations*, 51(2), 157-177.
- [6] Frone, M. R., Russell, M., & Barnes, G. M. (1996). Work-family conflict, gender, and health related outcomes: A study of employed parents in two community samples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1, 57-69.
- [7] Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress*. New York: Wiley
- [8] Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. H. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76-88.
- [9] Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, 25(2), 513-540.
- [10] Carlson, D. (1999). Personality and role variables as predictors of three forms of work -family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 55, 236-53.
- [11] Netemeyer, R.G., Maxham, J.G., & Pullig, C. (2005). Conflicts in the work-family interface: Links to job stress, customer service, employee performance, and customer purchase intent. *Journal of Marketing*, 69, 130-143.
- [12] Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- [13] Netemeyer, Richard, G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrin, R. (1996). Development and validation of work-family conflict and family-work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400-410.
- [14] Stephens, G.K., & Sommer, S.M. (1996). The measurement of work to Family conflict. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 56(3), 475-486.
- [15] Geurts, S. A. E., Kompier, M. A. J., Roxburgh, S., & Houtman, I. L. D. (2003). Does work-home interference mediate the relationship between workload and wellbeing? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 532-559.
- [16] Amstad, F.T., Meier, L. L., Fasel, U., Elfering, A., & Semmer, N.K. (2011). A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 16(2), 151-169.
- [17] Bellavia, G., & Frone, M. (2004). Work-family conflict in Barling, J., Kelloway, E.K., & Frone, M.R. (Eds), *Handbook of Work Stress*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [18] Cardenas, R. A., Major, D. A., & Bernas, K. H. (2004). Exploring work and family distractions: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11, 346-365.
- [19] Swanson, V., & Power, K.G. (1999). Stress, satisfaction and role conflict in dual-doctor partnerships. *Community, Work & Family*, 2, 67-88.
- [20] Burke, R. J. (1988). Some antecedents and consequences of work-family conflict. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12(3), 287-302.
- [21] Voydanoff, P. (2005). Social integration, work-family conflict and facilitation, and job and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 666-679.

- [22] Perrewe, P.L., Hochwarter, W.A., & Kiewitz, C. (1999). Value attainment: An explanation for the negative effects of work–family conflict on life satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 318–326.
- [23] Aryee, S., Srinivas, E.S., & Tan, H.H. (2005). Rhythms of life: Antecedents and outcomes of work–family balance in employed parents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 132–146.
- [24] Kirchmeyer, C., & Cohen, A. (1999). Different strategies for managing the work/non-work interface: A test for unique pathways to work outcomes. *Work & Stress, 13*, 59–73.
- [25] Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance as mid-turbulence on international assignments: Work–family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management, 27*, 99–121.
- [26] Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gilley, K. M., & Luk, D. M. (2001). Struggling for balance as mid-turbulence on international assignments: Work–family conflict, support and commitment. *Journal of Management, 27*, 99–121.
- [27] Netemeyer, R.G., Maxham, J.G., & Pullig, C. (2005). Conflicts in the work–family interface: Links to job stress, customer service, employee performance, and customer purchase intent. *Journal of Marketing, 69*, 130–143.
- [28] Kelloway, E.K., Gottlieb, B.H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 337–346.
- [29] Greenhaus, J. H, Collins, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2003). The relation between work –family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 63*, 510–531.
- [30] Vinokur, A.D., Pierce, P.F., & Buck, C.L. (1999). Work–family conflicts of women in the Air Force: Their influence on mental health and functioning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 865–878.
- [31] Peeters, M.C.W., de Jonge, J., Janssen, P.P.M., & Linden, V. S. (2004). Work–home interference, job stressors, and employee health in a longitudinal perspective. *International Journal of Stress Management, 11*, 305–322.
- [32] Grzywacz, J. G., & Bass, B. L. (2003). Work, family, and mental health: Testing different models of work–family fit. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 248–262.
- [33] Parasurman, S., & Simmers, C. A. (2001). Type of employment, work–family conflict and well-being: A comparative study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 551–568.
- [34] Loerch, K. J., Russell, J. E., & Rush, M. C. (1989). The relationships among family domain variables and work–family conflict for men and women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35*, 288–308.
- [35] Gutek, B.A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(4), 560–568.
- [36] Gutek, B.A., Searle, S., & Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work–family conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(4), 560–568.
- [37] Behson, S. J. (2002). Coping with family-to-work conflict: The role of informal work accommodations to family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*, 324–341.
- [38] Nielson, T. R., Carlson, D. S., & Lankau, M. J. (2001). The supportive mentor as a means of reducing work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 364–381.
- [39] Rehman, R. R. & Waheed, A. (2012). Work–family conflict and organizational commitment: Study of faculty members in Pakistani universities. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 9*(2), 23–26.
- [40] MacDermid, S.M. (2005). Considering conflict between work and family. In E.E. Kossek & S.J. Lambert (Eds.), *Work and life integration: Organizational, cultural, and individual perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [41] Medved, C.E. (2004). The everyday accomplishment of work and family: Exploring practical actions in daily routines. *Communication Studies, 55*, 128–145.
- [42] Shumate, M., & Fulk, J. (2004). Boundaries and role conflict when work and family are co-located: A communication network and symbolic interaction approach. *Human Relations, 57*, 55–74.
- [43] Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2003). When work and family collide: Deciding between competing role demands. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90*, 291–303.
- [44] Greenhaus, J.H., & Powell, G.N. (2006). Managing incidents of work–family conflict: A decision-making perspective. *Human Relations, 59*(9), 1179–1212.
- [45] Carlson, D. S., & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor–strain relationship: An examination of work–family conflict. *Journal of Management, 25*(2), 513–540.

- [46] Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., & Williams, L. J. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, 56(2), 249-276.
- [47] Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work-family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54, 392-415.
- [48] Scott, & Bruce. (1995). Decision making styles: The development and assessment of new measure. *Educational and Psychological measurement*, 55, 818-831.
- [49] Keegan, W.J. (1984). *Judgement, choices and decions*. New York: Wiley
- [50] Shull, F.A., Delbeq, A.L., & Cummings, L.L. (1970). *Organizational Decisions*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- [51] Miller, D.C., & Byrnes, J.P. (2001). To achieve or not to achieve: A self-regulation perspective on adolescents' academic decision making. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(4), 677-685.
- [52] Gupta, M.P., & Khanna, R.B. (2004). *Quantitative techniques in decision making*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- [53] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.
- [54] Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.
- [55] Harren, V.A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 119-133.
- [56] Driver, M. J. (1979). Individual decision making and creativity. In Kerr S. (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior*. Columbus, OH: Grid publishing.
- [57] Rowe, A. J., & Boulgarides, J. D. (1992). *Managerial decision making: A guide to successful business decisions*. New York: McMillan
- [58] Ali, A., & Al-Shakis, A. (1985). Managerial value system for working in Saudi Arabia: An empirical investigation. *Group & Organization Studies*, 10(2), 135-151.
- [59] Ali, A. (1989). A comparative study of managerial beliefs about work in the Arab States. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 4, 95-112.
- [60] England, G., Dhirgra, O., & Agarwal, N. (1974). *The manager and the man*. Kent, OH: Kent State University
- [61] Flowers, V. C., Hughes, M., Myers, & Myers S. (1975). *Managerial values for working: An AMA survey report* American management association: New York
- [62] Schmidt, W. H., & Posner, B. Z. (1982). *Managerial values and expectations: The silent power in personal and organizational life*. New York: Amacom.
- [63] Brew, F. P., Hesketh, B., & Taylor, A. (2001). Individualist-collectivist differences in adolescent decision making and decision styles with Chinese and Anglos. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 1-19.
- [64] Spice., & Sadler S. (2005). An examination of general decision making style questionnaire in two UK samples. *Journal of Managerial psychology*, 20(2), 137-149.
- [65] Yi, J. S., & Park, S. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in decision making styles: A study of college students in five countries. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 65, 85-101.
- [66] Mau, W. C. (2000). Cultural differences in career decision making styles and self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 365-378.
- [67] Weber, E. U., & Hsee, S. K. (2000). Culture and individual judgment and decision making. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49(1), 32-61.
- [68] Brenner, O. C., & Bromer, J. A. (1981). Sex stereotypes and leader behavior as measured by the agreement scale for leadership behavior. *Psychological Review*, 48, 960-962.
- [69] Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys?* New York: Random House
- [70] Hablemitoglu, S., & Yildirim, F. (2008). The Relationship Between Perception of Risk and Decision Making Styles of Turkish University Students: A Descriptive Study of Individual Differences. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 4(2), 214-224.
- [71] Kim, S., Hasherrand, L., & Zacks, R. T. (2007). Aging and a benefit of distractibility. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14(2), 301-305.
- [72] Chen, Y., & Sun, Y. (2003). Age differences in financial decision making: Using simple heuristics. *Educational Gerontology*, 29(7), 627-635.
- [73] Bergstrand, B. (2001). Situating the estimate: Naturalistic decision making as an alternative to analytical decision making in the Canadian Forces.

- [74] Callan, J. & Proctor S. (2000). Tactical decision making under uncertainty: Experiments I, and II. *Technical Report*, 1821, April, Pacific Science and Engineering Group. California: SSC San Diego, Inc.
- [75] Muchinsky, P. M. (2007). *Psicología aplicada al trabajo*(8ªed.). Ciudad de México: Thomson.