



Generational Cohort and Work-Life Balance Policies Preference Among University Senior Teaching Staff in Ghana: Does Gender Matter?

*Dr. Nicodemus Osei Owusu
Irene Combey*

Department of Management, School of Business, College of Humanities and Legal Studies, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Prof. Nana Yaw Oppong

Department of Human Resource Management, School of Business, College of Humanities and Legal Studies, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

[Doi:10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p79](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p79)

Submitted: 05 November 2021

Accepted: 01 March 2022

Published: 31 March 2022

Copyright 2022 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

4.0 OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Owusu N.O., Combey I. & Oppong N.Y. (2022). *Generational Cohort and Work-Life Balance Policies Preference Among University Senior Teaching Staff in Ghana: Does Gender Matter?*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 18 (10), 79. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n10p79>

Abstract

The study sought to examine work-life balance (WLB) policies preference among generational cohorts concerning gender. Being quantitative, a population of 714 with a sample size of 333 was selected, but 306 responded. The main independent variable was gender while the dependent variable was work-life balance policies with four dimensions: Flexible Work Arrangement; Wellness and Personal Development; Leave Arrangement and Dependent Care Assistance. The data was analysed using inferential statistics. The study results showed that except for Wellness and Personal Development, where gender difference between males and females of Generation Y existed, gender did not differ significantly from the rest of the policies. Therefore, it was recommended that there should be equal treatment of both males and females in implementing WLB policies.

Keywords: Work-life balance, Policies preference, Gender, Generational cohort, University, Ghana

Introduction

In today's world, diversity in the workplace is not only characterised by various racial and or ethnic groups but also, by several employees from various generations. The different generations who work with each other in the same organisations also experience increasing workloads forcing them to work several hours. The ramification of this is that most of these employees spend long hours at their workplaces, reducing staying at home (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011). Such a practice has further deepened the work demands on employees leading to stress and work imbalances, which are harmful to workers' health (Bannai & Tamakoshi, 2014). This is especially true, to a large extent in the tertiary institutions, where most of the staff like the senior academic teaching staff, are supposed to be involved in their job almost at all times. Such an engagement potentially leads to the loss of traditional differences between work-life and family life.

Largely, there are four generational cohorts of employees that are involved in today's work-life balance (WLB) challenges. They include 'Traditionalists' who were born between 1925 and 1945; Baby Boomers (1946 – 1964); Generation X (1965 – 1980), and Generation Y (1981 – 1999) (Lester, Standifer, Schultz & Windsor, 2012). Each of these generations is characterised not only by different time horizons and environments but also affected by various events. Accordingly, there have been huge variations in generational choices and or preferences (Inglehart, 1997; Aydemir, Dinç & Çağlar, 2016). This assertion is backed by the generational cohort theory which explains how generations under normal circumstances share values and viewpoints of the world, and how a generation tends to vary from one another. This suggests that the understanding each generation has about this world differs and these differences shape their opinions, which also have an impact on the behaviours and expectations of each generational cohort at the workplace (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011).

In the context of Ghana, both men and women within each generational cohort have been saddled with the issue of work-life balance (WLB). Women in each of the cohort, for example, besides working in formal paid jobs, are the ones who bear the greater portion of domestic tasks such as child nurturing and making meals for the family causing them to have insufficient time for neither their homes nor professional works (Porter & Ayman, 2010). On the part of men, they still bear their families' financial burdens and need to work long hours outside their homes, which makes them incapable of having enough time for their family members (Annor, 2014). In each of these cases, apart from the work disturbing the family and social lives, the pressures from the family also significantly affect their outputs, particularly those in the tertiary institutions (Mabokela & Mlambo, 2015). In these institutions, most of the staff like the senior academic members are often faced with work-life

imbalances as they often take on the diverse roles of teaching, mentoring, advising, supervising, researching, community services, and institutional assignments. They have to struggle to fulfill these professional roles and their roles as a wife, husband, mother, uncle, or aunt (Annor, 2014; Mabokela & Mlambo, 2015). The magnitude of these roles makes it stressful for them to find stability between their professional and private life.

Consequently, the nature of these synchronous demands in working and family life often calls for workers to relentlessly seek to balance life by taking into account the good WLB policies in their institutions (Burke & Mikkelsen, 2005; Nwagbara, 2020). However, while several WLB policies might have been implemented, we need to be mindful of the probable gendered ways in which they are expected to be used among generations. In other words, gender matters when it comes to understanding the effects of WLB policies (*Doble & Supriya*, 2010). From the point of view of Chung and Lippe (2018), the use and preference for flexible WLB policies among men and women are different in so many ways which lead to different consequences for wellbeing and work intensification. To this end, we need to address WLB across genders, as expectations and coping styles can be seen to be divergent (Baick & Drew, 2006; Parker, 2007).

However, even though many studies have addressed WLB flexible policies and the nuanced gendered ways in which it may mean different things for men and women, there are some caveats that this study attempts to tackle. For example, according to Chung and Lippe (2018), one of the most significant caveats of the earlier studies on this issue is that they are primarily based on qualitative data, with most interviews and observations as research tools. Additionally, even those using quantitative data (Wight, Raley & Bianchi, 2008; Craig & Powell, 2011, 2012) mostly employed data from the developed countries. However, because work cultures and gender norms are different in these Western countries compared to those in Africa, and for that matter Ghana, the genders prefer WLB policies that are expected to be different. Moreover, the fact that they are from different generational cohorts suggests that differences are likely to exist between males and females. Therefore, there is the need to have more evidence from a wider range of countries and in different contexts in Africa to appreciate how WLB policies can lead to different results for men and women across generational cohorts (Chung & Lippe, 2018). In light of this, the study was conducted to unearth the all-inclusive WLB needs of full-time working people of the Ghanaian tertiary sector workforce.

Thus, the purpose of the study was to investigate how WLB policies preference differs with respect to gender among different generational cohorts of senior academic members of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. Specifically, the focus was on whether female and male elements of

generational cohorts differ in their policy priorities across four meaningful WLB policy areas in the context of Ghana.

Study Hypothesis

H₁: There is a significant difference in WLB policies preference among generational cohorts with respect to gender in the University of Cape Coast senior teaching staff.

In terms of significance in Ghana, the study contributes to appreciating the variances that pertain to generational cohorts in tertiary institutions in terms of WLB policies preferences by gender. Besides, gender is too broad to be studied without contextualisation (Chung & Lippe, 2018; Chung & Van der Horst, 2018), and so by contextualising the study in terms of institutions, occupation, and country, we are able to gain better insight into WLB policies preferences which will be helpful to organisations in designing gender-specific measures to address work-life imbalances. Finally, the results would augment the existing body of knowledge on generational cohort and WLB policies preferences concerning gender, because no study has been conducted in the context of gender in tertiary institutions in Ghana.

With the study background discussed, the rest of the paper is organised as follows: First, a review is given on the literature, which focuses on the theory underpinning the study, the concepts of generational cohorts, WLB, as well as gender and WLB. The following section focuses on methodology. This is followed by discussions on the findings and ends with the study's conclusions.

Literature Review

The theory used to support this study was the generational cohort theory, which explains why variations exist between different generations of workers (D'Amato & Herzfeldt, 2008; Edmunds & Turner, 2005). Being advocated by Strauss & Howe (1991), the theory claims that important historic events and social changes in society influence the values, attitudes, views, and disposition of persons within a given cohort. It further explains how historical occurrences and social experiences that happen in the formative stage instead of the later years of persons affect and influence their opinions and values when they grow. That means that historical incidents can shape individual generations in both childhood and adulthood life. The generational cohort theory supports this study because it clarifies how the constituents of the same generation share similar values and perspectives of the world. This would help us understand the extent of the discrepancies and similarities between female and male constituents of generational cohorts in terms of preference for WLB policies in the tertiary institutions in Ghana.

The Concept of Generational Cohorts

Mannheim (1998) defines a generation as a group of people who share common habits and culture. This definition is further strengthened by Kopperschmidt (2000) who asserts that generation is a group of people who have the exact date of birth and experiences, and are affected by the same crucial factors during their growing periods. A standard chronological delineation of a "generation" involves a birth period of roughly twenty years (Wilson et al., 2008). The two key factors associated with generation are; date of birth and events associated with the period (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Thus, a generation is characterised by the shared attitudes, happenings and inclinations that mature in the environment of social and economic experiences of a well-defined period (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Howe & Strauss, 2000).

Considering the above discussion, a generational cohort can be considered to be a group of persons born within the same historical moment and are shaped by common happenings and situations at the time of their youth and adolescence (Howe & Strauss, 2000). In essence, these are the people who during the same period, have experienced comparable real societal and historical events during their years of maturity, a period between late adolescence and early adulthood years (Rogler, 2002). These individuals' lives are moulded by events that happen when they are young and adolescent and have left influential tracks concerning power, organisations and family responsibilities (Arsenault, 2004). Situations that prevailed in their adolescence, such as political, social, economic, and sociological forces, influenced the attitudes and opinions of a cohort (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). This makes year range a strong defining factor of generational cohorts regardless of geographical location (Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

Frameworks of Cohorts

There are various compositions of generational cohorts with their year ranges and names. A review of existing literature reveals that names are used to describe the cohorts such as Veterans for the Silent Generation, Baby Busters for Generation X, GenNext or Millennials for Generation Y (Arsenault, 2004). However, Zemke, Raines and Filipczak (1999) had listed the following birth years for the generations: Silent generation (traditionalists) (1922-1943); Baby Boomers (1944-1960); Gen X (1961-1980); Gen Y (1981-2000). According to Lancaster and Stillman (2002), some birth ranges like that of the Traditionalist, goes as far as forty years' span.

In the context of this study, the Silent Generation (born 1922-1943) who are individuals over 70 years now and therefore are on retirements, are not included. In view of this, this study focuses on the three-generational

cohorts who are currently in the Ghanaian labour force. These are The Baby Boomers (born 1946-1964); Generation X (born 1965-1980), and Generation Y (born 1981-1999). Some studies like that of Oblinger and Oblinger (2005), have shown that there is the development of the fifth-generation, known by them as the Post Millennials describing those born from 1995 to 2015. These fifth generational cohorts are in their developmental stages since the majority, if not all, are yet to fully join the labour force in Ghana (Labour Force Statistical Report, 2015).

In terms of the characteristics of Generational Cohorts, the Baby Boomer generation is often described as materialistic workaholics who desire self-fulfillment and place a high value on work and the acquisition of things, sometimes at the expense of family (Gentry, Griggs, Deal, Mondore & Cox, 2011). The Generation Xers (GenXers) follow the Baby Boomers (Lyons & Kuron, 2014), and are noted as being comfortable with diversity and change (Gentry et al., 2011), skeptical and individualistic (Constanza, Badger, Fraser, Severt & Gade, 2012), risk-tolerant, and entrepreneurial (Gentry et al., 2011). The Generation Y or the Millennial cohort represents those born since 1981. They are characterized as coming of age in an era of 24-hour web-based connectedness, possessing an inflated sense of self, and believing that they can achieve anything (Deyoe & Fox, 2012). They are also considered to be socially conscious but highly cynical and narcissistic (Costanza et al., 2012).

Work-Life Balance (WLB)

WLB is generally defined in so many ways. For example, Grzywacz and Carlson (2007) considered WLB as the "accomplishment of role-related expectations that are negotiated and shared between an individual and his/her role-related partners in the work and family domains" (p. 66). Greenhaus, Collins and Shaw (2003), on the other hand, define it as "the extent to which an individual is equally engaged in, and equally satisfied with his or her work role and family role" (p. 513). However, in the context of this paper, the understanding of WLB is based on the notion that, both paid work and social life must be less visible as priorities that are competing with each other but as complementary sides of a full life. While this viewpoint may consider different factors, it takes into account the social and contextual matters, as well as organisational based issues. In a sense, this perspective is in line with Clarke, Koch and Hill (2004), who opined that in general, WLB has to do with an acceptable degree of 'fit' between the numerous responsibilities in an individual's life. Thus, the core thrust of WLB is that work and private lives should be seen more as harmonising ingredients of a complete life than as competing priorities.

There are three major components to WLB: balance: time, involvement and satisfaction (Greenhaus et al., 2003). Time balance involves dedicating suitable quantities of time to work and life roles. Involvement balance implies obtaining identical intensities of psychological rendezvous in work and life roles. Satisfaction balance is getting equivalent degrees of contentment from work and life roles. The contention is that WLB is a type of inter-role divergence where responsibility demands emanating from the work and life spheres of influence are jointly incompatible in certain ways (Lewis, 2008). Pasamar and Valle (2015) have argued that lack of WLB can endanger an individual's health and well-being, subsequently affecting productivity, commitment, and employee turnover. Additionally, Felstead, Gallie and Green (2002) opined that the absence of WLB can significantly impact an individual's psychological and mental state.

Gender and Work-Life Balance

According to Fapohunda (2014), gender is one of the general dimensions on which variations in status are based. To the author, gender is a socially constructed concept that lays down the socially and culturally agreed roles that males and females are expected to perform. It comprises those social, cultural and physiological facets related to males and females through specific social contexts. The roles of females and males are often described variously in different cultures. Women's domestic tasks and childcare activities often affect the nature of work they tend to like, and the relationship between WLB policies like flexible working and work-family conflict has different consequences for men and women (Van der Lippe, Van Breeschoten & Van Hek, 2019). Moreover, different WLB policy arrangements may not have the same results for men and women. For example, WLB policies established by governments and organisations tend to permit women, especially those with dependent children, to work fewer hours to intensify the time available for their family and other responsibilities (Fujimoto, Azmat & Härtel, 2012). On the other hand, men usually have to handle imbalanced prospects of personal life, as they are typical to work full time, since they are the ones who are expected to bear the family's financial responsibilities (Lewis, Brannen & Nilsen, 2009). Despite these disparities between men's and women's working patterns, there are serious challenges faced by full-time working women. Pocock, Skinner and Pisaniello (2010) revealed that women have been found to have higher work-life interference per hour worked and more dissatisfaction than men when working for more than 35 hours per week, hence a higher preference to reduce their work hours men do. To this end, in advancing a better understanding in this changing world of work, we need to understand that there are disparities in expectations and handling styles across genders (Baick & Drew, 2006; Klapper & Parker, 2011).

In the context of Africa, even though domestic tasks and the labour market compete for women's time and energy, and therefore have difficulties in having WLB, most young women would rather prefer to have careers than to stay at home (Fapohunda, 2018). In the same vein, men are realising that work alone may not give satisfaction and want a balance between paid work and private responsibilities without maltreatment at work (Nwagbara, 2020). They are often seeking substitutes and flexibility, as this is to help them have more time with their families, even though working less implies a smaller income (Oloyede, 2012).

Research Method

This study employed the quantitative research approach with a descriptive survey design. The population was made up of all senior academic members of the University of Cape Coast, which numbered 714. This was made up of 580 males and 134 females. Per the distribution of senior staff population by cohorts, Baby Boomers were 188, Gen X were 360 and Gen Y were 166 (University of Cape Coast Directorate of Human Resource, 2018).

The sample size was 333 respondents and this was carefully chosen based on the G-Power version 3.1.9.2 software, which gave a sample of 302. Ten percent was included to accommodate the nonresponse rate, bringing the sample size to 333. G-power was used because it was considered the most expedient method to compute power using power analysis software (Erdfelder, Faul & Buchner, 1996). Besides, G-Power prevents the use of complex tables and formula works and offers the researcher the power to include the "test family" (e.g., t-tests, F tests), the type of power analysis (i.e., a priori), and the input parameters (i.e., tails(s), effect size, power, etc.). This, therefore, tailors the sample size more closely to the research in question.

For the sampling procedure, stratified random sampling was employed. The researchers considered it imperative to gain information about key subgroups of the population, which is the teaching staff in their respective cohorts namely: Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y. This method was used taking into consideration Sarantakos (1993) and McBurney (2001) recommendation that, if the population one intends to survey has identifiable subgroups, a stratified random sample can be used to improve accuracy. After the stratification procedure, simple random sampling was employed to select the respondents from each stratum.

About the data collection instrument, a questionnaire was employed. A set of written questionnaires on WLB was adopted from Lingard and Francis (2005) after a thorough review of extant literature. The questionnaires were 20 and dealt with the extent to which senior academic members agreed that certain WLB policies were preferred in terms of balancing their lives. It was a five-point rating scale on level of agreement, with one (1) indicating "least

level of agreement" and five (5) meaning "highest level of agreement" to the policies. The questionnaire was self-administered and the respondents were comfortable responding to the questionnaire because of the assurance of strict confidentiality. There was a 93.39 percent return rate of administered questionnaires representing 311, of which five had incomplete information. Thus, a total of 306 were used for the final analysis.

In processing and analysing the data, the completed questionnaires were edited for consistency and clarity, coded and entered into SPSS version 22.0. The study objective was analysed based on the hypothesis below:

H₁: There is a significant difference in work-life balance policies preference among a generational cohort of senior academic members with respect to gender at the University of Cape Coast.

The testing of the hypothesis was divided into three, based on the generational cohorts. This was analysed using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) in order to authenticate whether there was a WLB preference within the gender of each generational cohort. The dependent variables were the WLB policy constructs while the independent variable was gender. These policy constructs were Wellness and Personal Development; Flexible Work Arrangement; Leave Arrangement and Dependent Care Assistance. In all aspects, the analysis was expected to reveal the results of the MANOVA, which would provide the combined effect of the differences that exist between all the dependent and independent variables. Even in situations where we failed to reject the null hypothesis, the researchers went further to do a follow-up test to see how each dependent variable differed from the independent variable.

Results and Discussions

The demographic information gathered on the respondents showed that 154 of teaching staff representing 50.8 percent, fall within the Generation X cohort, followed by 80 Baby Boomers representing 26.4 percent, and finally, 72 Generation Y representing 23.7 percent. This outcome is not surprising because many of the teaching staff who are Baby boomers are retiring because of the mandatory retirement age in Ghana (Labour Force Survey Report of Ghana, 2015) while Gen Y is now coming on board due to their age and educational qualifications. In terms of gender, the result indicated that 202 males representing 66 percent labour force of teaching staff dominated, while the females were 104 representing 34 percent. Although there have been improvements, more needs to be done.

In the case of testing the hypothesis formulated, the results for various generational cohorts in terms of gender are presented in the tables below.

Generation Y

Table 1 presents the results of the MANOVA at the 0.05 level with Gender as the independent variable and WLB constructs as the dependent variables.

Table1: MANOVA of WLB Polices Within Gender of Gen. Y

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis sis df	Error df	p-value
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.976	668.107 ^b	4.000	67.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.024	668.107 ^b	4.000	67.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	39.887	668.107 ^b	4.000	67.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	39.887	668.107 ^b	4.000	67.000	.000
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.103	1.923 ^b	4.000	67.000	.117
	Wilks' Lambda	.897	1.923 ^b	4.000	67.000	.117
	Hotelling's Trace	.115	1.923 ^b	4.000	67.000	.117
	Roy's Largest Root	.115	1.923 ^b	4.000	67.000	.117

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The results presented in Table 1 indicate no statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level in the preference of importance in WLB policies within the gender of Generational Y [$F = 1.923$, $p < 0.05$]. From the results presented in Table 1, the Sig Value of F-Stats of 1.923 is 0.117, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that "There is no significant difference of work-life balance policies preference among generational Y cohort concerning gender among teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast" and conclude that the means among the different gender of Generational Y are equal with regards to their preference on importance of WLB policies.

As earlier indicated, a follow-up analysis was done to find out the individual effects, and the results were presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Test of Between Subjects Effects of Generation Y for Gender

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Df	F	p-value
FWA_C	MALE	2.9952	0.67497	1	0.21	0.885
	FEMALE	3.0200	0.76357			
LA_C	MALE	3.1952	0.73184	1	1.629	0.206
	FEMALE	3.4200	0.74343			
WPD_C	MALE	3.0536	0.78580	1	6.781	0.011**
	FEMALE	3.5667	0.87576			
DCA_C	MALE	3.0397	0.70308	1	0.794	0.376
	FEMALE	3.1889	0.69719			

Source: Field Survey (2019)

Key: WPD_C = Wellness and Personal Development Construct
 FWA_C = Flexible Work Arrangement Construct
 LA_C = Leave Arrangement Construct
 DCA_C = Dependent Care Assistance Construct

From Table 2, the results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference between Gender (male, female) of Generation Y concerning the Wellness and Personal Development Construct ($F [1] = 6.781, p < 0.05$). In this case, the mean difference value was 0.5131 in favour of Females. With the mean score, Male ($M=3.0536, SD= 0.78580$) was significantly different from Female ($M=3.5667, SD= 0.87576$). This tends to support the findings of Lingard & Francis (2005), where females showed a higher preference for wellness and personal development initiative.

However, gender did not differ significantly from Flexible Work Arrangement, Leave Arrangement and Dependent Care Assistance [$F (1) < 1.630, p>0.05$]. According to the means and contrary to the expectation, each WLB Policy Construct was valued virtually the same by Male and Female, with Wellness and Personal Development being an exception. Therefore, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in work-life balance policies preference among generational Y cohort regarding gender among teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast" was partially supported.

Generation X

With regards to Generation X, the result of the MANOVA at the 0.05 level was presented in Table 3

Table 3: MANOVA of Work-life balance Policies within Gender of Gen. X

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	p-value
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.974	1411.509 ^b	4.000	149.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.026	1411.509 ^b	4.000	149.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	37.893	1411.509 ^b	4.000	149.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	37.893	1411.509 ^b	4.000	149.000	.000
Gender	Pillai's Trace	.045	1.740 ^b	4.000	149.000	.144
	Wilks' Lambda	.955	1.740 ^b	4.000	149.000	.144
	Hotelling's Trace	.047	1.740 ^b	4.000	149.000	.144
	Roy's Largest Root	.047	1.740 ^b	4.000	149.000	.144

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The Table 3 result indicates no statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level in the preference of importance in WLB policies within the gender of Generational X [$F = 1.740$, $p < 0.05$]. From Table 3, the p-value of F-Stats of 1.740 is 0.144, greater than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that "There is no significant difference of WLB policies preference among generational X cohort with respect to gender among teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast" and conclude that means among the different gender of Generational X are equal with regards to their preference on importance of WLB policies. This tends to support the findings of Antecol, Bedard, and Stearns (2016) who noted that Gen X had "career moms" and as this took place in their early stages, they became aware that they would have to choose, as their mums did. This has made this generation natural allies with women on "work-life balance" challenges and has more advanced opinions on the potentials of females, hence exhibiting more balance between male and female ways of reasoning and working.

To find out the individual effects, a follow-up analysis was done and the results were presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Test of Between Subjects Effects of Generation X for Gender

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Df	F	p-value
FWA_C	MALE	2.6552	0.64955	1	3.103	0.080
	FEMALE	2.8694	0.80576			
L_C	MALE	3.0705	0.67879	1	1.500	0.223
	FEMALE	3.2122	0.64731			
WPD_C	MALE	2.9429	0.77851	1	0.015	0.901
	FEMALE	2.9592	0.72051			
DCA_C	MALE	2.9032	0.66578	1	0.397	0.530
	FEMALE	2.8333	0.58333			

Source: Field Survey (2019)

From the results presented in Table 4, it can be concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between Gender (male, female) of Generation X ($F [1] = 1.740, p < 0.05$). Gender did not differ significantly from all the four main WLB policies [$F (1) < 3.1040, p > 0.05$]. Conferring from the means and contrary to the expectation, each WLB Policy Construct was valued virtually the same by gender. Therefore, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in WLB policies preferences among generation Y cohort regarding gender among senior teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast" was supported.

The explanation for this indifference is that both males and females within Gen Y rate freedom and leisure comparatively higher than the other two generations (Gibson, Greenwood & Murphy, 2009; Twenge, 2010). In addition, in contrast to the women from the baby boom generation, the young women from Gen Y are focused on economic independence and are very career-oriented (Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman & Lance, 2010), hence will like to have the same WLB policies preference as men.

Baby Boomers

In the case of the Baby Boomers, the result of the MANOVA at the 0.05 level was presented in Table 5

Table 5: MANOVA of WLB Polices Within Gender of Baby Boomers

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	p-value
Intercept Pillai's Trace	.975	740.010 ^b	4.000	75.000	.000
Wilks'	.025	740.010 ^b	4.000	75.000	.000
Lambda ^t	39.467	740.010 ^b	4.000	75.000	.000
Hotelling's Trace					
Roy's Largest Root	39.467	740.010 ^b	4.000	75.000	.000
Gender Pillai's Trace	.038	.731 ^b	4.000	75.000	.574
Wilks' Lambda	.962	.731 ^b	4.000	75.000	.574
Hotelling's Trace	.039	.731 ^b	4.000	75.000	.574
Roy's Largest Root	.039	.731 ^b	4.000	75.000	.574

Source: Field Survey(2019)

Table 5 results indicate no statistically significant difference at the $p < 0.05$ level in the preference of importance in WLB policies within the gender of Baby Boomers [$F = .731, p < 0.05$]. The p-value of Table 5 of 0.731 is 0.574 which is greater than the significance level of 0.05; thus we fail to reject the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference of WLB policies preferences among Baby Boomers generational cohort for gender among senior teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast. Thus, we concluded that means among the different genders of Baby Boomers are equal regarding their preference on the importance of WLB policies. This is because Baby Boomer women strived to "have it all" and fingered that "fitting in" and making it in

the business world necessitate that they downplay their femininity (Turner, 2017). This could explain why females always wanted to be at par with men, leading to no gender differences.

The follow-up analysis was done to find out the individual effects, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Test of Between Subjects Effects of Baby Boomers for Gender

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Df	F	p-value
FWA_C	MALE	2.9236	0.56633	1	0.902	0.345
	FEMALE	2.7920	0.59296	1		
L_C	MALE	3.1418	0.67294	1	0.850	0.359
	FEMALE	3.2960	0.73738	1		
WPD_C	MALE	3.0000	0.73283	1	0.687	0.410
	FEMALE	3.1400	0.62115	1		
DCA_C	MALE	3.0091	0.61982	1	0.229	0.634
	FEMALE	3.0800	0.60116	1		

Source: Field Survey (2019)

The results presented in Table 6 indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the Gender (male, female) of Baby Boomers ($F [1] = 1.740, p < 0.05$). Thus, gender did not differ significantly from all the four main WLB policies [$F (1) < 3.1040, p > 0.05$]. Conferring from the means and contrary to the expectation, each WLB Policy Construct was considered practically similar by Male and Female. Therefore, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in WLB policies preference among Baby Boomers generational cohort regarding gender among senior teaching staff in the University of Cape Coast" was supported. This result is not surprising because both male and female baby boomers are seen as workaholics and thus tend to prioritize their work (Crampton & Hodge, 2007). In general, because both men and women of the baby boomers feel pressure to take care of children or grandchildren and aging parents simultaneously (Kupperschmidt, 2000), they would all be interested in being supported by care facilities such as care leave. Nevertheless, they would not be interested in using flexible opportunities as working from home since that is quite unusual for them (Beutell & Witting-Berman, 2008).

Conclusion

The study sought to examine WLB policies preference among generational cohorts for gender among the senior teaching staff at the University of Cape Coast. In line with literature, there were two sided views with differences in gender and WLB policies preferences. On one side, the study found gender differences between males and females of Generation Y concerning the Wellness and Personal Development Construct ($F [1] = 6.781,$

$p < 0.05$). In this instance, there was a significant difference between the two where females showed a higher preference for wellness and personal development initiatives. However, gender did not differ significantly from Flexible Work Arrangement, Leave Arrangement and Dependent Care Assistance [$F(1) < 1.630, p > 0.05$]. Indeed, both Males and Females were virtually the same on these three policies. Thus, while full-time working men would like to work excessively long hours and control their job context, it is with women. However, in the African context, full-time working women are confronted with narrower range of social activities outside their work due to their traditional responsibilities of caring for the family, thereby necessitating their flexible working hour arrangements. In essence, our finding suggests that lack of incentives like flexible working hours and lack of managers' care can affect men the same way as women.

Implicitly, these findings imply that, just like men, full-time working women need fair and equitable WLB policy options as well as management understanding to allow them to control and succeed in their work and non-work roles with greater flexibility. Once managers and supervisors show greater sensitivity towards their socially constructed dilemmas, women like men will be able to balance their dual roles better, which can positively affect their career advancements (Atkinson & Hall, 2009). With both men and women facing conflict because of long working hours and excessive job demands, there is employers for both men and women greater control over how they manage the needs of their job. Once employers demonstrate greater sensitivity to men and women's gendered dilemmas about their job demands (including long working hours), they can be expected to gain more control over their WLB, which in turn, would lead to increased productivity in academia (Rafnsdóttir & Heijstra, 2013).

Recommendations

Based on this study findings, it is suggested that, rather than focusing on further developing WLB policies, practices and programmes at the institutional level, management should be sensitive to provide university senior staff a greater sense of control in managing their work and non-work lives within their given social context to attain their WLB. University authorities must understand their senior staff's gender needs. Such understanding should be followed by providing greater discretion to decide when, where, and how their job is to be done, which can bring about greater work and non-work satisfaction (McDonald, Brown & Bradley, 2005). In addition, there is a need for improved gender-friendly work-life balance options like childcare options and organisational assistance through individual breaks, childcare within institutional premises, flex schedules, working from home, and part-time work.

Secondly, the University of Cape Coast should incorporate more Dependent Care Assistance policies, for example, special scholarships for employees' children and elder care services in their WLB policies. This is because all cohorts embrace Dependent Care Policies as a vital component of Work-life balance policies that aid in balancing their lives. When such policies are implemented, it solves issues of imbalance from the family on work, which could positively impact organisational productivity and employee performance as a whole. The government and organisations should further enhance more dependent policies because for all generations, the concept of family can never be overlooked. This could be seen from the high agreement given to Dependent Care Assistance Policies.

Thirdly, organisations must pay crucial attention to meeting the needs of Generation X in balancing their lives. The reason is that this generation is currently the largest workforce and results from the study indicated that they had the least agreements on how the available policies were important in balancing their lives. As the generation that strongly agitated for work-life balance policies, implementers and managers must seek to satisfy their needs or fear losing them to other organisations, once this group perceives imbalance. Hence, leading to low productivity.

Also, gender should not be given much attention when handling WLB policies. Rather, the concentration of managers should be keener to generational diversity. Over the past decade, the variations between males and females at work are becoming an issue of the past as females are taking up roles meant for men and again, we have both men and women being breadwinners now.

Suggestions for Further Research

The present study examined work-life balance policies among teaching staff generational cohorts at the University of Cape Coast. Further studies can be done by replicating this in other universities. Individual factors such as emotional intelligence and job engagement and environmental factors like advanced technology may affect the results and, therefore, be considered in further studies. Additionally, a comparative study of work-life balance policies among universities and widening it to cover work-life balance policies among generational cohorts for non-teaching staff could be studied.

References:

1. Annor, F. (2014). *Managing work and family demands: The perspectives of employed parents in Ghana*. University of Cambridge, Cambridge: United Kingdom

2. Antecol, H., Bedard, K. & Stearns, J. (2018). Equal but inequitable: Who benefits from gender-neutral tenure clock stopping policies? *American Economic Review*, 108(9), 2420-41.
3. Arsenault, P.M. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership issue. *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal*.
4. Atkinson, C. & Hall, L. (2009). The role of gender in varying forms of flexible working. *Gender, Work & Organisation*, 16(6), 650-666.
5. Aydemir, M., Dinc, M. S., & Çağlar, M. (2016, June). How work-life balance and work values differ from generation to generation: An exploratory study. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual International Conference on Social Sciences (AICSS)* (pp. 77-89).
6. Baick, I., & E. Drew. (2006). Struggling with juggling: Gender and worklife balance in the legal professions. *Women's Studies International Focus* 29 (2), 9–22
7. Bannai, A. & Tamakoshi, A. (2014). The association between long working hours and health: a systematic review of epidemiological evidence. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 5-18
8. Beutell, N. J., & Wittig-Berman, U. (2008). Work-family conflict and work-family synergy for generation X, baby boomers, and matures: generational differences, predictors, and satisfaction outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23 (5) 507-523
9. Brough, P., Timms, C., Chan, X.W., Hawkes, A. & Rasmussen, L. (2020). Work–life balance: definitions, causes, and consequences. *Handbook of Socioeconomic Determinants of Occupational Health: From Macro-level to Micro-level Evidence*, 473-487.
10. Burke, R.J. & Mikkelsen, A. (2005). Gender issues in policing: do they matter?. *Women in Management Review*.
11. Chung, H. & Van der Lippe, T. (2018). Flexible working, work–life balance, and gender equality: Introduction. *Social Indicators Research*, 1-17.
12. Chung, H. & Van der Horst, M. (2018). Flexible working and unpaid overtime in the UK: The role of gender, parental and occupational status. *Social Indicators Research*, 1-26.
13. Costanza, D.P., Badger, J.M., Fraser, R.L., Severt, J.B. & Gade, P.A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 27(4), 375-394.
14. Craig, L. & Powell, A. (2011). Non-standard work schedules, work-family balance and the gendered division of childcare. *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(2), 274-291.

15. Craig, L., Powell, A. & Cortis, N. (2012). Self-employment, work-family time and the gender division of labour. *Work, Employment and Society*, 26(5), 716-734.
16. Crampton, S. M., & Hodge, J. W. (2007). Generations in the workplace: Understanding age diversity. *The Business Review*, Cambridge 9(1), 16-23.
17. Crumpacker, M. & Crumpacker, J.M. (2007). Succession planning and generational stereotypes: should HR consider age-based values and attitudes a relevant factor or a passing fad? *Public Personnel Management*, 36(4), 349-369.
18. D'Amato, A. & Herzfeldt, R. (2008). Learning orientation, organisational commitment and talent retention across generations: A study of European managers. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
19. Deyoe, R.H. & Fox, T.L. (2012). Identifying strategies to minimize workplace conflict due to generational differences. *Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business*, 5, 1.
20. Directorate of Health, University of Cape Coast, Yearly Report, (2018)
21. Doble, N. & Supriya, M. V. (2010). Gender differences in the perception of work-life balance. *Management*, 5(4), 331-342.
22. Edmunds, J. & Turner, B.S. (2005). Global generations: social change in the twentieth century. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4), 559-577.
23. Erdfelder, E., Faul, F. & Buchner, A. (1996). GPOWER: A general power analysis program. *Behaviour Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 28(1), 1-11.
24. Fapohunda, T.M. (2014). Gender influence in work life balance: Findings from Nigeria. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(2), 25-39.
25. Felstead, A., Gallie, D. & Green, F. (2002). *Work skills in Britain, 1986-2001*.
26. Fu, C.K. & Shaffer, M.A., (2001). The tug of work and family. *Personnel Review*.
27. Fujimoto, Y., Azmat, F. & Härtel, C.E. (2013). Gender perceptions of work-life balance: management implications for full-time employees in Australia. *Australian Journal of Management*, 38(1), 147-170.
28. Gentry, W.A., Griggs, T.L., Deal, J.J., Mondore, S.P. & Cox, B.D. (2011). A comparison of generational differences in endorsement of leadership practices with actual leadership skill level. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(1), 39.
29. Gibson, J.W., Greenwood, R.A. & Murphy Jr, E.F. (2009). Generational differences in the workplace: Personal values,

- behaviours, and popular beliefs. *Journal of Diversity Management (JDM)*, 4(3), 1-8.
30. Greenhaus, J.H., Collins, K.M. & Shaw, J.D. (2003). The relation between work–family balance and quality of life. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 63(3), 510-531.
 31. Grzywacz, J.G. and Carlson, D.S. (2007). Conceptualizing work—family balance: Implications for practice and research. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 9(4), 455-471
 32. Howe, N. and Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. Vintage.
 33. Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization, postmodernization and changing perceptions of risk. *International Review of Sociology*, 7(3), 449-459.
 34. Joshi, A., Dencker, J.C., Franz, G. & Martocchio, J.J. (2010). Unpacking generational identities in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 392-414.
 35. Kapoor, C. & Solomon, N. (2011). Understanding and managing generational differences in the workplace. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*.
 36. Klapper, L.F. & Parker, S.C. (2011). Gender and the business environment for new firm creation. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 26(2), 237-257.
 37. Kupperschmidt, B.R. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *The Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65-76.
 38. Labour Force Statistical Report. (2015). Accra, Ghana
 39. Lancaster, L.C. & Stillman, D. (2002), *When Generations Collide: Traditionalists, Baby Boomers, Generation Xers, Millennials: Who They Are, Why They Clash, How to Solve the Generational Puzzle at Work*, HarperCollins, New York, NY
 40. Lester, S.W., Standifer, R.L., Schultz, N.J. & Windsor, J.M. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 19(3), 341-354.
 41. Lewis, D., (2008). *Convention: A philosophical study*. John Wiley & Sons.
 42. Lewis, S., Brannen, J. & Nilsen, A. eds. (2009). *Work, families and organisations in transition: European perspectives*. Policy Press.
 43. Lingard, H. & Francis, V. (2005). The decline of the 'traditional' family: work-life benefits as a means of promoting a diverse workforce in the construction industry of Australia. *Construction Management and Economics*, 23(10), 1045-1057

44. Mabokela, R.O., & Mlambo, Y.A. (2015) "*The older women are men:*" navigating the academic terrain, perspectives from Ghana. *High Education* 69, 759–778.
45. McDonald, P., Brown, K. & Bradley, L. (2005). Explanations for the provision-utilisation gap in work-life policy. *Women in Management Review*.
46. Meenakshi, M.S.P. & Ravichandran, K. (2013). Quality of Work Life–The Need of the Hour.
47. Nwagbara, U., (2020). Institutions and organisational work-life balance (WLB) policies and practices. *Journal of Work-Applied Management*
48. Oblinger, D., Oblinger, J.L. & Lippincott, J.K. (2005). *Educating the net generation*. Boulder, Colo.: EDUCAUSE, c2005. 1 v.(various pagings): illustrations.
49. Oláh, L.S., Kotowska, I.E. & Richter, R. (2018). The new roles of men and women and implications for families and societies. In *A Demographic perspective on gender, family and health in Europe* (41-64). Springer, Cham.
50. Oloyede, (2012). Effective work/life strategies: Working couples, work conditions, gender and life quality. *Social Problems* 47 (3), 291–326
51. Parker, C. C. (2007). Generational differences in work life balance Attitudes. A thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology of the State University of New York for the degree of MS.
52. Pasamar, S. & Valle, R. (2015). Antecedents of work–life involvement in work–life issues: institutional pressures, efficiency gains or both? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(8), 1130-1151.
53. Pocock, B., Skinner, N. & Pisaniello, S.L. (2010). *How much should we work: working hours, holidays and working life: the participation challenge*. Adelaide: Centre for Work+ Life, University of South Australia.
54. Porter, S., & Ayman, R. (2010). Work flexibility as a mediator of the relationship between work- family conflict and intention to quit. *Journal of Management and Organisation*, 16, 411- 424.
55. Rafnsdóttir, G.L. & Heijstra, T.M. (2013). Balancing work–family life in academia: The power of time. *Gender, Work & Organisation*, 20(3), 283-296.
56. Rogler, L.H. (2002). Historical generations and psychology: The case of the Great Depression and World War II. *American Psychologist*, 57(12),1013.

57. Sarantakos, S. (1993). Varieties of Social Research. In *social research* (29-69). Macmillan Education UK.
58. Tapscott, D. (2009). *Grown up digital: How the Net generation is changing your world*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
59. Turner, I. (2017), *Work-life Balance Among Medical Doctors in Nigeria: A Gender Perspective*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Brunel, Brunel
60. Twenge, J.M. (2010). A review of the empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201-210.
61. Twenge, J.M., Campbell, S.M., Hoffman, B.J. & Lance, C.E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142.
62. University of Cape Coast, Human Resource Department, Yearly Report, (2017)
63. Van der Lippe, T., Van Breeschoten, L. & Van Hek, M. (2019). Organisational work–life policies and the gender wage gap in European workplaces. *Work and Occupations*, 46(2), 111-148.
64. Wight, V.R., Raley, S.B. & Bianchi, S.M. (2008). Time for children, one's spouse and oneself among parents who work nonstandard hours. *Social Forces*, 87(1), 243-271.
65. Yin, R.K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*, 19(3), 321-332.
66. Zemke, R., Raines, C. & Filipczak, B. (1999). Generation Gaps in the Classroom. *Training*, 36(11), 48