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ABSTRACT

The research at hand focuses on **job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among female civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District**. Samples of 100 employees were used in the study. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire which consisted of the following sections:

(i) a biographical and occupational data questionnaire, (ii) Eum, Lee, and Paek’s (2007) Effort-Reward Imbalance questionnaire, (iii) Bedenia, Burke, and Moffat’s (1998) Short-form Work-family Conflict questionnaire, and (iv) Halpern’s (1966) Job Satisfaction questionnaire. The data were analyzed by means of Pearson’s Correlation Technique, Multiple Regression Analysis, and Analysis of Variance. The results showed that job satisfaction does not moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress. The study also found a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress and between work-family conflict and job satisfaction. It also showed that both work-family conflict and job satisfaction respectively accounted for a significant proportion of variance in occupational stress. The thesis ends with several recommendations for future research and for future professional or managerial practice.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and definition of variables

Much research has been done with regard to the relationship between work-family conflict and stress, and evidence suggests that job satisfaction can be regarded as a moderator of this relationship Kossek & Ozeki (1998). Spector (2000) supported this statement by saying job satisfaction is a reflection of good treatment. It is of great importance for managers of organizations to know whether this is indeed the case. Knowing this will help managers to create conditions that are favourable for the development of job satisfaction in their organizations in order to reduce both work-family conflict and the resulting occupational stress.

Job satisfaction can be defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience. Job satisfaction has also been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job, an affective reaction to one’s job, and an attitude towards one’s job. Lim & Ployhart (2004) argues that job satisfaction is an attitude that clearly distinguishes the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect, beliefs and behaviours. Job satisfaction refers to a variety of aspects of the job that influence a person’s level of satisfaction with it. Job satisfaction is of great importance because it seems to affect organizational behaviour.

The term "Job Satisfaction" was described by (Lim & Ployhart 2004) who observed it as a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say "I am satisfied with my job". Job Satisfaction is described as how people feel about their job and its different aspects. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs (Sekaran & Uma 1999). However, a more direct definition is provided by Temple & Gillespie (2009) who defines Job Satisfaction as the end state of feeling, the feeling that is experienced after a task is accomplished. This feeling could be negative or positive depending on the outcome of the task undertaken.
In today's world the effects of work-family conflict on females in the workplace are rather significant and have a large impact on how much effort employees put into their job and how work-family conflict results in stress. This occurs as a result of conflict between one's job and one's family life. One may go on to examine how work-family conflict results in one becoming stressed due to the many roles which many women have to fulfill, such as the role of a mother, wife and bread winner.

Greenhaus and Beutell (1985, as cited in Daalen, Willemsen & Sanders, 2006) define work-family conflict as conflict “in which the role pressure from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect”. Conflict is understood to arise when an individual has to perform multiple roles, such as worker, spouse, and parent. Each of these roles imposes demands on their incumbents, requiring time, energy, and commitment. They report that, as work-family conflict originates from various conditions, different forms of conflict are distinguished.

Work-family conflict is “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressure from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), such that participation in one domain becomes more difficult due to the demands of participation in the other domain and vice versa. Work-family conflict is considered to be bi-directional, i.e., work can interfere with family (work-to-family conflict; WFC) and family can interfere with work (family-to-work; FWC).

There are essentially three different, but overlapping, approaches to the definition and study of occupational stress (Lazarus, 1966; Aryee, Srinivas & Tan, 2005; Cox, 1978, 1990; Cox & Mackay, 1981; Fletcher, 1988, Cox, 1993). The first approach conceptualizes occupational stress as an aversive or noxious characteristic of the work environment, and, in related studies, it is treated as an independent variable – the environmental cause of ill health. The second approach defines occupational stress in terms of the common physiological effects of a wide range of aversive or noxious stimuli. It treats occupational stress as a dependent variable as a particular physiological response to a threatening or damaging environment. This has been
termed the ‘physiological approach’. The third approach conceptualizes occupational stress in terms of the dynamic interaction between the person and their work environment. When studied, stress is either inferred from the existence of problematic person-environment interactions or measured in terms of the cognitive processes and emotional reactions which underpin those interactions. This final approach has been termed the ‘psychological approach’. The engineering and physiological approaches are obvious among the earlier theories of stress, while the more psychological approaches characterize contemporary stress theory.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study sought to investigate the role of job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District of the Eastern Cape Province. The question to which an answer was sought in this study was whether the degree of job satisfaction makes any difference in the extent to which work-family conflict is associated with stress among these managers.

1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The research objectives were:

- To determine whether job satisfaction is a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress among female civil service managers.
- To determine to what extent job-satisfied and job-dissatisfied female civil service managers are experiencing occupational stress.
- To determine to what extent female civil service managers experiencing and not experiencing work family conflict also experience occupational stress.
1.4 HYPOTHESES

The following were the hypotheses of the study:

Hypothesis 1. 4.1

H₀: There is no significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress.

H₁: There is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress.

Hypothesis 1. 4.2

H₀: There is no significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress.

H₁: There is a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress.

Hypothesis 1. 4.3

H₀: There is no combined effect between job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately.

H₁: There is a combined effect between job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately.

Hypothesis 1. 4.4

H₀: Job satisfaction does not moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress.
H₁: Job satisfaction moderates the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress.

This means that: (i) high work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in high occupational stress, (ii) low work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will result in low occupational stress, (iii) low work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in a medium level of occupational stress, (iv) and high work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will also result in a medium level of occupational stress.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study was intended to lead to a better understanding of the relationship between work family conflict and occupational stress. It will also lead to better stress management and better work-family conflict management among managers of female staff in work organisations. The study was also meant to augment the academic literature on work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and stress and how these variables are inter-related.

1.6 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study will focus only on female managers in the Department of Education, and only in the King Williams’ Town District. Were it not for financial and time constraints, the study would have focused on a larger number of government departments and on a wider geographical area such as the entire Eastern Cape Province.

1.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical considerations will strictly be observed. Before starting the research permission to carry out the study will be requested from the top management of the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District. Participants’ right to confidentiality and the need for informed consent will be observed.
The principle of voluntary participation and anonymity will also be observed. A covering letter accompanying the questionnaire will be used to inform the participants of all this.

1.8 OUTLINE OF THE MINI-DISSERTATION

This mini-dissertation is arranged as follows:

Chapter 1: Background of the study

The chapter provides an introduction / background to the study, statement of the problem, research objectives, hypotheses, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, ethical considerations, and chapter outline.

Chapter 2: Literature review

This chapter reviews previous literature relating to the three variables that are the main focus of the study. The chapter also reviews literature relating to the relationships between these variables. It also reviews the theoretical perspectives underlying this study.

Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This chapter explains the research design followed on the study, the population, sample and sampling procedure, the research instruments, the data collection procedure, and the data analysis methods.

Chapter 4: The Results

This chapter reports the results of the study in relation to the reliability and validity of the measuring instruments and the hypotheses.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter discusses the results in relation to the hypotheses and to previous research findings. It also identifies the shortcomings of the study and makes recommendations for future research and professional managerial practice.

1.9 TIMEFRAME AND BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS

The study was carried out within a period of six months and approximately R5000 was used to cover costs.

1.10 CONCLUSION

In this chapter an introduction and background to the study have been provided, the research problem stated, the hypotheses, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, ethical considerations, the outline of the mini-dissertation and the time frame and budgetary considerations supplied.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter reviews previous literature relating to the three variables that are the main focus of the present study. In particular, the chapter reviews the definitions of the three variables that have appeared in the literature, it reviews the literature research relating to the interrelations among these variables as well as the theoretical perspectives underlying the study.

2.2 JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job, an affective reaction to one’s job and an attitude towards one’s job. Job satisfaction is an attitude but points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect emotion, beliefs and behaviours. This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors. In fact, job satisfaction can be seen in three ways, namely as a function of: the actual features of the job, the opinions of other people in the workplace, the individual personality type and correlation to the respective job.

Job satisfaction, fostered by the intrinsic rewards of helping others, predicts retention among direct care workers (Denton & Hooks 2007). Intrinsic rewards are often accompanied by physical and emotional demands of providing care and by inadequate extrinsic rewards (Benjamin and Matthias 2004; & Geiger-Brown 2007). The rewards and stressors of the dyadic care relationship, individually experienced by workers, are shaped by long-term care policies. Insufficient authorized hours of care, for example, may force workers to choose between providing less than optimal care or working unpaid overtime hours, creating stress in the care relationship. Financial strain and health status, considered personal stressors in some models (Ejaz, Casper, Lockwood,
Bordeaux & Brinkley 2008), are influenced by long-term care wage and benefit policies (Kelliher & Anderson 2008). Job satisfaction includes general elements and specific elements the whole perception of job pleasure is considered as general elements such as job security, pay, co-worker, supervision and personal growth and development are considered as specific elements.

Job satisfaction describes how content an individual is with his or her job. The happier people are within their job, the more satisfied they are said to be. Job satisfaction is not the same as motivation or aptitude, although it is clearly linked. Job design aims to enhance job satisfaction and performance, methods include job rotation, job enlargement, job enrichment and job re-engineering. Other influences on satisfaction include the management style and culture, employee involvement, empowerment and autonomous work position. Job satisfaction is a very important attribute which is frequently measured by organizations.

2.3 THEORIES RELATING TO JOB SATISFACTION
2.3.1 Maslow’s 1954 hierarchy of needs theory

When discussing human needs, growth, and self-actualization, one cannot look far before finding Abraham Maslow and his “hierarchy of needs”. Maslow’s traditionalist views of job satisfaction were based on his five-tier model of human needs. At the lowest tier, basic life sustaining needs such as water, food, and shelter were identified. The next level consisted of physical and financial security, while the third tier included needs of social acceptance, belonging, and love. The fourth tier incorporated self-esteem needs and recognition by one’s peers and at the top of the pyramid was reserved for self-actualization needs such as personal autonomy and self-direction. According to Maslow, the needs of an individual exist in a logical order and that the basic lower level needs must be satisfied before those at higher levels are activated.

Maslow identified five levels of needs which are basically the, Self Actualization (level 5 highest level), Self Esteem (level 4), Social belonging & Love needs (level 3), Safety
(level 2), Physiology (level 1). According to Maslow, these five levels of needs have to be satisfied if the individuals are to be motivated. In other words, motivation is driven by the existence of these unsatisfied needs, meaning that unless individuals have fulfilled their needs they are motivated to do so.

However, Maslow’s (1954) idea was that in order to motivate the individuals the lowest level of needs has to be satisfied before the next level of needs is activated. Once the lower levels of needs are satisfied the next level of needs will act as a motivator. For example, a person who is dying of hunger will at first be motivated to fulfill his hunger by earning wages/salaries. But once his basic needs are satisfied, then this will no longer act as a motivator, but thereafter it is only the second level of needs such as a good and safe working environment etc that will motivate him.

Maslow (1954) pointed out the fact that satisfying the individual needs is a step by step process that should follow from the lowest level to the highest level of needs and only satisfies one level of needs at a time. The hierarchy of needs theory ranging from lower to higher order needs was designed by (Maslow 1954) Lower-order needs, such as survival needs, are often referred to as extrinsic needs for instance compensation and working conditions, while higher-order needs are referred to as intrinsic needs for example, recognition and achievement.

2.3.2 Herzberg’s two-factor theory

Herzberg, Beutell, and Mausner (1999) formulated the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. Herzberg's two factor theory is another major content theory that focuses on the individual needs of the people. According to Herzberg et al (1999), two separate groups of factors that had a strong impact on motivation were identified. His first group of factors was the hygiene factors which consisted of factors such as working conditions, quality of supervision, salary, status, company policies and administration. What he tend to believe was the fact that hygiene factors strongly influenced feelings of dissatisfaction among employees thus paving way to affect the job performance. Herzberg also went further to say that the presence of these factors will not motivate the employees as such, but it is necessary to have the hygiene factors right in the first place.
if the employees are to be motivated. What was actually meant by this was that, if these hygiene factors are not present in the organization then it is not possible to motivate the employees because it is these factors that act as the foundation for the motivating factors to be effective. For example, without a good and safe working environment it is no use giving responsibility to an employee because the chances of motivating him are very low.

The two-factor theory attempts to explain how job satisfaction is affected by the presence of extrinsic job factors and extrinsic job factors. Herzberg, Beutel & Mausner (1999) postulated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were two separate and sometimes unrelated phenomena. The two-factor theory postulates that everyone has two types of needs, hygiene needs and motivator needs. Hygiene needs include factors extrinsic to the work itself, such as the work environment, supervision and pay. Motivator needs include intrinsic factors, such as achievement, recognition, and work activities.

According to Herzberg (1966), when hygiene needs are not fulfilled, the worker is dissatisfied. When hygiene needs are fulfilled, the worker is not dissatisfied. The fulfillment of hygiene needs does not produce a state of satisfaction, but a state of neutrality. When fulfilled the worker is not satisfied. The state of being not satisfied is not equivalent to being dissatisfied. However if individuals do not obtain achievement and responsibility at work, they do not feel satisfied which is different from dissatisfied. Herzberg (1966) states that the two-factor theory can imply that a worker can be simultaneously satisfied and dissatisfied because satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate states.
2.3.3 Goal-setting theory

The goal setting theory by Adams & King (1999) is another theory that can be used to explain employee satisfaction in the workplace. It is the provision of a specific target that an individual tries to achieve or something that an individual attempts to accomplish. Judge, Heller and Mount (2002) argue that having goals can provide satisfaction and motivation to individuals because it allows them to compare their current performance with the performance required to achieve a particular goal. If they are not achieving the level set by the requirements of the goal, they will feel dissatisfied and will thus work harder to attain it. If they succeed and achieve their goal they will feel satisfied with their achievement and experience a sense of self-esteem.

2.3.4 Range of Affect theory

Range of Affect theory is arguably the most famous job satisfaction model (Ahsan & Alam 2009). The main premise of this theory is that satisfaction is determined by a discrepancy between what one wants in a job and what one has in the job. Furthermore, the theory states that how much one values a given facet of work, for instance the degree of autonomy in a position, moderates how satisfied/dissatisfied one becomes when expectations are met.

When a person values a particular facet of a job, his satisfaction is more greatly impacted both positively, when expectations are met, and negatively when expectations are not met, compared to one who does not value that facet. To illustrate this, if Employee A values autonomy in the workplace and Employee B is indifferent about autonomy, then Employee A would be more satisfied in a position that offers a high degree of autonomy and less satisfied in a position with little or no autonomy compared to Employee B. The theory also states that too much of a particular facet will produce stronger feelings of dissatisfaction the more a worker values that facet (Ahsan, & Alam’s, 2009).
2.3.5 Opponent Process Theory

Sekaran (1999) proposed a unique theory of job satisfaction called opponent process theory. The opponent process theory hypothesizes that job attitudes emanate from a person’s physiological state. Sekaran’s (1999) theory of emotions postulates that certain events in the environment produce general physiological arousal, and arousal is identical regardless of the stimulus provoking it. Opponent process theory postulates that when you experience an extreme emotional state central nervous system mechanisms attempt to bring you back to a state of emotional equilibrium or neutrality. This theory presents an intriguing explanation of why job attitudes change over time and why workers may become bored with jobs they once found satisfying. Sekaran’s (1999) theory has not been tested empirically so it is not known whether it is a viable theory of job satisfaction.

2.3.6 Dispositional Theory

Another well known job satisfaction theory is the Dispositional Theory (Dienstbier, 1989). This theory suggests that people have innate dispositions that cause them to have tendencies towards a certain level of satisfaction, regardless of one’s job. This approach became a notable explanation of job satisfaction in light of evidence that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time and across careers and jobs. Haar, Spell, Driscoll & Dyer (2003) argued that there are four core self evaluations that determine one’s disposition towards job satisfaction: self-esteem, general self-efficacy, locus of control and neuroticism. Core self-evaluation is the idea that higher levels of self-esteem and self-efficacy lead to higher work satisfaction. Lower levels of neuroticism lead to higher job satisfaction.

2.3.7 Job satisfaction Process Theories

In contrast to Maslow’s hierarchy of Needs Theory and Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory, which have been referred to as Job-satisfaction Content Theories.
Theory attempt to explain job satisfaction by looking at expectancies and values (Saari, Judge 2004). This theory of job satisfaction suggests that workers’ select their behaviors in order to meet their needs. Within this framework, Cote (2002) and Kingston (2003) have become the most prominent theorists.

Mount, Llies and Johnson (2006) suggested that people perceive their job as a series of inputs and outcomes. Inputs are factors such as experience, ability, and effort, while outcomes include things like salary, recognition, and opportunity. The theory is based on the premise that job satisfaction is a direct result of individuals’ perceptions of how fairly they are treated in comparison to others. This “equity theory” proposes that people seek social equity in the rewards they expect for performance. In other words, people feel satisfied at work when the input or contribution to a job and the resulting outcome are commensurate to that of their co-workers. According to Saari & Judge (2004), this social equity is not limited to others within the same workplace, and the equity comparisons often reach into other organizations that are viewed as similar places of employment.

Discrepancies that occur between expected compensation and actual outcome lead to dissatisfaction. If employees receive less than they expect or otherwise feel as if they have been treated unfairly, then dissatisfaction may occur. Conversely, overcompensation may also lead to dissatisfaction and the employee may experience feelings of guilt. The compensation does not have to be monetary, but pay is typically the most visible and most easily modified element of outcome. Salary also has significance beyond monetary value and the potential to acquire material items, and Kelliher and Anderson (2003) note that it is also an indication of personal achievement, organizational status, and recognition.

To illustrate and clarify his ideas, Saari & Judge (2004) generated a three-variable equation for scientifically determining job satisfaction. Expectancy is the first variable, and this is the individual’s perception of how well he or she can carry out the given task.
Instrumentality is the second variable of the equation, and this refers to the individual's confidence that he or she will be compensated fairly for performing the task. Valence is the third variable, which considers the value of the expected reward to the employee. In Saari’s (2004) formula each variable is given a probability value, and when all three factors are high, workers will be more satisfied and have more motivation. If any of the factors are low, work performance and employee motivation will decline.

2.3.8 Job satisfaction Situational Theories

The situational occurrences theory emerged in 2001, when Erdwins, Buffardi, Casper and Brien (2001) stated that job satisfaction is determined by two factors: situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Situational characteristics are things such as pay, supervision, working conditions, promotional opportunities, and company policies that typically are considered by the employee before accepting the job. The situational occurrences are things that occur after a job has been taken that may be tangible or intangible, positive or negative. Positive occurrences might include extra vacation time, while negative occurrences might be an interview, a single-item measure, or a workplace observation; however, most researchers opt for a more objective and in-depth survey instrument that may identify faulty equipment or strained co-worker relationships, etc. Within this theoretical framework, job satisfaction is a product of both situational factors and situational occurrences.

2.3 WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

Work-family conflict is “a form of interrole conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by virtue of participation in the family (work) role” (Greenhaus & Beutell, 2000).
Work-Family Conflict is defined in a number of ways. In essence, Work-Family Conflict occurs when a person’s performance of roles in one of the two domains is hindered by performance of his/her role in the other domain. This role conflict takes two forms, namely role overload and role interference. Role overload occurs when the demands of both domains surpass the individual’s capability to perform either role well. Role interference occurs when there is a conflict in roles from both domains such that the individual fails to accomplish either role Lepine & Dyne (2001). There are two forms of Work Family Conflict, namely time-based conflict and strain-based conflict. Time-based conflict is present when time spent in one domain reduces the time spent in the other domain, while strain-based conflict occurs when the strain suffered in one domain negatively affects the fulfillment of roles in the other domain.

Ergeneli, et. al. (2010) identified a third form, behaviour based conflict, which occurs when certain behavior may be suitable in one domain and not the other. This supports the notion that an individual's experience in one domain may spill over to the other domain. Family alone demands much from an individual, but in this new millennium where more than one individual or spouse is working to support a family, the demands of upholding family life and maintaining a career or job are immense.

Conflict between work and family is important for organizations and individuals because it is linked to negative consequences. For example, conflict between work and family is associated with increased absenteeism, increased turnover, decreased performance, and poorer physical and mental health.

Conceptually, conflict between work and family is bi-directional. Most researchers make the distinction between what is termed work to family conflict, and what is termed family to work conflict. Work-to-family conflict occurs when experiences at work interfere with family life like extensive, irregular, or inflexible work hours, work overload and other forms of job stress, interpersonal conflict at work, extensive travel, career transitions, unsupportive supervisor or organization. For example, an unexpected meeting late in the day may prevent a parent from picking up his or her child from school.
Family-to-work conflict occurs when experiences in the family interfere with work life like the presence of young children, primary responsibility for children, elderly care responsibilities, interpersonal conflict within the family unit, unsupportive family members (Kanter 2000). For example, a parent may take time off from work in order to take care of a sick child. Although these two forms of conflict work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW) are strongly correlated with each other, more attention has been directed at WIF more than FIW. This may be because work demands are easier to quantify; that is, the boundaries and responsibilities of the family role is more elastic than the boundaries and responsibilities of the work role. Also, research has found that work roles are more likely to interfere with family roles than family roles are likely to interfere with work roles (Killiher & Anderson 2008).

Work can conflict with one’s home and family life. However, workaholism can lead to adverse effects on one’s relationship with his or her partner. Workaholism is “an individual difference characteristic referring to self-imposed demands, compulsive overworking, an inability to regulate work habits, and an over indulgence in work to the exclusion of most other life activities (Haar & Roche 2008). Workaholism can affect a person’s private life since it includes exclusion of other activities including spending time with spouses which is significant to any healthy, happy relationship.

When there is a strain on a relationship due to a partner’s workaholism, both partners can become stressed and less supportive of one another resulting in negative behavior. Individuals, who work a lot to the point of interference with the rest of their lives, tend to perceive their family as having less of a strong communication background. These individuals also perceive their families as having family roles that are not as clearly defined as they would like them to be. Workaholism isn’t the only dynamic that can be a factor in work-family conflicts.

Greenhaus and Kopelman (2001) defined interrelation of role conflict as the extent to which a person experiences pressures within one role that are incompatible with the pressures that increase within another role.
Grzywacz et al., (2007) highlighted the strategic importance of work-family issues and their increasing importance for managers. The balancing of work and family issues is becoming increasingly important for employees and employers to consider. Adams, *et al.*, (1999) noted that workers face challenges of managing their work and family roles, and importantly, these challenges have become more numerous and complex. The focus towards work-family issues and work-family practices in particular, has been driven by a number of major demographic changes. These include the increased participation rates of working women and mothers (Lalluka, Chandola, Roos, Cable, Sekine, Kagamimori, Tatsuse, Marmot & Lahelma2009), the rising number of dual-career couples and single parent families (Glass & Goodstein, 1999), and the enlargement in the elderly population (Sue, Cambell & Clark 2000). At the heart of work-family policies is the necessity for programmes to help employees balance their work and family roles (Haar& Roche, 2008; Goodstein, 2001; Judge, Boudreau & Bretz Jr., 2002).

Given the increase in workforce diversity, these changes have made balancing work and family considerably more challenging. For example, Kelliher and Anderson (2008) noted that UK firms have increasingly offered flexible work practices to respond to these challenges.

Goodstein (2001) noted that these changes have increased the interdependence of work and family spheres and intensified the conflicting demands of work and family. Due to these factors, managing the conflict between work and family responsibilities has been recognized as a critical challenge for organizations (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998).

Some work-family studies have explored the potential buffering effects of supervisor support (Fu & Shaffer, 2000). Work-family conflict is among the most commonly studied outcomes in the work-family literature (Byron, 2005; Kossek, Colquitt, & Noe, 2001). While there can be both a positive and negative spillover between work and family domains (Kingston, 2003), the work-family conflict research focuses on the difficulties employees have in balancing their work and family commitments.
Work-family conflict is of importance to those interested in work-family practices, as these are often depicted as allowing greater balance between work and family responsibilities (Maertz, & Campion, 2005), which suggests that there should be some interaction between work-family practices and work-family conflict. The relationship between employee work lives and non-work pursuits has been previously scrutinized (Kanter, 2000). Greenhaus, Kopelman & Collins (2001) suggested that the conflict an employee experiences between their work and other life roles deserves particular attention from researcher.

However, the focus here was only on work-family conflict, as previous studies have shown that employees more frequently report work-to-family conflict than family-to-work conflict (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Kinnunen & Mauno, 1998 as cited in Daalen et al., 2006). Research on work-family conflict recognizes the interdependence between work and family domains and examines how the simultaneous performance of interdependent roles of employee, parent, spouse, with their related demands in terms of time, energy and commitment, can cause an individual to experience role conflict (Wallis & Price, 2003). According to Voydanoff (1993) role conflict arises when the fulfillment of one role is hindered by participation in another role.

Simplified conflict between an individual’s work and home responsibilities can be labeled work-family conflict (Boles, Johnston, & Hair, 2005). According to Frone, Barnes and Farrell (1999), work-family conflict reflects the overall goodness-of-fit between work and family life, and has been conceptualized as an important source of stress that can influence an individual’s well being.

The relationships between work-family conflict and employee attitudes and health have been well examined and established (Lallukka et al., 2009; Greenhaus, Allen & Spector, 2006; Frone, Barnes, & Farrell (1999). According to Lallukka et al, 2009, little research has been devoted to the issue of managing work-family conflict.
The study suggest that while the work-family conflict literature has explored many sources of conflict, for example hours worked (Marvasti 2004), what has been missing is an attempt to explore how employees might seek to manage these sources of conflict.

First, Time based conflict, takes two forms: (1) Time pressures associated with membership in one role may make it physically impossible to fulfill expectations arising from another role; (2) Pressures also may produce a prejudice with one role even when attempt to meet the demands of another role are made second. Strain-based conflict, it exists when strain in one role affects one’s performance in another role. The roles are incompatible in the sense that the strain created by one makes it difficult to fulfill the demands of another. Third, Behaviour-based conflict happens when the behavioral styles that one exhibits at work (impersonality, logic, power, authority) may not be incompatible with behaviors desired by their children and spouse within the family.

Earlier work-family conflict was viewed as a one-dimensional construct. Grzywacz & Carlson (2007) suggested that it was reciprocal in that work could interfere with family which family could also interfere with work.

### 2.3.1 THEORIES RELATING TO WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT

Several theories have been used to explain the relationship between work roles and family roles. Nine competing theories are especially prominent in this regard. These are: spillover, compensation, segmentation, congruence, integrative, resource drain theories, role salience, and demands control.

#### 2.3.1.1 Spillover theory

This theory focuses on the impact that job satisfaction and or affect from one domain has on the other domain (Judge, Heller, & Mount 1999). Positive spillover refers to situations in which the satisfaction, energy, and sense of accomplishment derived from one domain transfers to another. On the contrary, negative spillover refers to the problem driven from one domain to another (Fu & Shaffer 2000). For example, increased satisfaction
(dissatisfaction) in the work domain leads to increased satisfaction (dissatisfaction) with life.

2.3.1.2 Compensation theory

This is a bidirectional theory stating that the relationship between the work and non-work domains is one in which one domain may compensate for what is missing in the other (Kossek & Ozeki 1998).

Thus, domains are likely to be interrelated in a counterbalancing manner. For example, individuals not satisfied with family life may try to enhance performance at work.

2.3.1.3 Segmentation theory

Segmentation is the theory that each domain operates independently, such that satisfaction can be derived from work, family, or both (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). Therefore, segmentation theory is the antithesis of the spillover theory in which it is postulated that one can compartmentalize competing role demands.

2.3.1.4 Congruence theory

Congruence is the theory that states that although a positive or negative relationship may be found between work and family, the relationship is spurious because it is caused by a third common factor, like personality (Gonyea & Googins 2001).

2.3.1.5 Integrative theory

Integrative theory suggests that work and family roles are so intertwined that they become indistinguishable (Krouse & Afifi 2007).
2.3.1.6 Resource Drain theory

Resource drain theory states that a negative correlation between family and work domains, such that there is a finite amount of personal resources to be expended and more activity in one domain, by definition, takes away resources that could be expended in the other domain (Greenhaus, Jeffrey, & Nicholas 2000).

2.3.1.7 Role Salience Theory

Geiger and Brown (2007) argue that most research on Work-Family Conflict assumes that both work and family roles are of equal importance to individuals. However, Haar, et al (2008) point out that research has indicated that the stress that occurs among many dual-career couples is as a result of the nature of their work and their family role expectations. They thus argue that WFC research should consider role expectations in order to effectively explain WFC effectively. According to Pleck (2002), different roles provide different things for the individual. An important value not sought in work might reveal its importance in being sought in homemaking, community service, etc.

2.3.1.8 Demands control theory

The demands control theory of strain can be used to explain how job characteristics affect WFC. This theory states that there are two sets of job characteristics that interact resulting in strain and stress. The first one is labeled job demands, which is basically the nature of work, for example, repetitiveness or arbitrary supervision, shift work. The second set is decision latitude which consists of required skill level and decision authority (amount of control in a position). Decision latitude controls the effects of job demands on WFC in such a way that when decision latitude is high job demands create less strain but more strain when decision latitude is low (Glass, 1999).
2.3.2 WORK-FAMILY LINKAGE AND RELATED THEORY

Work-family linkage comprises of HR management, organizational behavior and sociology. Three patterns are involved in work-family linkage theory and each one is related to the theory. Relationships between work and family come in many patterns. These are the separate pattern, mutual pattern and blending pattern. These patterns can be explained by role theory, spillover theory, compensation theory and boundary theory. Work family conflict is represented in six dimensions.

Role conflict model, gender differences model and work-family interface model described causation and outcomes of work-family conflict.

2.3.2.1 Work-family linkage patterns

a) Separate spheres pattern - roles theory

Role is defined as expected behaviors that come from some social status in the separate spheres pattern; it sees family and work as a distinctive system that come from sex role difference, domestic area for women and public area for men (Sue 2000), role segmentation from different expectations on men and women. Sex role has a psychological and social dimension. Women are expected to be good wives and mother.

Men are expected to work for family. Such social expectation is not changed much as society develops. Further, family and work should remain separate in order to function properly and the division of labour by sex should be maintained in order to avoid conflict, (Ejaz et al 2008).

From role theory, two spheres do not affect each other; work and family are treated as independent issues, however at present women are not only housewives but also businesswoman, police, politicians, etc. So this pattern is rarely used by social scientists. Additionally, this pattern assumes role can separate the two spheres in terms of time, physical location, emotions, attitudes, and behavior, but this segmentation is not absolute.
b) Mutual pattern - spillover theory and compensation theory

Spillover theory recognizes that systems may have spillover effects on one another as experiences gained from the family area may have effects on work (Kanter 2000). The same time, membership in the two systems causes strain and overload for individuals, families, and work units. Spillover can be positive or negative:

Positive spillover refers to the fact that satisfaction and achievement in one field may bring both satisfaction and achievement in another field. Negative spillover refers to the fact that difficulties and depression in one field may bring the same emotion in another field. The spillover effect pattern shifts attention from the effects of social institutions on each other to the effects of family members on each other, ignoring the social and political consequences of the context in which family and work are located.

Compensation theory is in contrast with spillover (Judge et al, 2002). It holds that what is provided by one makes up for what is missing in the other (Kossek et al 2001). The theory views workers as actively seeking greater satisfaction from their work or family life as a result of being dissatisfied with the other. So there is an inverse relationship between work and family such that work and non-work experiences tend to be mutually contradictory.

It further proposes that individuals make differential investments of themselves in the two settings (Byron 2005), as denials experienced in work are made up or compensated for in non-work activities. This provides a plausible explanation of why some workers become more involved in their work when they experience family problems. Therefore, when people experience compensation from work, this means that they feel more job satisfaction than family satisfaction. When compensation happens, one would expect high involvement in one sphere to be accompanied by low involvement in the other. Therefore, when people try to compensate for a lack of satisfaction at home, they become more involved in their work and their work involvement will increase (Sekaran 1999).
Mutual pattern recognizes work and family as mutual effects. Both spillover and compensation theories, however, view work-family linkage as dependent on the developmental analysis of long-term work-family linkages in the life span of a person or a couple.

Therefore, it adopted a psychological/developmental framework to explore the dynamics of the relationship between individual, family and career developments in the life span of a person/couple.

Furthermore, mutual pattern regards individuals’ behaviours as passive ones not based on initiative, unlike the separate spheres pattern, which denies the connection between family and work (Judge, Heller & Mount 2002).

c) Integration pattern - boundary theory

Sue (2000) is the researcher who believes there is a boundary between work and family. Three forms of boundaries exist in boundary theory. These are mental boundary, time boundary and physiological boundary. Individuals are border-crossers who make daily transitions between the field of work and home. Boundary theory is widely used in work and family issues such as work at home, flexible time, etc (Robbinson, 2004) as a result. Individuals try to find a suitable boundary between work and family. Boundary is characterized by permeability, flexibility and blending. Permeability refers to the bound that one role can penetrate to another. For example, an operator working in a call centre is not allowed to make a private call.

Flexibility refers to extension boundary between roles. For example, a telecommuting female also plays a mother role. When permeability and flexibility both exit in two or more roles, blending happens. Therefore, work and family linkage presents an integration trend in the times of information. Boundary between work and family are more complicated because of information technology. Based on boundary theory, though it is difficult to change some sides of work and family, individuals can change the boundary between two fields to some extent (Denton & Hooks, 2007). Individuals are reactive in the work and family field.
2.3.2.2 Models related to work-family conflict

a) Role conflict model

In this model, work-family conflict is based on role conflict. This model views work-family conflict separately into work and family. This role conflict model was propounded by Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) and it holds that work conflict and family conflict has a positive relationship with interrole conflict and these three kinds of conflict individually have a negative relationship with job and family satisfaction while, job and family satisfaction are positively related to life satisfaction.

b) Sex difference model

Role conflict model was extended by Higgins, Duxbury and Irving (2001). They developed a more extensive and complete model. They added two more variables, which are role involvement and role expectation, and they also substituted quality of work and family life for job and family satisfaction in order to eliminate the lack of a significant relationship between work-family conflict and job and family satisfaction. Higgins, et al (2001) paid attention to sex differences in work-family conflict.

Kingston’s (2003) studied sex differences in social judgment. According to him, social judgment for men usually comes from the work role. If men get much involved in family, it will differ from social expectation and this will lead to high degree of work-family conflict. Social judgment for women, on the other hand, comes from family role. If women get much involved in work, this will differ from social expectation and will lead to a high degree of conflict. This model, however, still views work-family conflict statically. It does not consider that the roles of men and women are changing which leads to new role expectations and new contents of work-family conflict for men and women.

c) Double direction model

A Double Direction model by Erdwins et al, (2001) adds stressor variables and depression outcomes to work-family conflict model. This model gives a way to think work-family conflict in a double direction. Job stressors and FWC increase job distress
(positive) while job involvement reduces job distress (negative). Family stressors and WFC increase family distress (positive) while family involvement reduces family distress (negative). Both of Job and family distress increase depression (positive).

2.3.3 How is work-family conflict being addressed?

With advances in technology, individuals who work outside of the home and have intense schedules are finding ways to keep in touch with their families when they cannot physically be with them. Cell phones, wireless internet and gadgets such as the Blackberry make it possible for members and loved ones to be at the finger tips of working individuals. Technology has thus allowed them allowing them unprecedented control and creativity in maneuvering the tenuous balance between work and family (Temple 2009).

2.4 STRESS

2.4.1 General

Stress is prevalent in the world today. (Marmot et al, 2003). The individual responds to stress in ways that affect him/her as well as his/her environment. Because of the over abundance of stress in our modern lives, we usually think of stress as a negative experience, but from a biological point of view, stress can be a neutral, negative, or positive experience.

Stress is related to both external and internal factors. External factors include the physical environment, including your job, your relationships with others, your home, and all the situations, challenges, difficulties, and expectations you are confronted with on a daily basis. Internal factors determine your body’s ability to respond to, and deal with, the external stress-inducing factors. Internal factors which influence your ability to handle stress include nutritional status, overall health and fitness levels, emotional well-being, and the amount of sleep and rest you get (Goodstein 2001).
Stress has driven evolutionary change, the development and natural selection of species over time. Thus, the species that adapted best to the causes of stress (stressors) have survived and evolved into the plant and animal kingdoms we now observe. Man is the most adaptive creature on the planet because of the evolution of the human brain, especially the part called the neo-cortex (Cote et al. 2002).

This adaptability is largely due to the changes and stressors that we have faced and mastered. Therefore, we, unlike other animals, can live in any climate or ecosystem, at various altitudes, and avoid the danger of predators. Moreover, most recently, we have learned to live in the air, under the sea, and even in space, where no living creatures that we know of have ever survived. So then, what is so bad about stress? Stress is the physiological, psychological, emotional and behavioral response of a person seeking to adapt and adjust to internal and external pressures or demands (Kelliher 2008, Kingston 2003).

For the organization, organizational commitment and work performance may be affected, and labour turnover may increase (Aldwin, 1999). Bakker, Demerouti & Burke (2009) supports this by saying performance of the job by an employee also requires that his or her expectations and aspirations in terms of reward considerations and fulfillment of his needs, be met if these are fulfilled, employee would be satisfied with the outcome of job performance and greater job satisfaction would motivate the employees in performing their tasks more efficiently and results in organisation productivity.

At one time or another, most people experience stress. The term stress has been used to describe a variety of negative feelings and reactions that accompany threatening or challenging situations (Stoner, Charles, Richard, Hartman & Arora 2000). However, not all stress reactions are negative. A certain amount of stress is actually necessary for survival. For example, childbirth is one of the most stressful experiences of life. Stress is defined as a dynamic condition in which an individual is confronted with an opportunity, constraint, or demand related to what he/she desires and for which the outcome is perceived to be both uncertain and important (Cooke, Robert,& Rousseau 1994 ) and supported by Nel, Van Dyk, Schultz & Werner (2004).
Stress has been viewed as a set of neurological and physiological reactions that serve an adaptive function. Traditionally, stress research has been oriented toward studies involving the body's reaction to stress and the cognitive processes that influence the perception of stress.

Stress can also be defined as any circumstance that places special physical and/or psychological demands on a person such that an unusual or out of the ordinary response occurs (Bakker, et al 2009). The circumstances could, for example, be financial problems, or a difficult boss. Kadis, Leslie & McClendon (1995) indicates that work over-load and work under-load can lead to stressful conditions. Stress is not necessarily dysfunctional. A stressful condition may encourage a person to perform better when working towards a deadline.

Lambert (2004) argues that stress does not originate from an event, but rather an interaction of the individual with the event. This again suggests that WFC does not lead to stress on its own but rather in interaction with an individual who may be satisfied or dissatisfied with his/her job. Another study that suggests that Work-Family Conflict, job satisfaction and stress may all be interrelated is that by Gottlieb, Kelloway and Martin-Matthews (1996) which found that all three variables are mainly accounted for by family support, perceived organizational support for family life, perceived work load, and involvement in child care.

This has been proved to be true in the study done by Ergeneli, Ilsev, and Karapinar (2010), where they found that Work-Family Conflict has a negative relationship with job satisfaction for stress-predisposed male employees. There are indirect indications in the literature suggesting that this may be the case. Pleck, and John (2002), for example, noted that different people experiencing similar life conditions are not necessarily affected in the same manner. One person experiencing WFC may therefore be stressed while another not stressed depending on the extent to which the two persons are satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs.
Most of the common physical symptoms of stress are caused by own bodies 'fight or flight' response, which was never intended by nature to be used for extended periods of time (Saari 2004, Gonyea 2001) This response evolved to help us in dangerous situations - either to stay and fight or run away. Both these reactions involve the body using chemicals and hormones to heighten awareness and give an instant boost of energy and strength.

For short-term 'problems' that can be physically resolved, this chemical response is fine and causes no health problems for a fit human body. However most of today's modern problems, situations and issues are not short term and cannot be solved with simple physical reactions. Therefore our bodies are in a 'stressed' or alert state for much longer periods of time than is safe for them to cope with. Over a period of time, this is what causes the major health problems associated with stress.

Stress is linked to the six leading causes of death such as - heart disease, cancer, lung ailments, accidents, cirrhosis of the liver, and suicide. Stress is a state we experience when the demands that are put upon us cannot be counter balanced by our ability to deal with them. For many of us, the pace of modern life and the rapid technological changes, cause us constantly to feel unable to cope with the demands that are put upon us. These demands come from many different sources - home, relationships, money, job, health, self-esteem, etc.

Erdwins et al 2001, is of the view that, many of the things that used to help female managers cope with the everyday stresses and strains of life have slowly been taken away from us: Extended families to share everyday problems, communities that were small enough to look after the individual, long term job safety, sensible levels of borrowing and debt, physical activity - whether at work or play. Physical activity of any kind helps to relieve symptoms of stress and even remove many of the causes. The removal of each of these support systems has left us feeling more and more exposed and alone in a rapidly changing world. The old saying - "A problem shared is a problem halved" is proving to be very accurate regarding stress.
The chemical and hormonal changes which affect every single organ of your body when you are stressed, have not evolved and developed along with today's modern fast-paced society. Your subconscious biological protection systems that were designed to help you protect yourself from physical threat have become the major health issue in modern 'developed' societies. These protection systems react to mental issues in a similar way that they respond to physical threats.

The main difference is that the mental issues don't go away quickly, thus your body remains in a dangerously 'alert' state for unhealthy periods of time (Erdwins et al, 2001, Gonyea et al, 2001).

We all experience stress in our daily lives from different sources: jobs, relationships, finances. Furthermore, whether you are dealing with a daily stressor, chronic stress, or a major life challenge like illness or divorce, stress can take a significant toll on you both physically and emotionally (Kingston 2003). How do you know when you’re dealing with a level of stress that is unhealthy for you? The answer to this question can be tricky for a few reasons: Stress affects the body in many different ways. Some of these are obvious, but others may not be as noticeable or easy to detect until they become more severe.

Different people are affected more or less intensely, and in different ways. The effects of stress often look like symptoms of other illnesses (partially due to the fact that stress lowers immunity and makes us vulnerable to many things), sometimes people mistake symptoms of illness for stress and vice versa. People who thrive on stress tend to feel it as their natural state, making it more difficult to discern stress symptoms until after much of their stress is alleviated. When under high levels of stress, people often find it difficult to stop and notice their body’s responses.

Stress affects everyone in a unique way; there are certain factors that are common. If you are experiencing any of the following, it could be a sign that you are being affected by stress: Headaches: Certain types of headaches can be related to stress. If you are experiencing more headaches, especially tension headaches, stress could be the
culprit. More Frequent Colds or Flu: There is an inverse relationship between stress and immunity, so if you are under too much stress, you may be getting sick more often. Sleep Problems: There are many ways that stress affects sleep. Too much stress can rob you of sleep and make the sleep you get less restorative.

General Anxiety: Anxiety does serve important function for survival, but if you are feeling anxious much of the time, it could be because you have too many stressors in your life, or it may indicate a medical condition like generalized anxiety disorder. If you experience an increase in anxiety, you may want to talk to your doctor.

Fuzzy Thinking': Your body's stress response pumps your body with hormones that make it possible for you to fight or flee quickly. When triggered in excess, this stress response can actually cause you to think less quickly. Feelings of Frustration: If you are faced with many demands at once, the natural result for many people is increased frustration and irritability. The trick is to find ways to prevent frustration and calm down quickly. Lowered Libido: Stress can affect your libido in several ways. If you are too tired for sex, or cannot seem find the time for your partner, this can be due to stress in your life as well. These are just a few of the many ways that stress can affect your body and mind.

2.4.1Work-related (or occupational) stress

Working can provide our lives with structure, purpose, satisfaction and financial income (Lallukka et.al 2009). However, the workplace can also be a cause of stress and worry. We all need some pressure in our working lives. It makes our work satisfying and helps us to meet deadlines. Too much pressure, without the chance to recover, however, causes stress. In a 2006 Health and Safety Executive survey, one in six working people in the UK reported that their job was very or extremely stressful. Work-related stress is one of the biggest causes of sick leave. Workplace stress is different for everyone, what is stressful for one person may not be stressful for another. It can depend on your personality type and how you have learned to respond to pressure (Sue 2000).
2.4.2.1 Symptoms of work-related stress

Work-related stress can cause both physical and emotional health problems. It can cause you to be more prone to physical symptoms such as in headaches, muscular tension, backache and/or neck ache, tiredness and sleep problems, digestive problems, a raised heart rate, skin rashes, sweating, blurred vision (Kanter 2000).

Chronic (long-term) stress can also contribute to anxiety and depression, and can even increase your risk of having a heart attack or stroke. Managers may also be prone to psychological symptoms such as: feelings that you can't cope, irritability and mood swings, disturbed eating patterns, finding it hard to concentrate, feeling less motivated a lower sex drive (libido). According to a study by The Work Foundation, nearly one in three working men say that the demands of their job interfere with their private life, and nearly one in four feel that their work has caused them to neglect their children.

2.4.2.2 Causes of work-related stress

There are a number of factors that can make one feel stressed at work, including: poor working conditions, long working hours, relationships with colleagues, lack of job security, difficult journeys to and from work, the way the company is managed, mismatch between the requirements of the job and your own capabilities and needs, inflexible working hours and too much or too little responsibility (Killiher & Anderson 2008). However, often there is no single cause of work-related stress. Although it can be triggered by sudden, unexpected pressures, it is often the result of a combination of stressful factors that build up over time.

2.4.2.3 Treatment of work-related stress

a) Self-help

There are a number of ways to reduce the negative impact of stress. Most of these involve examining how you go about your work. One of the most important factors is managing your time more effectively. Prioritize tasks, delegate where you can and make sure you don't take on more work than you can handle. Take regular breaks at work and
try to finish one task before starting another. Other things that you can do yourself include the following: Make sure your work environment is comfortable.

If it is not, ask for help from your organisation’s health and safety officer (Haar & Roche 2008). If possible, do not work long hours - sometimes projects need extra time, but working long hours over many weeks or months does not generally lead to more or better results at work.

Take a look at your relationships with your colleagues - do you treat each other with respect and consideration? If not, try to find a way to improve relationships with your colleagues. Find out if your organisation offers flexible working hours. It is important to talk directly to your manager about work-related stress. He or she has a duty to take reasonable steps to try to resolve the problem. Explain how you are feeling and discuss your workload. If you find talking about your concerns difficult, it may help to make notes during your discussion.

It is worth asking if your organisation has any policies on harassment, bullying or racism. Ask your Human Resources Department how to challenge these policies and make sure you know what support there is for you if you decide to do this. There are things you can do outside of work to help reduce your stress levels. Try to exercise every day if possible. Exercise helps to use up the stress hormones that cause your symptoms, giving you a sense of wellbeing and helping your muscles to relax. Even a brisk walk for 30 minutes a day will combat stress (Fu & Shaffer 2000). Other self-help steps are:

- Talk to a friend or relative - this is a good way to get your worries off your chest. It can give you a fresh perspective and help to make stressful situations more manageable.
- Do not drink too much alcohol or caffeine, or smoke. Instead of helping, these stimulants may increase your stress levels.
- Eat regular meals and a healthy, balanced diet with plenty of fruit and vegetables.
• Take up a new hobby or interest to take your mind off your problems.
• Have some fun - meet your friends or do something you love.
• At the end of each day, reflect on what you have achieved rather than worrying about future work. Do not be too hard on yourself and remember to take each day as it comes. You may need to take some time off work, but this is not always advised (Haar et al 2008)

2.4.2.4 Stress management

It is impossible to escape pressure at work altogether, so managers need to learn how to manage stress effectively (Sue 2000). There are four basic approaches to dealing with stress:

- removing or changing the source of stress
- learning to change how you react to a stressful event
- reducing the effect stress has on your body
- learning alternative ways of coping (Sue 2000)

Stress management techniques aim to promote one or more of these approaches. Female managers can learn these techniques from self-help books, attending a stress management course, or at therapy sessions run by a counselor or psychotherapist.

a) Talking therapies

These can include Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT), which challenges negative thought patterns and helps you to react differently to events. CBT is often available at General Practitioners’ surgeries.

b) Medicines

Your General Practitioner may prescribe you medicines. If you’re suffering from depression and anxiety, you may be prescribed antidepressants.
c) Complementary therapies

Aromatherapy, reflexology and massage may provide a quiet, relaxed environment in which to wind down. Learning relaxation techniques such as meditation, self-hypnosis, visualization, and breathing exercises can also help you to relax. Yoga and Pilates may also help relieve muscle pains and help you control your breathing in stressful situations. They may also help you sleep better and relieve stress-related physical pains such as stomach pains and headaches.

2.4.3 THEORIES RELATING TO STRESS

2.4.3.1 Mandler’s Interruption Theory

Mandler’s Interruption Theory of stress provides a transition between the internal component of stress and the interaction component. Mandler defines stress as an emergency-signaling interruption. The basic premise is that autonomic activity results whenever some organized action or thought process is interrupted.

The term interruption is used in the sense that any event, whether external or internal to the individual, prevents completion of some action, thought sequence, or plan and is considered to be interrupted. Interruption can occur in the perceptual, cognitive, behavioural, or problem-solving domains.

The consequences of the interruption will always be autonomic activity and will be interpreted emotionally in any number of ways, ranging from the most joyful to the most noxious.

2.4.3.2 Smith’s Transaction Theory

According to the Transaction Theory of stress (Scherer, 2000), the cognitive appraisal of stress is a two-part process which involves a primary appraisal and a secondary appraisal. Primary appraisal involves the determination of an event as stressful. During primary appraisal, the event or situation can be categorized as irrelevant, beneficial, or stressful. If the event is appraised as stressful, the event is then evaluated either as harm/loss, a threat, or a challenge. A harm/loss refers to an injury or damage that has
already taken place. A threat refers to something that could produce harm or loss. A challenge refers to the potential for growth, mastery, or some form of gain.

Cote and Morgan (2002) argue that we cannot assess the origins of stress by looking solely at the nature of the environmental event; rather stress is a process that involves the interaction of the individual with the environment. These categories are based mostly on one’s own prior experiences and learning. Also, each of these categories generates different emotional responses. Harm/loss stressors can elicit anger, disgust, sadness, or disappointment. Threatening stressors can produce anxiety and challenging stressors can produce excitement.

This theory helps to integrate both the motivational aspects of stress and the varying emotions that are associated with the experience of stress. Secondary appraisal occurs after assessment of the event as a threat or a challenge. During secondary appraisal the individual now evaluates his or her coping resources and options. According to the theory of transactions, stress arises only when a particular transaction is appraised by the person as relevant to his or her well-being. In order for an event to be appraised as a stressor, it must be personally relevant and there must be a perceived mismatch between a situation's demands and one’s resources to cope with it.

Goodstein (2001) offers a reformulation of the Transaction theory, which focuses on the emotional consequences of appraising an event as a stressor or as a challenge. He asserts that when an event is appraised as a challenge, it lead to different physiological consequences than when it is appraised as a harm/loss or threat. Goodstein (2001) uses the term stress to refer to transactions that lead only to negative emotions and he uses the term challenge to describe a transaction that could lead both to positive and negative emotions. A good definition of stress would be that, stress is the condition that results when the person/environment transactions lead the individual to perceive a discrepancy whether real or not between the demands of a situation and the resources of the person’s biological, psychological, or social systems.
2.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature relating to job satisfaction, work-family conflict, stress and the interrelationships among these variables. The next chapter will discuss the research methodology employed in this study.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter describes the research design, the population, the sample, sampling techniques, data collection instrument, the data collection procedure, and data analysis methods used in this study.

3.2 THE POPULATION

According to Kruger et al. (2005) the population encompasses the total collection of units about which the researcher wishes to make specific conclusions. The population of this study consisted of all female senior, middle and junior managers in the Department of Education in the KWT District. There are 400 of them.

3.3 SAMPLE AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

3.3.1 General

According to Schiffman and Kanak (2007), a sample is the result of a process of selecting certain members from a population to represent the entire population. In most instances, the total population is so large that it is not possible to collect data from every individual person or entity included in it. It is scientifically acceptable to draw a sample from the entire population and to generalize the findings of the research to that population, the sample being representative of the whole population.

A random sample of 100 members of the population was selected using a table of random numbers. The necessary sampling frame was obtained from the office of the Human Resources Director in the Department of Education in the King Williams' Town District. It was in the form of a list of all the names of all female senior, middle, and junior managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District. Although Raosoft, Inc. (2001) offers a specific formula, the Raosoft Sample Size Estimator to calculate the required sample size, Fouche and Delport (2002) state that a
10% sample size is sufficient to represent the population. The sample size to be used in this study far exceeds this requirement.

According to Fouche, Delport & Strydom (2005) probability sampling such as random sampling allows generalization of the findings to the entire population as this sampling method has the least bias and offers optimal generalizability.

3.3.2 Biographical and occupational description of the sample.

This section presents the demographic and occupational characteristics of the sample. These characteristics include age, marital status, educational qualifications, and position held in the organization. The age distribution of the respondents that participated in this study is illustrated in Figure 1, the marital status distribution in Figure 2, the educational qualification distribution in Figure 3, the distribution according to the number of children of the respondents in Figure 4, the distribution according to the occupational position of the respondents in Figure 5, and the age of the last born child distribution is in Figure 6.

3.3.3 Age distribution of respondents

![Figure 1: Age distribution of the sample](image)
Figure 1, shows the age distribution of the respondents. It shows that 36% (n=36) of respondents were between the ages 26 and 35 years, another 36% between the ages 36 and 45, 555 and 6% (n=6) were between the ages 16 and 25 years.

### 3.3.4 Marital status of the respondents

![Bar chart showing marital status](image)

Figure 2: Marital status of the sample

Figure 2 shows that the highest percentages of managers 33% (n=33) are divorced. Married managers constituted 32% (n=32) of the respondents. Married managers are followed by single managers with 19% (n=19), and separated managers with 16% (n=16).
3.3.5 Highest educational qualifications of the respondents

Figure 3: Highest educational qualifications of the sample

As shown in Figure 3, 43% (n=43) of the respondents had Matric, 41% (n=41) of the respondents had a Diploma, 9% (n=9) had pre-matric qualifications, 5% (n=5) had a degree, while 2% (n=2) of the respondents had post-graduate qualifications.
3.3.6 Number of children of respondents

Figure 4: Number of children of the sample

Figure 4 shows that 46% (n=46) of respondents had three to five children. Figure 4 also shows that 28% (n=28) of respondents have one to two children, 20% (n=20) of respondents had more than 5 children and 6% (n=6) had no child.
3.3.7 Occupational position of respondents

![Graph showing occupational positions]

**Figure 5: Occupational position of the sample**

Figure 5 shows that 40% (n=40) of the respondents were assistant managers, 38% (n=38) deputy managers, 22 (n=22%) are managers. This shows that the majority of respondents are assistant managers.
3.3.8 Age of the last born child

Figure 6 shows that 30% (n=30) of the respondents had their last born child ranging between the ages 11 to 15, 28% (n=28) with last born child ranging between ages 6 to 10, 17% (n=17) had their last born child being older than 15 years. The respondents 25% (n=25) had no children as they were still young.

![Age of the last born child](image)

**Figure 6: Age of the last born child of the sample**

3.4 RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The questionnaires used to gather data in this study were self-administered and given by hand to gather data. The questionnaires were accompanied by a covering letter addressed to the prospective respondents. These questionnaires were: a biographical and occupational data questionnaire designed by the researcher, The Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) questionnaire for occupational stress, the Hallpern questionnaire for job satisfaction, and the Short-form questionnaire of Hallpern (2004) for work-family conflict.
3.4.1 The biographical and occupational data questionnaire

The first part tapped data related to biographical and occupational variables, that is, age, marital status, educational qualifications, number of children, occupational position in the department and the age of the last born child. This data was tapped with a view to obtaining a clear understanding of the sample used in the study.

3.4.2 Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) Stress scale

The Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) questionnaire for occupational stress has been operationalized as a standardized self-report measure containing 23 Likert-type items in its established short version. These items define three unidimensional scales: effort (six items), reward (11 items) and over commitment (six items) with each item rated on a 5 point (effort, reward) or 4 point (over-commitment) Likert scale. When the scale was tested for internal consistency it was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.89 for the whole scale (Eum, Lee, Kim & Paek 2007).

3.4.3 Bedeina’s short form questionnaire for Work-Family Conflict

Bedeina’s short form questionnaire for work-family conflict was used. The work-family conflict subscale was composed of 8 items, and family-work conflict subscale composed of 4 items. Respondents used a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, and Always) to indicate the frequency with which they had experienced the situations described by each of the 12 items. The questionnaire was found to have Cronbach’s alpha of .90 for work-family conflict and .86 for family-work conflict (Bedeina, Burke, Moffett, 1988).

3.4.4 Halpern’s job satisfaction questionnaire (JSQ)

Halpern’s (1966) questionnaire for job satisfaction will also be used. It is a 10-item Likert scale ranging from “Very dissatisfied” (1) to “Very satisfied” (10). The scale measures satisfaction with both of Herzberg’s (1958) motivation and hygiene aspects of the job
(Halpern 1966). When the questionnaire was tested for internal consistency, it was found to have an alpha co-efficient ranging from 0.81 to 0.90 for the intrinsic and extrinsic factors of job satisfaction (Lizze, Yang, Cheng, Siegrist 2005).

3.5 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Permission to collect data was obtained from the Human Resources Director in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District. A copy of the covering letter accompanied each set of questionnaires and informed the prospective respondents of the purpose of the study and requested their voluntary participation. It assured the prospective respondents that their responses would be dealt with confidentiality and that their names were not needed. Finally it requested the respondents to return the completed questionnaires to the researcher by internal mail.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS

According to Fouche et al. (2005), data analysis involves methods that help to describe facts and develop explanations. The purpose of analysis is to reduce data to an intelligible and interpretable form so that the relationships among variables in the study can be studied and conclusions drawn. This study made use of the Pearson Correlation Technique, Linear Regression Analysis, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to test the hypothesis of the study.

3.7 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study focused only on female managers in the Department of Education, and only in the King Williams' Town District. This was done in order to avoid the logistical problems that could have resulted from studying many organizations. This was also done because of financial and time constraints.
3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethical considerations were strictly observed. Before starting the research, permission to carry it out was requested from the top management of the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District. Participants’ right to confidentiality and the need for informed consent were observed.

Moreover, no subject was forced to participate in the study if he/she was not comfortable to participate in it. The principle of anonymity was also observed. As indicated earlier, a covering letter accompanying the questionnaire was used to inform the participants of all this.
CHAPTER FOUR  

RESULTS  

4.1 INTRODUCTION  

The previous chapter described the research methodology used in this study. The present chapter focuses on the results obtained based on the statistical analysis conducted. The reliability of the various measuring scales used in this study, was measured using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Cronbach’s alpha is used as a measure of the reliability of a psychometric instrument. The Alpha Coefficient is a measure that indicates the internal consistency of a multiple-item scale. Alpha is used when there are several Likert-type items that are summed to make a composite score or sum. A commonly accepted rule of thumb for describing internal consistency using Cronbach’s alpha is as shown the table 1.  

**Table 1: Rule of thumb for describing Internal Consistency using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRONBACH’S ALPHA</th>
<th>INTERNAL CONSISTENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha \geq 0.9 )</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9&lt;( \alpha \leq 0.8 )</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8&lt;( \alpha \leq 0.7 )</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7&lt; ( \alpha \leq 0.6 )</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6&lt; ( \alpha \leq 0.5 )</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha &lt; 0.5 )</td>
<td>unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(George & Mallerly 2003)  

The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the job satisfaction scale is: 0.71.  

The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the stress scale is: 0.73.  

The Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for work-family conflict scale is: 0.71.
All these scales are considered to be of acceptable reliability and construct validity was indicated in table 1.

4.2 HYPOTHESIS TESTING

The data will also be analyzed in relation to the hypotheses, and the results were as in paragraphs 4.2.1 to 4.2.4.

4.2.1 Hypothesis 1

The first null hypothesis of the study \((H_0)\) was: “there is no significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress” and the corresponding alternative hypothesis \((H_1)\) was that “there is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress”. Hypothesis 1 was tested by means of the Pearson Correlation Technique. The correlation coefficient between work-family conflict and stress was found to be \(r = 0.22, p < .003\) which is highly significant.

This leads to acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that “there is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress” and to the rejection of the null hypothesis that “there is no significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress.

4.2.2 Hypothesis 2

The second null hypothesis of the study \((H_0)\) was that “there is no significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and stress,” and the corresponding alternative hypothesis \((H_1)\) was that “there is a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and stress”.

This hypothesis was also tested by means of the Pearson Correlation Technique. The correlation between overall job satisfaction and stress was found to be \(r = -0.152 p < 0.1311\). This shows that there is a negative but not significant association between job satisfaction and stress. This leads to acceptance of the null hypothesis and rejection of the alternative hypothesis.
The two main components of overall job satisfaction, i.e. intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated. The correlation coefficient between the two was $r=0.73$, $p < 0.001$. This suggests that both are also not significantly correlated with occupational stress.

The results also indicate that there is a highly significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction($r=0.53$, $p < 0.01$). There is also a highly significant positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction ($r=.52$, $p< 0.01$). This also suggests that both extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction are not significantly correlated with occupational stress.

4.2.3 Hypothesis 3

The third null hypothesis of the study ($H_0$) was that “there is no combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately”. The corresponding alternative hypothesis ($H_1$) was that “there is a combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately”. This hypothesis was tested by means of Multiple Regression Analysis.

**Table 2:** Multiple regression between overall job satisfaction and Work-Family Conflict as independent variables, and occupational stress as a dependent variable

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Squared</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Squared</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>44,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the results of the regression analysis, regressing stress (dependent variable) against the independent variables, overall job satisfaction and work-family conflict. The results indicate that the multiple correlation value is 0.70, with the R-squared value being 0.47. This indicates that approximately 0.47 of the variance in stress can be attributed to the independent variables (job satisfaction and work-family conflict) entered into the regression. The F-statistics of 0.44 is significant at the 0.001 level indicating that this is a highly significant relationship.

Table 2 further shows a Beta weight of =0.48, p< 0.0001 for the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational stress. This means that job satisfaction accounts for 0.48 of the variance in occupational stress and that this is a highly significant proportion of variance.

This table also shows Beta weight of 0.32, p < 0.0001 for the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress. This means that work-family conflict accounts for 0.32 of the variance in occupational stress, and that this is a highly significant proportion of variance. While job satisfaction accounts for a higher amount of variance in stress than in work-family conflict, both account for a highly significant proportion of variance.

As stated above Table 2 shows that R-squared is $R^2=0.47$. This means that the two independent variables: job satisfaction and work-family conflict together account for 0.47 of the variance in stress. This result, is in support of $H_0$ of hypothesis 3 in that though 0.47 is higher than the Beta weight for work-family conflict (0.32), it is lower than that for job satisfaction (0.48). The two independent variables do not have a combined effect that results in them accounting for a greater proportion of variance in stress than
the two of them independently. The reason for the lack of a combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict is probably due to the high correlation between the two variables ($r= 0.30$, $p<.006$)

4.2.4 Hypothesis 4

The fourth null hypothesis of the study (Ho) was that “job satisfaction does not moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress. The corresponding alternative hypothesis (H1) was that “job satisfaction moderates the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress.” This means that: (i) high work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in high occupational stress, (ii) low work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will result in low occupational stress, (iii) low work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in a medium level of occupational stress, and (iv) high work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will also result in a medium level of occupational stress. This hypothesis was tested by means of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results were as shown in Tables 3 to 5.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance; Results for the effect of Work-Family conflict Overall (Total) Job Satisfaction on Occupational Stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Term</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: WFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.34072</td>
<td>13.34072</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.579494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Total JS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.045757</td>
<td>4.045757</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.760120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.03879</td>
<td>67.03879</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.215648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4142.64</td>
<td>43.1525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Adjusted)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4226.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Significance level: Alpha = 0.05)
Table 4: Analysis of Variance Results for the effect of Work-family Conflict and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction on Occupational stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Term</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: WFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.51311</td>
<td>11.51311</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.609698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Intrinsic JS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.984893</td>
<td>5.984893</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.970619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7011424</td>
<td>0.7011424</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.899683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4213.181</td>
<td>43.8873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Adjusted)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4226.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level: Alpha = 0.05

Table 5: Analysis of Variance Results for the effect of Work-Family Conflict and Extrinsic Job Satisfaction on Occupational stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Term</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: WFC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.980718</td>
<td>2.980718</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.609698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Extrinsic JS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.8967</td>
<td>121.8967</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.970619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.306585</td>
<td>0.306585</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.899683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4091.051</td>
<td>42.61512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Adjusted)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4226.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance level: Alpha = 0.05

The results appearing in Tables 3 to 5 shows that job satisfaction is not a significant moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress because there is no significant intervention between work-family conflict and job satisfaction on occupational stress. This is shown by the row AB in each table.

To be more specific, Table 3 shows that there is no interaction effect between work-family conflict and overall job satisfaction on occupational stress (F=1.55, df=1/99, p< 0.22). Table 4 shows that there is no interaction effect between work-family conflict and intrinsic job satisfaction on occupational stress (F= 0.02, df= 1/99, p< 0.90).
Table 5 shows that there is no interaction effect between work-family conflict and extrinsic job satisfaction on occupational stress \((F= 0.01, \text{ df } 1/99, p< 0.93)\). Under these circumstances, it would have fruitless to conduct the pair-wise comparisons implied by \(H_1\).

4.3 CONCLUSION

This chapter presented Cronbach alpha for the scales used in measuring job satisfaction, stress and work-family conflict. The measure showed that the scales used in this study have an acceptable degree of internal consistency and are reliable and valid. The Pearson correlation technique was used to analyse the data of the study in relation to two of the hypotheses. One of the research hypotheses was supported. This is the hypothesis that, there is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress.

The second hypothesis: “that there is a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress was not supported. The third hypothesis that there is a combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately was also not supported by the findings of this study. The fourth hypotheses that job satisfaction moderates work-family conflict and occupational stress was also not supported by the results of this study.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter is based on the results of the data analysis reported in Chapter Four. In this chapter, the results are discussed in relation to the hypothesis and previous research findings. The limitations of the study are highlighted and recommendations for future research and for managerial practice are made.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS IN RELATION TO THE HYPOTHESES

5.2.1 Hypotheses 1

The first null hypothesis of the study \( (H_0) \) was: “there is no significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress” and the corresponding alternative hypothesis \( (H_1) \) was that “there is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress”. Hypothesis 1 was tested by means of the Pearson Correlation Technique. The correlation coefficient between work-family conflict and stress was found to be a positive and highly significant one \( r = 0.22, p<.003 \)

This leads to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis that “there is a significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress” and to the rejection of the null hypothesis that “there is no significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and stress.

Some of the following studies are in support of the significant positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress that was found in the present study while others are suggestive of such a correlation. Moynihan & Pandey (2007) investigated the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress using a sample of public sector health and human services managers. The study showed that there is a moderate positive correlation between work-family conflict and occupational stress.
The occupational stress meta-analysis conducted by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) also revealed that among the foci of commitment, the work-family conflict and occupational stress relationship is frequently investigated. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) reported that work-family conflict is an outcome of psychological commitment to an organization. They argue that employees who display high levels of job satisfaction and less of occupational stress may be the least likely to engage in voluntary turnover.

### 5.2.2 Hypotheses 2

The second null hypothesis of the study ($H_0$) was that “there is no significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress, and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ($H_1$) was that “there is a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress.

This hypothesis was tested by means of the Pearson Correlation Technique. The correlation between job satisfaction and occupational stress was found to be $r = -0.152$ with $p <= .13$. This shows that there is a negative but not significant association between job satisfaction and occupational stress. This leads to an acceptance of the null hypothesis and rejection of the alternative hypothesis. The two main components of overall job satisfaction that is intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated. The correlation coefficient between the two was $r=0.73$, $p < 0.001$. This suggests that both are also not significantly negatively correlated with work-family conflict.

The results also indicate that there is a highly significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction($r=0.53$, $p < 0.01$). There is also a highly significant positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction ($r=0.52$, $p < 0.01$). This is a further indication that both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction are also not significantly negative correlated with occupational stress.

The results of the present study are therefore not in support of the results of several previous studies. A significant negative correlation was also one of the findings in the
study carried out by Guleryuz (2008) for example also found a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and occupational stress ($r=0.67\ p<0.01$).

Mosadeghrah, Ferlie, and Rosenberg (2008) in their study, found moderate levels of job satisfaction and occupational stress among a sample of hospital employees. Among other results of the study it was found that the employee’s job satisfaction and occupational stress were highly inter-related. These findings are both not in support of the findings of the present study.

In the study by Warsi, Fatima, and Sahibzada (2009), job satisfaction was found to be significantly negatively correlated with occupational stress ($r=0.65\ p<0.01$). These findings also differ from the findings of the current study.

The study of Kim, Leong, and Lee (2005) also differ from the findings of the present study, which was conducted among employees in a dining restaurant, job satisfaction was significantly negatively associated with occupational stress ($r=0.32,\ p<0.01$).

A study by Markovits, Davis and Van Dick (2007) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and occupational stress among Greek private and public sector employees. A profile-based approach to occupational stress was adopted. In addition to confirming the utility of the profiles approach towards studying occupational stress, the study found that the component of occupational stress was related to both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction as well as to affective organisational commitment.

Chin-Chin (2005) investigated the relationship between work values, job satisfaction, occupational stress and work-family conflict among Taiwanese nurses. The data was collected using a survey questionnaire which included socio-demographic data, work values, job satisfaction and occupational stress. The results of the study showed that work values were positively related to job satisfaction, and job satisfaction was positively related to occupational stress.
5.2.3 Hypothesis 3

The third null hypothesis of the study \((H_0)\) was that “there is no combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately”.

The corresponding alternative hypothesis \((H_1)\) was that “there is a combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately”. This hypothesis was tested by means of Multiple Regression Analysis.

The results show that: (i) job satisfaction alone accounts for 48% of the variance in occupational stress, (ii) work-family conflict alone accounts for 32% of the variance in occupational stress, and (iii) job satisfaction and work-family conflict combined account for 47% of the variance in occupational stress.

Thus, while the combined effect of both job satisfaction and work-family conflict is much greater than that of work-family conflict alone, it is slightly less than that of job satisfaction alone. This therefore leads to acceptance of the null hypothesis and a rejection of the alternative hypothesis.

This lack of a significant combined effect of job satisfaction and work-family conflict is probably due to the high correlation between the two variables \((r=0.30, p<.006)\)

Ha-Young & Hyun (2009) conducted a study with the prime aim to analyze an empirical test to classify workers’ character in private and public institutions. They sought to answer the question, “what are important organizational determinants of job satisfaction and work-family conflict?” The study findings suggested that job satisfaction has greater power to influence occupational stress than work-family conflict. The results also suggested that, the higher the degree of job satisfaction the lesser the occupational stress and the greater the job effectiveness. They further argued that an increase in the work related attitudes and wage satisfaction results in an increase in efficiency and effectiveness.
Moynihan & Pandey (2007) made a comparison of job satisfaction, occupational stress and work-family conflict using a sample of public sector health and human services managers. The results showed that managers had the greatest influence over job satisfaction and the least influence over occupational stress.

The results also showed that job satisfaction accounts for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than work-family conflict. In the study, it was also shown than there are moderate positive correlations between job satisfaction, occupational stress and work-family conflict. The findings of this study concur with the findings of the present study as far as the independent correlations are concerned. This study, however did not investigate the issue of combined effect of job satisfaction and occupational stress on work-family conflict on occupational stress.

5.2.4 Hypothesis 4

The fourth null hypothesis of the study (Ho) was stated as: “Job satisfaction does not moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress”, and the alternating hypothesis (H1) was stated as: “Job satisfaction moderates the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress”.

This means that: (i) high work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in high occupational stress, (ii) low work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will result in low occupational stress, (iii) low work-family conflict and low job satisfaction will result in a medium level of occupational stress, (iv) and high work-family conflict and high job satisfaction will also result in a medium level of occupational stress.

This hypothesis was tested with analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results of ANOVA showed that none of the predicted effects, which would have demonstrated the existence of the hypothesized moderator effect of job satisfaction, existed. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted and the alternative hypothesis rejected.

In the study of Sesanga and Garrett (2005), it was found that mainly extrinsic factors of job satisfaction contributed to the dissatisfaction of academic professionals, while the intrinsic aspects generally led to job satisfaction.
While many studies support a negative association between job satisfaction, work-family conflict and occupational stress, the causal ordering between these variables are both controversial and contradictory (Martin & Bennett, 1996).

According to Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982), “although day-to-day events in the workplace may affect an employee’s level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to re-evaluate seriously his or her attachment to the overall organization”.

However, Kalleberg and Maastekaasa (2001) found that previous research on the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress has not shown any consistent and easily reconcilable findings. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990), Porter (1974), Tett and Meyer (1993) maintain that a job satisfaction to organisational commitment model assumes that job satisfaction is a cause of less work-family conflict and occupational stress. The study also shows that commitment contributes to an overall positive attitude towards the job (Tett & Meyre, 1993, Vandenberge & Lance, 1992).

Vandenberge and Lance (1992) in their study further argue that job satisfaction does not moderate the relationship between work-family conflict and occupational stress. They argue that occupational stress and work-family conflict are not causally related to each other but are correlated because they are both determined by similar causal variables, such as task characteristics. Porter et al. (1974) maintain that task characteristics requires employees to think more universally and it takes longer to develop and are not sensitive to short-term variations in, working conditions. Job satisfaction on the other hand represents the employee’s more current reactions to the specifics of the work situation and employment conditions. Subsequent analyses revealed that job satisfaction play an important role in mediating the relationship between work values, occupational stress and work-family conflict. It was further anticipated that improving various work related attitudes would result in reduced turnover and absenteeism and more effective service delivery.
5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Though this study was well considered and executed, it nevertheless entails certain limitations which future studies should avoid. Some of these are the following:

- The study made exclusive use of self-administered questionnaires as data collection instruments. The problem with this is that it may have led to common-method variance that is spurious correlation of variables caused by the fact that these variables were measured with a similar measuring instrument, such as self-administered questionnaires.

- A relatively small sample was used. The Raosoft Sample Size Estimator (Raosoft 2001), which is a generally used and recognized statistical procedure for determining sample size indicates that a sample size appropriate to a population size, equal to that of the present study (400), is 197. Instead, a sample size of 100 was used in this study due to financial and time constraints. Such a sample size may fail to be completely representative of the present population.

- The study aimed at generalizing its findings to female civil service managers in the entire Eastern Cape Province. Due to financial and time limitations, however, its sample was drawn from only one civil service department in only one location that is King William’s Town. A sample from such a limited geographical area may again affect the external validity or generalisability of the findings.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on the limitations of the present study, it is hereby recommended that future studies should:
➢ Use larger samples calculated with Raosoft Sample Size Estimator (Raosoft 2001).
➢ Draw samples from more organisations and a wider geographical area that corresponds to the area to which the results of the study are to be generalized.
➢ Use more than a single method to collect data. For example, both self-administered questionnaires and observation could be used, and the data analysis could entail a mixture of both qualitative and quantitative analysis. This would result in what is referred to as triangulation. Such triangulation often improves both the internal and the external validity of a study.
➢ Some future studies should specifically adopt the experimental design rather than the survey design used in the present study. Experimentation ensures that causality is determined and the direction of such causality is also determined.

5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE MANAGERIAL PRACTICE

The results of this study also have important implications for future managerial practice in work organizations. One of the important results of the study is that both job satisfaction and work-family conflict account for a significant amount of variance in occupational stress- 48% of variance in the case of job satisfaction and 32% in the case of work-family conflict.

In order to reduce occupational stress, therefore, it is necessary that serious measures be taken to increase job satisfaction and to reduce work-family conflict. The measures that can be taken to increase job satisfaction include: job design, an approach to motivation suggesting that jobs can be created so as to enhance people’s interest in doing them. Another strategy that can be used is job enlargement, the practice of expanding the content of a job to include more variety and a greater number of tasks at the same level (De Nobile & McCormick 2005).

Managers can also use job enrichment, the practice of giving employees a high degree of control over their work, from planning and organization, through implementing the
required activities and evaluating the results. Managers may also apply job rotation so that each employee will have an opportunity to perform different tasks using various skills and talents. By using this method the Department of Education may be able to reduce stress and increase the level of interest.

Providing sufficient opportunity for promotion to employees would also increase job satisfaction because promotion enhances a person’s self-worth. Managers must create work environment that will make employees feel that work is meaningful, offers control over how work is accomplished, maintains a clear set of behavioral norms, makes feedback concerning completed work available, and provides supportive relations with supervisors and co-workers (Boles, Johnston & Hair 2005).

The following measures can be taken to reduce work-family conflict: allowing flextime, providing crèches in the workplace and providing opportunities for telecommuting (Greenberg, 2011).

5.6CONCLUSION

This study was designed to test job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among female civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town district. The results obtained from this study showed that there is a significant positive association between job satisfaction and occupational stress. The two main components of overall job satisfaction, that is, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were found to be significantly and highly inter-correlated with overall job satisfaction. This suggested that both components of overall job satisfaction are also highly correlated with occupational stress.

The results indicated that there is no combined effect between job satisfaction and work-family conflict whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in occupational stress than each of them separately. The results further showed that both job satisfaction and work-family conflict accounts for a significant proportion of variance in occupational stress.
Organisations must also actively implement strategies to reduce work-family conflict in order to reduce occupational stress and its negative consequences such as withdrawal behavior. The fact that intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated means that they are all equally important as probable determinants of occupational stress. Organizations must constantly upgrade both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The future research studies should incorporate an investigation of the outcomes of job satisfaction such as job rotation. This needs to be confirmed in actual empirical research.
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Biographical Information

I am Thembisa Binqela, a Master of Commerce student in Industrial Psychology Department in the University of Forte Hare. As part of the requirements for the completion of my studies, I am conducting a study on “Job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among female civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District”. An executive summary to the study is herewith attached.

Executive Summary

Job satisfaction entails processes that plans and shapes the progression of individuals within an organisation in accordance to the organizational needs and objectives, employees’ performance potential and their preferences. Employees, especially those that are young express desires for meaningful jobs, increased personal freedom better opportunities and matters affecting them in the workplace (Beach, 2001).

In todays fast and ever changing work environment it is of vital importance for employees to carefully plan and develop their careers to improve their employability. Job satisfaction as the moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among female civil service managers, help in the management of organisation to match individual strengths with organizational needs and implement programs to accomplish these joint objectives.

Organisations have a pivotal role to play in their employee satisfaction in the workplace if they want to reduce work-family conflict and stress in their staff and maintain a competitive edge. The aims of this study are to determine the extent to which managers that are high in work-family conflict and also high in job satisfaction will experience significantly less stress than those that are high in work-family conflict and low in job satisfaction and that there will be a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and stress enhances job satisfaction in organisation and how organisations can improve their strategies to enhance employee satisfaction.
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Name……………….Thembisa Binqela___________E-mail………………..binqela@yahoo.com

Cell no……………..0724715410 /0846883902
Section A: Demographic Information

Instructions: Please respond to the following questions by supplying the required information or making a cross (x) after the appropriate response. If you do not find the exact answer for your case, please choose the response closest to your case.

1. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Level of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which management position do you occupy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Age of the last-born child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B: QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE JOB SATISFACTION

We are interested in the extent of your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the work you do in your present job. Please respond to the following statements by placing a mark or slash (/) through each scale line (----/----) directly under the number that best describes the extent of your satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

1. **WORKING CONDITIONS:**
   Such things as the amount of work space available, lighting, temperature, equipment and so forth.


2. **OPPORTUNITY FOR ACHIEVEMENT:**
   Opportunities to achieve something you consider worthwhile, opportunities for successful accomplishment.


3. **INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS:**
   The social atmosphere of your work group, the kinds of feelings that exist between yourself and your fellow-workers.


4. **WORK ITSELF:**

The actual work you perform.


5. SUPERVISION:

The type of interpersonal relationship between yourself and your immediate supervisor.


6. TASK RESPONSIBILITY:

The amount of personal responsibility you are given for your own work.


7. COMPANY POLICY:

The procedures used by the Company in conducting its business, as well as the Company's attitude toward employees.


8. ADVANCEMENT:

The opportunities available for getting ahead, for being promoted.

9. **PAY:**

The amount of money you receive as compensation for the work you do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very dis-</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. **OVERALL SATISFACTION:**

Your feelings about the job as a whole, taking into account both the favourable and unfavourable aspects of the total job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very dis-</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECTION C: A QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT.**

Please consider the questions and then indicate by circling the most appropriate number on the scale; N= Never, R= Rarely, S= Sometimes, O= Often, A= Always.

**WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT** – The following are ways one’s work-life interfere with one’s family-life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work keeps me from family more than I would like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My work takes up time that I feel I should spend with my family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The time I must devote to my job does not keep me from participating equally in household responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I generally seem to have enough time to fulfill my potential both in my career and as a spouse and parent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I often feel the strain of attempting to balance my responsibilities at home and work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Because my work is demanding, I am often irritable at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The demands of my job make it difficult for me to maintain the kind of relationship with my spouse and children that I would like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The tension of balancing my responsibilities at home and work often causes me to feel emotionally drained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The problem-solving approaches I use in my job are effective in resolving problems at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The things that I do that make me effective at work also help me to be a better parent and spouse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What works for me at home seems to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. You have constant time pressure due to a heavy work load.

2. You have many interruptions and disturbances in your job.

3. You have a lot of responsibility in your job.

4. You are often pressured to work overtime.

5. Over the past few years, your job has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effective at work as well, and vice versa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am not able to act the same way at home as at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I act differently in responding to interpersonal problems at work than I do at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Behaviour that is effective and necessary for me at work would counter productive at home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION D: A QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEASURE STRESS AT WORKPLACE.**

We would like to know whether or not the following statements apply to you in relation to your present job, and if so, to what extent it distresses you. **Circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement.** Use the following key to the numbers:

**Key**

1. Does not apply.
2. Applies but does not distress me.
3. Applies and distresses me somewhat.
4. Applies and distresses me.
5. Applies and distresses me very much.
become more and more demanding.  
6. You receive the respect you deserve from your superiors.  
7. You receive the respect you deserve from your colleagues.  
8. You experience adequate support in difficult situations.  
9. You are treated unfairly at work.  
10. Considering all your efforts and achievements, you receive the respect and prestige you deserve at work.  
11. Your job promotion prospects are poor.  
14. Considering all your efforts and achievements, your work prospects are adequate.  
15. Considering all your efforts and achievements, Your salary/income is adequate.  
16. Your job security is poor.  

Please consider the questions and circle the appropriate number to the right of each statement. Use the following key to the numbers:

**Key**

1. Does not apply. 
2. Applies but does not distress me. 
3. Applies and distresses me somewhat. 
4. Applies and distresses me. 
5. Applies and distresses me very much.
1. Are you treated unfairly at work?  
2. Are the promotion prospects in your job poor?  
3. Have you experience or do you expect to experience an undesirable change in your work situation?  
4. Considering all your efforts and achievements, are your work prospects poor?  
5. Does your current job adequately reflect all your past efforts and achievements?  
6. Considering all your efforts and achievements, do you receive the respect and prestige you deserve at work?  
7. Does your salary / income adequately reflect all your past efforts and achievements?  

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION
APPENDIX B: Covering Letter

University of Fort Hare
Together in Excellence

16 September 2012

Dear colleague

RESEARCH STUDY: Job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between Work-Family Conflict and Stress among female civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District

I am currently researching job satisfaction as a moderator of the relationship between work-family conflict and stress among female civil service managers in the Department of Education in the King William’s Town District. This research is conducted in order to fulfill the requirements for the Master of Commerce degree in Industrial Psychology at the university of Fort Hare.

I would appreciate your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. Please complete the questionnaire and return it to the undersigned by e-mail within three days. Please make sure that you answer all the questions.

Please note:

• Your participation in this survey is confidential. There are no right or wrong answers. It is how you feel about a matter that is important, your opinion is valued. Please answer every question as honestly as possible.
• The results of the questionnaire will be processed by means of a computer. Only a summary of the end results will be made available to the respective participating members. Individual responses will not be submitted to management.

• All personal information that is required in section A is necessary to summarise and correlate the conclusions of the study in a proper manner.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Thembisa Binqela

Researcher
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