

WORK-FAMILY CONFLICT, WORK-FAMILY CULTURE, AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR AMONG TEACHERS

Jennifer DeNicolis Bragger, Ofelia Rodriguez-Srednicki

Montclair State University

Eugene J. Kutcher

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Lisa Indovino, Erin Rosner

Montclair State University

ABSTRACT: Two hundred three teachers completed measures of work-family culture, work-family conflict, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Pearson correlations indicated that OCB was related negatively to work-family conflict, and positively to work-family culture, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Hierarchical regression analyses indicated that work-family culture predicts work-family conflict, and that various forms of work-family conflict predict OCB. Analyses also showed that work-family culture predicts both organizational commitment and OCB, and that organizational commitment does not mediate the relationship between work-family culture and OCB. The findings support the importance for schools to foster a positive work-family culture.

KEY WORDS: organizational citizenship behavior; work-family conflict; work-family culture.

INTRODUCTION

Two highly pertinent and heavily researched topics in organizational literature today are work family balance and organizational citizenship

Address correspondence to Jennifer DeNicolis Bragger, Montclair State University. E-mail: braggerj@mail.montclair.edu.

behavior (Levy, 2003). These areas of study are so important in modern organizations because of their influence on organizational success and on the personal lives of employees (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Organ & Ryan, 1995). While a great deal of research has investigated both the antecedents and consequences of work family conflict and stress, and of citizenship behavior in organizations, little or no research has investigated how these constructs relate to one another. Some research has found that lower work family conflict is related to increased job satisfaction (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), and greater organizational commitment (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999), while other research has found these same variables to be antecedents of greater engagement in citizenship behaviors in organizational settings (Organ & Ryan, 1995). The time constraints, burnout, and exhaustion (Bacharach, Bamberger, & Conley, 1991) that often result from work family conflict may reduce the likelihood that employees, especially school teachers who are involved in a wide variety of extra-role behaviors in their workplace, will engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. It is the purpose of the current research to investigate how work family conflict and work family culture (defined by Thompson et al., 1999, as the collectively perceived quality of support an organization displays to its employees regarding their balance between work and life of an organization) are related to engagement in organizational citizenship behaviors. The present study investigated the relationships between how teachers, as a subset of the working population, experience work-family conflict and engage in OCB in their schools.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Smith, Organ, and Near (1983) completed one of the initial studies of an organizational construct alternatively called the "good soldier syndrome," discretionary behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, extra-role behavior, and contextual performance. Smith and colleagues initially defined organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) as discretionary behavior in organizations that is not enforceable by threat of sanctions or termination; behavior that is not formally defined by a job description or the position's formal role in the organization; and behavior that is generally thought to be a matter of personal choice, in that specific individual behaviors cannot be tied to specific rewards. Smith et al. (1983) also defined such behaviors as those that benefit others, perhaps even to the detriment of the person performing the behavior, and those behaviors that, in aggregate and over time, contribute to organizational effectiveness.

More recently, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) defined organizational citizenship behavior as activities at work that "do not support the

technical core itself as much as they support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function" (p. 73). For example, they may promote group cohesiveness or one's satisfaction with coworker relationships. Organ (1988) suggests that OCBs are discretionary in that they are not enforceable by punishment. While it is true that OCBs may be subjectively considered in performance evaluations, each individual behavior is not measured or evaluated. Employees are aware that OCB contributions might result in future rewards, but the rewards are uncertain and the relationship is indirect.

Over the past two decades researchers have investigated the various antecedents of such behaviors, and though there has been some debate over what behaviors do and do not constitute OCB, there is agreement that the concept has much relevance in organizations today. Researchers agree that the behaviors vary less across different jobs than does task performance, and so may be easier to aggregate and study across job types and organizations (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). By definition, these behaviors also contribute to organizational success.

Earlier studies of OCB focused on a two-factor model emphasizing the roles of altruism and compliance (Smith et al., 1983). The term altruism was used to label behaviors that involved helping other individuals in the organization, while compliance was originally used to label behaviors targeted at the organization as a whole. Recent research has labeled these dimensions OCB-I (toward the individual), or courtesy, and OCB-O (toward the organization), or conscientiousness respectively.

Other models of OCB have focused on a five-factor model. These factors have been labeled altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue (Organ, 1997). Altruism is defined as discretionary behaviors that specifically aid another person in the organization with an organizationally relevant issue. Conscientiousness is defined as discretionary behaviors that aid the organization in general and go beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization. Sportsmanship is the willingness of the employee to tolerate less than ideal situations without complaining. Courtesy is defined as behaviors aimed at preventing work-related problems with others from occurring. Civic virtue involves behaviors that indicate that the individual responsibly participates in or is involved in the life of the organization. Research has found that the facets of altruism and courtesy correspond to the OCB-I dimension of the two-factor model and that conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue typically fall into the OCB-O factor.

In the past 20 years, a great deal of research has attempted to investigate the individual and organizational circumstances that might increase the occurrence of OCBs. Some research has investigated personality and more "dispositional" individual characteristics, suggesting that OCB might have a genetic component (Konovsky & Organ, 1996).

Other work has found clear linkages between employee attitudes and OCB. Specifically, job satisfaction and organizational commitment have both been cited as antecedents (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ & Ryan, 1997; Schappe, 1998; Smith et al., 1983; Witt, 1991). Research has investigated the possibility that procedural justice, leadership styles, and reward systems may moderate the relationships between job satisfaction and OCB as well as organizational commitment and OCB. Alternatively, it has been suggested that these variables directly influence job satisfaction and organizational commitment. When employees feel that their organization has procedural justice and their leaders dispense equitable rewards, they are more satisfied and more committed to their organizations. Increased satisfaction and commitment are then predicted to lead to more OCBs (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Schnake & Dumler, 1997). A meta-analysis investigating the antecedents of OCB found that the job satisfaction/OCB and organizational commitment/OCB relationships are not completely dependent upon perceptions of procedural justice or equitable reward systems (Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Although the precise relationships among these variables are unclear, they remain popular factors associated with OCB. The meta-analysis conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) indicated that, of the antecedents that had been researched to date, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, leadership support, and perceived fairness were moderately predictive of organizational citizenship behavior. Except in the case of conscientiousness, personality traits and other dispositional measures were not found to correlate well with OCB. While these findings are enlightening, they also leave much of the variance in OCB unexplained. It is the contention of this research that work family conflict may help to explain some individual variability in OCB. Work family conflict is an extremely important construct in today's organizations because of its proliferation in the lives of modern working men and women. Though high levels of work family conflict has been found to be an antecedent of job dissatisfaction and lowered organizational commitment, research has not investigated how it might relate to engagement in OCB.

Work-Family Conflict

More than 60% of women with children under the age of six are currently in the workforce (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). Though two-income families and single-parent families are more prevalent than the traditional two parent household where the father works and the mother stays home, recent research has found that men and women are more involved with their children than they were thirty years ago (e.g. Hoffert & Sandberg, 2001). These facts have brought the issue of

work-family conflict into the forefront of modern organizations' consideration. Research has added that this conflict is related to job dissatisfaction, lower organizational commitment, emotional exhaustion, and burnout (Beutell & Berman, 1999; Boles, Johnston, & Hair, 1997).

Work-family conflict arises when the time, energy and behavioral demands of a role in one domain (work or family) make it difficult to meet the demands of the other domain (work or family) (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Perrewe, Hochwarter, & Kiewitz, 1999). Accordingly, as the number of working women with young children at home and dual-career households rise, so too does the need for research and organizational attention to the causes and potential reduction of stress due to work-family conflict. Research in the area of work-family conflict has been conducted in the fields of psychology (Beutell & Berman, 1999; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998), sociology (Fredriksen & Scharlach, 1999; Secret, Sprang, & Bradford, 1998), gender studies (Raber, 1994), education (Rodritti, 1995), marketing (Boles et al., 1997), management (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), human resource management (Goff & Mount, 1991; Higgins, Duxbury, & Johnson, 2000), and organizational behavior (Franklin Cannon, 1998).

More recent treatments of the construct have acknowledged its multidimensional nature, where both sets of demands (family and work) are in direct and reciprocal competition. Specifically, work-to-family conflict describes that work demands interfere with one's ability to carry out his/her family responsibilities. Family-to-work conflict describes when family responsibilities interfere with one's at-work responsibilities (Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003).

The work-family conflict literature has generally supported a "spill-over" model, suggesting that when an individual feels stressed in his/her home life, this stress spills-over into the work arena and can affect various behaviors in the workplace (Kossek & Ozeki, 1998). This body of research indicates that if organizations do not take steps to reduce levels of work-family conflict, the resulting levels of stress may influence efficiency, profitability, and retention in their organizations. Research has found that high levels of work-family conflict are related to lower job satisfaction (Beutell & Berman, 1999; Boles et al., 1997; Higgins et al., 2000; Perrewe et al., 1999; Sund & Ostwald, 1985) and organizational commitment (Franklin Cannon, 1998; Thompson et al., 1999), and to higher levels of burnout (Bacharach et al., 1991), emotional exhaustion (Boles et al., 1997), absenteeism (Goff & Mount, 1991) and turnover (Boles et al., 1997). We are interested in determining if and how high levels of work family conflict, which seem to predispose employees to exhaustion, burnout, absenteeism, and turnover, may be related to the performance of non-essential helping behaviors in organizations (or OCBs).

Work-Family Conflict, Work-Family Culture, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Research has investigated the role of the organization in exacerbating or ameliorating levels of work-family conflict. Various studies have investigated the ability of various quality of work life (QWL) and quality of family life (QFL) programs to reduce work-family conflict and the negative consequences that occur with it (Goff & Mount, 1991; Higgins et al., 2000; Raber, 1994; Warren & Johnson, 1995). These studies have measured the influence of options such as flex-time, telecommuting, and on-site day care on reducing levels of work-family conflict. Results, however, have been largely mixed; some studies found that such flexibility options decrease levels of work family conflict while other studies found that they do not. One recent study by Thompson et al. (1999) suggests a potential reason for the divergent findings; they posit that the level of work-family conflict individuals feel is related to the supportiveness of their work environment and not just the availability of work family benefit options. Providing family related benefits is not always sufficient to reduce levels of work-family conflict. In order for employees to take advantage of benefits such as flex-time, working from home, and on-site day care, employees must feel confident that doing so will not endanger their jobs or hurt their career opportunities.

Thompson et al. (1999) defined work-family culture as “the shared assumptions, beliefs, and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employees’ work and family lives” (p. 394). They found that employees were more likely to utilize work-family benefits in a supportive work-family culture and that employees’ levels of work-family conflict were lower in a supportive work-family culture. Based on this research, we therefore hypothesized that (H1) we would find a negative relationship between work-family culture and levels of work-family conflict. We also sought to extend these findings by exploring the sub-constructs of work-family conflict. Specifically, we (H1A) hypothesized a negative relationship between work-family culture and work-to-family conflict. We also (H1B) hypothesized a negative relationship between work-family culture and family-to-work conflict.

Tompson and Werner (1997) found that higher levels of role conflict in the workplace are related to lower levels of organizational citizenship behavior. Although their study looked exclusively at competing roles within the workplace, comparisons can be made to the phenomenon of work-family conflict. Role conflict has been defined as the simultaneous occurrence of two or more sets of pressures, such that compliance with one set would make compliance with the other more difficult (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). Thus, work-family conflict is

generally defined as role conflict between employees' work and family roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). The pressure to engage in certain behaviors to fulfill family obligations may make it difficult to go above and beyond normal role demands at work. The conflict between work and family roles is likely to decrease the likelihood of engaging in OCBs. We therefore hypothesized that (H2) individuals who report higher overall levels of work-family conflict would engage in fewer OCBs. This extends the work of Tompson and Werner (1997) by applying their findings on role conflict to work-family conflict. Again, the current study aims to dissect the sub-constructs of work family conflict by further hypothesizing that (H2A) individuals who report higher levels of work-to-family conflict would engage in fewer OCBs and that (H2B) individuals who report higher levels of family-to-work conflict would engage in fewer OCBs.

Stoner, Hartman, and Arora (1990) found that time pressure is positively related to the amount of role conflict one experiences in the work and family arenas. Time constraints seem to increase the conflict between work and family roles. Two research studies investigating predictors of OCBs have indicated that time pressures at work are related negatively to OCBs (Hui, Organ, & Crooker, 1994; Tompson & Walker, 1997). Hui and associates (1994) reported that when time pressure is higher, engagement in OCBs is lower. The current study extends this research by looking specifically at the time constraints engendered by work family conflict. Because time constraints that increase role conflict between home and work lives are likely to limit the possibility of engaging in extra-role behaviors, we hypothesize that (H2C) individuals who report higher levels of time-restrained work-family conflict will engage in fewer OCBs.

Research has indicated that organizational commitment is related negatively to work-family conflict and positively to OCBs (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Tompson and Werner (1997) found that the relationship between role conflict and the loyalty dimension of OCB was partially mediated by organizational commitment. Tompson et al. (1999) found that a supportive work-family culture was related positively to employees' affective commitment to an organization. When employees are provided with the means of reducing work-family conflict and an environment that encourages them to take advantage of work-family benefits, they are likely to feel a reduction in work-family conflict. They may feel committed to the organization for providing this support, and this may increase the likelihood of their engaging in OCBs. Thus the work-family culture of an organization influences employees' organizational commitment to the organization and this may influence their engagement in OCBs. Therefore, we aim to replicate the findings of Tompson et al., (1997) by hypothesizing that (H3) employees who report that they work in an

organization with a supportive work-family culture will report greater organizational commitment than employees who report that they work in an organization with a less supportive work-family culture. We extend that research by hypothesizing that (H4) employees who indicate that they work in an organization with a supportive work-family culture will engage in more OCBs than employees who indicate that they work in an organization with a poor work-family culture. Finally, we hypothesized (H5) that the relationship between work-family culture and OCBs is mediated by employees' level of organizational commitment. Employees who indicate that they work in a supportive work-family culture will report organizational commitment to their organization, and this commitment will result in higher levels of OCBs.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools in Northern New Jersey and the New York Metropolitan area. Three hundred twenty surveys were distributed in five schools. A total of 203 teachers completed the surveys, representing a 63% response rate. The teachers ranged in age from 21 years to 64 years, with a mean age of 40 years. Forty-seven of the teachers were males (23%) and 134 of the teachers were females (66%). Ten percent of the teachers did not identify their gender. Seventy-two percent of the teachers had tenure, and all but 15 belonged to a union. Thirty-four percent of the teachers were single, 57% were married, 4% were divorced, 1% widowed and 4% did not indicate their marital status. Fifty-four percent of the teachers had at least one child.

Procedure

The researchers obtained permission from the principal of each school to collect data. The researchers attended mandatory meetings and asked the teachers if they would be willing to spend about fifteen minutes completing surveys regarding their levels of stress in the organization. The teachers were asked to read a short explanation of the research and sign a consent form if they wished to participate in the research. Participants were then asked to complete surveys regarding work-family conflict, their perceptions of their organization's work-family culture, their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior, as well as a short demographic questionnaire. They were told that their participation was completely

voluntary. Each set of surveys was stapled and each survey in the set was assigned the same random identification number in case a participant's data set was separated. Once teachers completed the surveys, they were thanked for their participation and given a feedback sheet that explained the purpose of the research in detail. Once they read the feedback sheet, they were asked if they had any questions and were told that the results of the study would be posted on the primary authors' website within a few months.

Measures

The primary variables of interest were work-family culture, work-family conflict, organizational commitment, and OCB. In addition to these variables, we decided to assess levels of job satisfaction because of its established relationship to both work-family conflict and OCB.

Work-family Culture

Work-family culture was assessed using Thompson et al. (1999) measure of work-family culture. Their 21-item scale provides an overall measure of the respondent's perceptions of their organization's support for employees' attempts to balance work and family responsibilities. The scale also provides subscale scores measuring three separate components of work-family culture: (1) managerial support (e.g. In general, managers/supervisors in this organization [school] are quite accommodating of family related needs); (2) negative career consequences of devoting time to family (e.g. Most employees are resentful when women in this organization [school] take extended leaves to care for newborn or adopted children), and (3) organizational time demand or expectations that might interfere with family life (e.g., to be viewed favorably by top management, employees in this organization must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives). Our tests demonstrated sufficient internal consistency ($\alpha = .74$).

Work Family Conflict

Levels of work-family conflict were assessed using Kelloway, Gottlieb, and Barham's (1999) 22-item scale that assesses both time- and strain-based work interference with family (WIF) and family interference with work (FIW). The time-based WIF subscale includes items that assess the extent to which time-based pressures at work interfere with family life (e.g. Job demands keep me from spending the amount of time I would like with my family), while the time-based FIW subscale assesses the degree to which time pressures from family interfered with work (e.g. Family demands make it difficult for me to take on additional job responsibilities). The strain-based WIF items assess the degree to which

strain or fatigue due to work demands influenced family demands (e.g. I do not listen to what people at home are saying because I am thinking about work) and the strain-based FIW items assess how strain or fatigue from family life affected work demands (e.g. Events at home make me tired and irritable on the job). Internal consistency measures were found of $\alpha = .80$ for the entire scale, $\alpha = .70$ for the WIF component, $\alpha = .83$ for the FIW component, and $\alpha = .82$ for the time-based conflict component.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB research has often measured the construct by having the supervisor or manager of the participant(s) assess levels of OCBs; however, the principals of the schools did not feel that they monitored many of the relevant behaviors closely enough to assess them. Instead, OCB was assessed using Podsakoff et al. (1990) five-factor measure. The five types of OCBs identified by Organ (1988) and measured with the Podsakoff et al. scale are altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. A total of 23 items measure the OCB construct. Examples of items are "I attend functions that are not required, but protect the company [school's] image" and "I help orient new people even though it is not required." Respondents indicated how strongly they agreed or disagreed with statements regarding their behavior in their organization. Items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The facets of altruism and courtesy correspond to the assessment of organizational citizenship focused toward individuals, while conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and civic virtue assess organizational citizenship toward the organization as a whole. In the current study, the scale demonstrated strong internal consistency, $\alpha = .89$.

Organizational Commitment

We assessed subjects' commitment to their organization using Allen and Meyer's (1990) organizational commitment measure. This scale measured three factors of organizational commitment: (1) affective commitment, defined as the level of emotional attachment to the organization (e.g., "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me."); (2) continuance commitment, which involves commitment to the organization derived from the perceived costs of leaving the organization (e.g., "Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire"), and normative commitment, defined as a sense of obligation to remain in the organization (e.g., "I owe a great deal to my organization"). Respondents indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree on a 7-point scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The scale demonstrated sufficient internal consistency, $\alpha = .83$.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was assessed using the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. This 20-item scale was developed by Weiss, England, and Lofquist (1967), and measures intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. In the current study, the MSQ yielded an alpha coefficient of .83.

RESULTS

Exploratory factor analysis indicated that responses to the surveys yielded expected sub-factors. The organizational commitment scale did indeed load on the three factors of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. OCB loaded on the two-factor model of OCB-I and OCB-O. The work-family conflict scale yielded the factors of time-based WIF, time-based FIW, strain-based WIF, and strain-based FIW. The two time-based scales were combined to form one overall mean of time-based work-family conflict. We also combined the two WIF scales to represent work-to-family conflict, and the two FIW scales to represent family-to-work conflict.

The means and standard deviations by gender, tenure, and parental status (whether the participants had children or not) for the variables of OCB, work-family conflict, work-family culture, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are reported in Table 1. We conducted *t*-tests comparing reported levels of the dependent variables of work-family conflict, OCB, and organizational commitment, and the independent variable of work-family culture by the demographic variables of tenure, gender, and parental status. We did not conduct a *t*-test comparing union status because almost all of the teachers belonged to a union. *t*-Tests indicated a significant difference between those teachers who had children and those who did not on levels of work-family conflict, with parents reporting higher levels of conflict than non-parents ($t = 2.18, p = .03$). *t*-Tests also indicated that the difference between males and females on perceived work-family culture approached statistical significance, with females reporting a more supportive work-family culture than males ($t = 1.89, p = .06$). There were no other significant differences by gender, parental status, or tenure for the overall measures of organizational commitment, OCB, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, or work-family culture. Variables showing significant differences were controlled for in the regression analyses.

We computed the correlation coefficients among all of our major continuous variables in order to determine which continuous variables we would need to control for in our regression analyses. The relationship between our predicted variables will be explored below, so these

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations by Gender, Tenure, and Parental Status

Variables	Gender				Tenure				Parental Status			
	Male		Female		Tenure		No Tenure		Children		No Children	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Organizational Citizenship	5.55	.84	5.76	.76	5.75	.78	5.59	.71	5.76	.71	5.69	.79
2. Work/Family Conflict	1.81	.39	1.76	.42	1.79	.38	1.70	.44	1.69	.34	1.82	.44
3. Work/Family Culture	4.40	.78	4.63	.71	4.58	.74	4.58	.71	4.64	.73	4.53	.74
4. Job Satisfaction	3.62	.64	3.72	.76	3.72	.81	3.71	.65	3.69	.59	3.76	.91
5. Organizational Commitment	3.74	.93	3.93	.76	3.87	.83	3.94	.75	3.91	.73	3.86	.86

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations Across Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5
1. Organizational Citizenship	5.71	.76	(-)				
2. Work/Family Conflict	1.76	.40	-.15*	(-)			
3. Work/Family Culture	4.58	.73	.35**	-.24**	(-)		
4. Job Satisfaction	3.71	.77	.24**	-.11	.37**	(-)	
5. Organizational Commitment	3.90	.82	.23**	.15*	.13	.29**	(-)

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

relationships will not be discussed here. As can be seen in Table 2, there were significant positive relationships between OCB and organizational commitment ($r = .23, p < .01$), job satisfaction ($r = .24, p < .01$), and work-family culture ($r = .35, p < .01$). There was also a significant negative relationship between OCB and work family conflict ($r = -.15, p < .05$). Organizational commitment was also related positively to job satisfaction ($r = .37, p < .01$). Work-family culture and work-family conflict were related negatively ($r = -.24, p < .01$).

Hypothesis Tests

Hypothesis 1

We conducted a hierarchical regression analysis to test the hypothesis that work-family culture would predict levels of work-family conflict. As can be seen in Table 3, results indicate a significant *negative* relationship between work-family culture and work-family conflict when controlling for parental status (whether the teacher had children or not) and organizational commitment, $F = 7.90, p < .001$. The effect size (R^2) was .046 (4.6%) when assessing the relationship between the control variables of parental status and organizational commitment and work-family conflict. The proportion of variability in work-family conflict explained by the regression increased to .109 (10.9%) after entering work-family culture as a predictor variable ($R^2\Delta = .064$).

Hypothesis 1A investigated the subset of work-family conflict that deals specifically with work's interference with family. As can be seen in Table 3, the hypothesis that work-family culture is negatively related to work-to-family conflict was supported, $F = 19.05, p < .001$. Regression analyses yielded an R^2 of .037 (adjusted $R^2 = .027$) when the control variables of parental status and organizational commitment were regressed onto work-to-family conflict. The explained variability increased to .123 (adjusted $R^2 = .110$) when adding work-family culture as a predictor ($R^2\Delta = .086$). As shown in Table 3 Hypothesis 1B, which

Table 3
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Work-Family Conflict From Work-Family Culture

Step	Predictors Included	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	R^2
<i>H1: DV = work-family conflict</i>					
1	Parental Status	.13	.16	2.28*	.05
	Organizational Commitment	.07	.15	2.11*	
2	Parental Status	.11	.14	2.08*	.11
	Organizational Commitment	.09	.18	2.58*	
	Work Family Culture	-.14	-.26	-3.72**	
<i>H1A: DV = work interfering with family</i>					
1	Parental Status	.10	.09	1.25	.04
	Organizational Commitment	.12	.17	2.46*	
2	Parental Status	.08	.07	.98	.12
	Organizational Commitment	.15	.21	3.04**	
	Work Family Culture	-.23	-.30	-4.36**	
<i>H1B: DV = family interfering with work</i>					
1	Parental Status	.16	.20	2.80**	.04
	Organizational Commitment	.03	.05	.77	
2	Parental Status	.16	.19	2.71	.05
	Organizational Commitment	.03	.06	.89	
	Work Family Culture	-.04	-.08	-1.13	

Note. *B* indicates unstandardized beta weights; β indicates standardized beta weights; *t* indicates results from *t* tests, where * indicates significance at $p = .05$ and ** indicates significance at $p = .01$; R^2 indicates the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable.

predicted that work-family culture is negatively related to family-to-work conflict, was not supported.

Hypothesis 2

As can be seen from Table 4, the regression equation testing the hypothesis that higher levels of work-family conflict would be associated with fewer OCBs when controlling for levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction was statistically significant, $F = 9.172$, $p < .000$, supporting our second hypothesis. The variance explained increased from 10% to 17% when work-family conflict was added to the control variables as a predictor of OCBs ($R^2\Delta = .066$).

As Table 4 shows, hypothesis 2A, which predicted that individuals who report higher levels of work-to-family conflict would engage in fewer OCBs, was supported, $F = 7.80$, $p < .001$. When the control variables (organizational commitment and job satisfaction) were entered as predictors of OCB, $R^2 = .10$ (adjusted $R^2 = .088$). Once work-to-family conflict was included, $R^2 = .15$ (adjusted $R^2 = .127$), and the explained

Table 4
Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors from Work-Family Conflict

Step	Predictors Included	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i> ²
<i>H2: DV = organizational citizenship behaviors</i>					
1	Organizational Commitment	.19	.22	2.59*	.10
	Job Satisfaction	.18	.18	2.13*	
2	Organizational Commitment	.23	.26	3.17**	.17
	Job Satisfaction	.14	.14	1.72	
	Work-Family Conflict	-.49	-.26	-3.30**	
<i>H2A: DV = organizational citizenship behaviors</i>					
1	Organizational Commitment	.19	.22	2.59*	.10
	Job Satisfaction	.18	.18	2.13*	
2	Organizational Commitment	.23	.26	3.10**	.15
	Job Satisfaction	.14	.14	1.63	
	Work interfering with family	-.31	-.22	-2.69**	
<i>H2B: DV = organizational citizenship behaviors</i>					
1	Organizational Commitment	.19	.22	2.59*	.10
	Job Satisfaction	.18	.18	2.13*	
2	Organizational Commitment	.21	.23	2.84**	.15
	Job Satisfaction	.17	.17	2.10*	
	Family interfering with work	-.39	-.22	-2.80**	
<i>H2C: DV = organizational citizenship behaviors</i>					
1	Organizational Commitment	.19	.22	2.59*	.10
	Job Satisfaction	.18	.18	2.13*	
2	Organizational Commitment	.23	.26	3.10**	.14
	Job Satisfaction	.15	.15	1.80	
	Time-based Work-Family Conflict	-.35	-.20	-2.49*	

Note. *B* indicates unstandardized beta weights; β indicates standardized beta weights; *t* indicates results from *t*-tests, where * indicates significance at *p* = .05 and ** indicates significance at *p* = .01; *R*² indicates the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable.

variance in OCB increased by 3.9%. Shown in Table 4, hypothesis 2B, which proposed that family-to-work conflict predicts OCB, was supported, *F* = 8.032, *p* < .001. When only the control variables were entered as predictors of OCB, *R*² was equal to .101 (adjusted *R*² = .088). After family-to-work conflict was added, *R*² increased to .15 (adjusted *R*² = .131), indicating a change in explained variance of 4.3%.

Hierarchical regression analyses found support for Hypothesis 2C (see Table 4), in that higher levels of time-based work-family conflict significantly predicted fewer OCBs, *F* = 7.417, *p* < .000. *R*² increased from 10% explained by the control variables of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, to 14% when time-based work-family conflict was included (*R*²Δ = .039) as a predictor of OCB.

Hypothesis 3

Table 5 shows that our hypothesis predicting a positive relationship between work-family culture and organizational commitment was somewhat supported by our regression analysis, $F = 3.52$, $p = .06$. Two percent of the variance in organizational commitment was explained when work-family culture was entered as a predictor.

Hypothesis 4

Table 5 also shows that levels of work-family culture significantly predicted OCB when controlling for job satisfaction and organizational commitment, $F = 11.25$, $p < .001$, providing support for our fourth hypothesis. Regression analysis found that explained variance in OCB increased from 10.5% when the control variables were entered as predictors to 20% when work-family culture was entered as a predictor.

Hypothesis 5

The fifth hypothesis predicted that organizational commitment mediated the relationship between work-family culture and OCB. As

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment in the Relationship Between Work-Family Culture and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

	DV: Organizational Commitment				DV: Organizational Citizenship Behavior			
	B	β	<i>t</i>	R^2	β	β	<i>t</i>	R^2
<i>H3: Work-family culture</i>	.15	.13	1.88 ⁺	.02				
<i>H4:</i>								
Step 1: Organizational Commitment					.20	.23	2.7**0	.11
Job Satisfaction					.18	.18	2.13*	
Step 2: Organizational Commitment					.19	.21	2.68**	.20
Job Satisfaction					.06	.06	.70	
Work-family culture					.33	.33	3.96**	
<i>H5:</i>								
Step 1: Job Satisfaction					.24	.24	2.94	.06
Step 2: Job Satisfaction					.12	.12	1.38	.16
Work-family Culture					.34	.34	3.98**	
Step 1: Organizational Commitment					.22	.23	3.32**	.05
Step 2: Organizational Commitment					.18	.19	2.79*	.15
Work-family Culture					.33	.32	4.79**	

Note. *B* indicates unstandardized beta weights; β indicates standardized beta weights; *t* indicates results from *t*-tests, where ⁺ indicates moderate significance, $p = .06$, * indicates significance at $p = .05$ and ** indicates significance at $p = .01$; R^2 indicates the amount of variance explained in the dependent variable.

shown in Table 5, we tested this prediction in three steps as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) by first regressing OCB onto the independent variable of work-family culture to demonstrate the presence of a relationship to be mediated. The relationship between these two variables was supported when controlling for job satisfaction (we did not control for organizational commitment here as it was the mediator variable), $F = 12.72$, $p < .001$ ($R^2 = .155$ when controlling for job satisfaction). The next step was to establish the relationship between the independent variable and the mediator variable. This relationship was established by testing our third hypothesis, which was marginally supported. The last step was to regress OCB onto both work-family culture and organizational commitment. We entered organizational commitment as a mediator, and then entered the predicted independent variable of work-family culture. The relationship between work-family culture and organizational citizenship behavior remained significant after controlling for organizational commitment. Given this finding, plus the marginally significant relationship between work-family culture and organizational commitment, and the lack of reduction in beta weights between the independent and dependent variables when the mediator was added to the regression equation, there was no convincing evidence of mediation of organizational commitment in the relationship between work-family culture and OCB.

DISCUSSION

Findings and Implications

Over time, work-family conflict has become a recognized stressor in the workplace for many people. Results from the current study indicated that parents had greater work-family conflict than non-parents. While non-parents have family-related demands as well, they may not interfere as directly with work responsibilities and scheduling. It may be true that family demands that relate to childcare require specific inflexible time commitment or unforeseen attention. The results also hinted at an association between respondent gender and perceived work-family culture. That is, the difference in reported culture between males and females approached, but did not reach, statistical significance. This finding may suggest some tendency for female employees to have greater access than male employees to family-friendly work policies. For example, maternity leave or similar employee benefits may be more typically offered to and used by women than similar programs would be used by men. That said, the lack of actual statistical significance implies the need for further research in this area.

Results of testing the first hypothesis indicated a significant *negative* relationship between work-family culture and work-family conflict when

controlling for parental status and organizational commitment. This finding supports research conducted by Thompson and colleagues (1999), which also found that a supportive work-family culture results in lower levels of work-family conflict. The current study extended the research by specifically examining this effect on the sub-constructs of work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict. Given that many studies have found work-family conflict to be related to various poor organizational outcomes (Bacharach et al., 1991; Boles et al., 1997; Goff & Mount, 1991) this finding indicates that it may behoove organizations to pay closer attention to their work-family culture. Creating friendly work-family policies may not be enough. School systems may wish to make clear to their administrators that they need to clearly support these policies. Analyses indicated that work culture was not necessarily related to one's family interfering with one's job responsibilities. It could be true that employees consider work-to-family matters as within the organization's control. Flexibility and support in terms of scheduling, policy, and benefits, which all contribute to work-family culture, may be more readily associated with how the organization can help to keep work demands from intruding into one's family roles.

The next hypotheses specified that OCBs would be related negatively to general work-family conflict (H2), its sub-constructs of work-to-family (H2A) and family-to-work conflict (H2B), and an additional sub-construct of time-restrained work-family conflict (H2C). All of these hypotheses were confirmed. After controlling for organizational commitment and job satisfaction, significant negative effects on OCBs were observed for the work-family conflict measures. Prior studies indicated that role conflict at work is related negatively to OCBs (Thompson & Werner, 1997) and that time pressure at work is related negatively to OCBs (Hui et al., 1994). The results of the present study extend these findings by specifying work-family conflict as a particular manifestation of role conflict and time pressure. The more conflict one feels between his/her roles at work and at home, regardless of which is perceived to interfere more with the other, the less he/she will engage in OCB. These findings suggest that if school administrators seek more altruistic and conscientious behavior from their teachers, they should devote attention and consideration to any steps they can take to reduce work-family conflict.

Hypothesis three suggested that there would be a positive relationship between work-family culture and organizational commitment. The results approached significance and were somewhat supportive of this hypothesis. In a regression analysis, it was found that teachers who perceived their schools as supportive tended to report relatively high levels of organizational commitment. This finding is consistent with results reported by Thompson et al. (1999), who suggested that

organizational accommodations aimed at reducing work-family conflict would be appreciated by employees, who would in turn feel greater commitment to the organization.

Thompson et al. (1999) also suggested that increased organizational commitment might in turn result in increases in OCBs. This relationship was reflected in hypothesis four of the present study, which predicted that teachers who perceived their schools as having a supportive work-family culture would engage in more OCBs than teachers who perceive their schools as relatively unsupportive. This hypothesis was also supported; when job satisfaction and organizational commitment were controlled, work-family culture was positively related to reported OCBs. This finding suggests that administrators would be well-advised to promote a supportive work-family culture in the schools.

The final research hypothesis specified that the relationship between work-family culture and OCBs is mediated by the employee's level of organizational commitment. This hypothesis was not confirmed, which implies that there is an effect of work-family culture on OCBs that is independent of its effect on organizational commitment. In other words, if a teacher perceives the school's work-family culture as supportive, that teacher will be more likely to engage in OCBs, even if he/she does not manifest greater organizational commitment. This finding provides further support for the promotion of a supportive work-family culture, since this factor appears to have both direct and indirect effects on OCBs.

Limitations and Future Directions

The findings of the present study are clearly limited by the cross-sectional nature of the research, which precludes any conclusions regarding causality. Future research may include in-depth open-ended interviews to further explore the mechanisms that explain one's engagement in OCBs. Furthermore, all data were collected via surveys at one point in time. As such, common method variance may have impacted the result. That is, the completion of paper-and-pencil instruments may have itself emerged as a factor above and beyond an actual latent factor such as the ones hypothesized in the study. Although exploratory factor analyses and consideration of the correlation matrix did not reveal that common method variance was a problem, future research may seek to collect relevant data with different techniques or at staggered collection intervals to reduce the potential of such bias.

In addition, other potential predictors of OCB should be considered, including the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in teaching, teachers' self-efficacy and self-concept regarding work roles, and departmental versus school-wide commitment and satisfaction. Another limitation of the study

was its use of self-report data to represent OCBs. While principal or supervisor ratings of subordinate OCB would have been preferable, those in our study, when asked, responded that they were unprepared to effectively gauge such behavior. Future research might attempt to collect manager reports of OCB in conjunction with work-family conflict and work-family culture in different types of organizational settings. Future research may also have subjects complete a social desirability scale, which measures the degree to which subjects' responses are influenced by their desire to be perceived well by others. This would allow researchers to determine the degree of bias inherent in OCB self-reports due to subjects' desirability to look good. Other research that aims to explore relationships between work-family conflict and OCB may investigate confidence in daycare choices and other non-parental family obligations (e.g. marriage, eldercare). Though we did control for the influence of parental status on work-family conflict, we did not control for marital status. Future research in this area should consider this variable.

Taken together, the findings of the present study strongly support the development of strong, supportive work-family cultures in school systems. Building such a culture in a school environment will continue to be a worthwhile, though difficult, challenge. Several devices that have been successful in other organizations, such as flex-time and telecommuting would not be feasible for teachers who must teach during structured school hours. Research and practice should actively solicit and consider other ideas. Efforts to hire teachers in schools where their children are enrolled, or allow children to enroll where their parents are faculty members can alleviate incompatible transportation factors. The provision of liberal personal days would be helpful on occasions when ill children require intense attention or medical appointments. Perhaps assistance can be offered in terms of finding and financing daycare for young children. Surveys, focus groups, and other data collection techniques may be used by school administrators to identify and explore other methods for promoting a supportive work-family culture. Although feasibility, school budget scrutinization, and other deterrents may render some ideas impractical, a demonstrated effort by school systems to consider the needs of its personnel is a logical first step.

CONCLUSION

The current research found support for the relationship between work-family conflict and OCB in organizations, as well as work-family culture and OCB. By echoing and extending the research of others, we call for additional exploration and development related to the promotion of strong work-family cultures and supportive environments.

Work-family conflict will continue to be an important influence on the performance and attitudes of employees in all types of organizations. Although the current study shows how organizational attention to this matter can engender prosocial citizenship, it is likely that there are many more potential returns on such a needed investment.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *63*, 1–18.
- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *12*, 39–53.
- Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173–1182.
- Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee “citizenship”. *Academy of Management Journal*, *26*, 587–595.
- Beutell, N. J. & Berman, U. W. (1999). Predictors of work-family conflict and satisfaction with family, job, career, and life. *Psychological Reports*, *85*, 893–903.
- Boles, J. S., Johnston, M. W., & Hair, J. F. Jr. (1997). Role stress, work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion: Inter-relationships and effects on some work related consequences. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, *17*, 17–28.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, *10*(2), 99–109.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personality selection* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carlson, D. S. & Perrewe, P. L. (1999). The role of social support in the stressor-strain relationship: An examination of work-family conflict. *Journal of Management*, *25*, 513–540.
- Franklin Cannon, D. (1998). Better understanding of impact of work interferences on organizational commitment. *Marriage and Family Review*, *28*, 153–166.
- Fredriksen, K. I. & Scharlach, A. E. (1999). Employee family care responsibilities. *Family Relations*, *48*, 189–196.
- Goff, S. J. & Mount, M. K. (1991). Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: A field study. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 793–809.
- Greenhaus, J. H. & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*, 76–88.
- Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work-family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *17*, 419–436.
- Higgins, C., Duxbury, L., & Johnson, K. L. (2000). Part-time work for women: Does it really help balance work and family?. *Human Resource Management*, *39*, 17–32.
- Hofferth, S. L. & Sandberg, J. F. (2001). How American children spend their time. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *63*, 295–308.
- Hui, C., Organ, D. W., & Crooker, K. (1994). Time pressure, Type A syndrome, and organizational citizenship behavior: A laboratory experiment. *Psychological Reports*, *75*, 199–208.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). *Organizational Stress*. New York: Wiley.
- Kelloway, E. K., Gottlieb, B. H., & Barham, L. (1999). The source, nature, and direction of work and family conflict: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *4*, 337–346.

- Kemery, E. R., Bedeian, A. G., & Zacur, S. R. (1996). Expectancy-based job cognitions and job affect predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 635-651.
- Konovsky, A. A. & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 253-266.
- Kossek, E. E. & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 139-149.
- Levy, P. E. (2003) *Industrial/organizational psychology: Understanding the workplace*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, MA .
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Health.
- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85-97.
- Organ, D. W. & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- Perrewe, P. L., Hochwarter, W. W., & Kiewitz, C. (1999). Value attainment: An explanation for the negative effects of work-family conflict on job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 4*, 318-326.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B, Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*, 107-142.
- Raber, M. J. (1994). Women in the workplace: Implications for child care. *Employee Assistance Quarterly, 9*(3/4), 21-36.
- Robinson, S. L. & Morrison, E. W. (1995). Psychological contracts and OCB: The effect of unfulfilled obligations on civic virtue behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 289-298.
- Roditti, M. G. (1995). Child day care: A key building block of family support and family preservation programs. *Child Welfare, 74*, 1043-1068.
- Schappe, S. P. (1998). The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 132*, 277-291.
- Schnake, M. & Dumler, M. P. (1997). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The impact of rewards and reward practices. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 4*, 216-229.
- Secret, M., Sprang, G., & Bradford, J. (1998). Parenting in the workplace: Examining a unique infant care option. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*, 795-815.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.
- Stoner, C. R., Hartman, R. I., & Arora, R. (1990). Work-home role conflict in female owners of small businesses: An exploratory study. *Journal of Small Business Management, 28*, 30-38.
- Sund, K. & Ostwald, S. K. (1985). Dual-earner families' stress levels and personal and life-style-related variables. *Nursing Research, 34*, 357-361.
- Thompson, C. A., Beauvais, L. L., & Lyness, K. S. (1999). When work family benefits are not enough: The influence of work-family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392-415.
- Tompson, H. & Werner, J. M. (1997). The impact of role conflict/facilitation on core and discretionary behaviors: Testing a mediated model. *Journal of Management, 23*, 583-572.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2001). Mothers in the Labor Force 1955-2001. Retrieved August 28, 2003, from U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics website at <http://www.bls.gov/data/>.
- Warren, J. A. & Johnson, P. J. (1995). The impact of workplace support on work-family role strain. *Family Relations, 44*, 163-169.
- Weiss, D. J., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire (short form) [measurement tool]*. University of Minnesota, Twin Cities, Minnesota: Vocational Psychology Research.
- Witt, L. A. (1991). Exchange ideology as a moderator of job attitudes-organizational citizenship behaviors relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 1490-1501.