The Role of Person, Spouse and Organisational Climate on Work–Family Perceptions

● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ●

J E A N E T T E   N .   C L E V E L A N D *
B R Y A N N E   C O R D E I R O **
G L E N D A   F I S K *
R E B E C C A   H A R R I S   M U L V A N E Y ***

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the individual, additive and interactive effects of employee gender and two organisational climate variables on employee ratings of role conflict, work–family conflict, family–work conflict and time–energy imbalance. Data gathered from eighty-one faculty participants indicated that women report greater role conflict and work–family conflict than men while spousal employment showed no effect on individual perceptions of conflict. However, perceived organisational climate predicts these outcomes beyond gender. Results also showed that perceived increase in work demands have perceived negative effects on employee well-being. The results highlight the important role that organisational climate variables play in our understanding of the work–family interface. Implications and areas of future research are discussed.

Pennsylvania State University
**Federal Management Partners, Inc.*
***Caliber, an ICF International Company*

INTRODUCTION

Recent research indicates that employee perception of organisational culture is a critical factor for understanding work–family conflict, as well as the reasons for the low take-up rates of work–family programmes (Thompson, Beauvais & Lyness, 1999). Work–family culture has been found to have a stronger relationship with employee attitudes and turnover intentions than the actual availability of benefits (Allen, 2001; Lyness, Judiesch, Thompson & Beauvais, 2001; Thompson et al., 1999). Yet we know little about whether the relationship between organisational climate and work–family outcomes differs or is moderated by employee gender. Further, the construct of work–family conflict has evolved from a general construct to two facets that reflect the direction of conflict, namely work-to-family conflict (WFC) and family-to-work conflict (FWC; Frone, 2003). We know less about the person or organisational correlates of these emerging constructs. Finally, organisational research approaches to work and family often ignore the consideration of spousal and/or children variables in understanding employee perceptions of conflict (Cleveland, 2005; Major & Cleveland, 2005).

In the present study we examined both person and context variables in understanding work and family conflict. Specifically, we assessed the individual, additive and interactive effects of employee gender and two organisational climate variables: perceived organisational performance expectations (e.g. low or high work expectations) and perceived organisational time demands on employee ratings of role conflict, WFC, FWC and perceived time–energy imbalance. Further, often employees are embedded in dyadic or couple marital relationships that vary and may influence their perceptions of conflict. Therefore, we examined the additive and interactive effects of spousal employment status and the two organisational climate variables on the same outcomes.

Women, Men and Work–Family Interactions

There is inconclusive evidence of consistent gender differences in perceptions of role conflict, WFC and FWC. In fact, a number of studies show few differences between men and women in perceptions of WFC or FWC (e.g. Eagle, Miles & Icenogle, 1997; Frone, 2003;

Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1992). The presence of more women in the workplace in recent years and the increased responsibilities placed upon men at home may be reflected in this finding.

On the other hand, some researchers suggest that women and men do differ in their experiences of WFC and FWC. For example, it has been found that women experience greater role overload and WFC than do men (Hammer et al., 1997). Further, Gutek, Searle and Klepa (1991) found that when men and women spent equal hours in paid work, women reported greater WFC than men, and men reported greater FWC than women. Gender role theory can provide one explanation for these gender variations. The theory sug-gests that women continue to perform more of the domestic duties (Hochschild, 1997) and thus view paid work as an interference with these tasks. Men, on the other hand, do not expect to share equally in housework duties and more often than women find that family responsibilities and household tasks interfere with their career demands and aspirations (Gutek et al., 1991). Further, employed men are more likely to have a stay-at-home or part-time employed spouse than employed women (Brett, Stroh & Riley, 1992). Therefore, we hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 1a: *Women will report greater general role conflict, work-to-family conflict (WFC) and time–energy imbalance than men, while*

Hypothesis 1b: *Men will report greater family–work conflict (FWC) than women.*

Perceived Organisational Climate and Work–Family Interactions

Organisational climate refers to perceptions of organisational policies, practices and procedures that are shared by individuals within organisations (Reichers & Schneider, 1999). James and James (1989) identified a number of dimensions of organisational climate that may be associated with conflict between work and non-work, including role stress and lack of harmony, job challenge and autonomy, leadership facilitation and support, and work group co-operation, friendliness and warmth. There is evidence that climates perceived by

employees to be beneficial to personal well-being are associated with higher levels of job satisfaction and organisational commitment (e.g. Mathieu, Hoffman & Farr, 1993).

Drawing from the rational goal approach of the competing values model of organisational effectiveness (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), Neal, West and Patterson (2000) suggest that it may be possible to enhance organisational outcomes by creating a climate that focuses on the achievement of organisational goals. One aspect of a climate for performance is high demand for work hours while another would be high organisational work expectations, including an emphasis on production, customer service and employee effort. However, a performance climate may be harmful to employee well-being. Heavy time demands and extensive work hours are shown to be directly related to work–family conflict (Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk & Beutell, 1996). Work pressure is one aspect of the work environment that is believed to contribute to perceptions of conflict. Work pressure can be defined as the extent to which a job is characterised by time demands, deadlines and a fast pace (Crouter et al., 1999). For example, employees who report high work hours are more likely to experience work–family conflict (Kofodimos, 1995). Further, employees in climates that encourage high time demands are more likely to experience work-to-family conflict (Thompson et al., 1999).

A climate for performance should enhance performance by motivating employees to work harder in task performance in order to achieve organisational objectives. On the other hand, a climate for well-being should enhance morale and job satisfaction because it is characterised by such attributes as supportive leadership, concern for employee welfare, participation in decision-making and autonomy (James et al., 1990). According to Thompson et al. (1999), a supportive work culture allows employees to more effectively balance work and family responsibilities and as a result experience less work and family conflict. Employees in organisations with low expectations of time demands reported higher affective commitment and less WFC (Thompson et al., 1999). Further, Neubauer (1992) found that nurses who reported less illness and greater job satisfaction also reported lower work pressure and less stress while Barnett (1996) found that increased time pressures and conflicting demands over time were

positively associated with great psychological distress. In the present study, we posited that:

Hypothesis 2: *Perceptions of organisational climate (e.g. organisational work expectations and organisational time demands) will be positively correlated with role conflict, WFC, FWC and perceptions of time–energy imbalance.*

Spousal Employment Level and Employee Perceptions of Role Conflict, WFC and FWC

Research suggests that work and family conflict may not only vary by personal and organisational characteristics, but also by the employment status of one's marital partner (Crouter & Helms-Erikson, 1997; Garies, Barnett & Brennan, 2003). The construct of work pressure or perceived organisational work expectations/demands has not been examined in relation to the employment status of one's spouse. Further, according to Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler and Wethington (1989), as both partners in a relationship increasingly have jobs outside the home and share parenting responsibilities, the potential for multiple role stress increases significantly. Contagion between the two roles is one explanation for increased stress among dual-earner parents. There are two forms of contagion. The first type reflects stress spillover where stress from one role (e.g. work) results in stress being experienced in another role (e.g. family) for the same individual. The second type refers to stress crossover which refers to the work stress experienced by an individual leading to the individual's spouse experiencing the stress at home (Crouter, 1984; MacDermid & Crouter, 1986; Piotrkowski, 1979; Repetti, 1987).

In the present study we collected information on employee role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance. Although we were unable to directly test either for spillover or contagion, we did obtain spousal employment information. Consistent with Bolger et al. (1989), we believe that the more hours that an employee's spouse works, the greater the employee perceptions of role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance.

Family systems literature suggests families strive to maintain an equilibrium and continuity. Each family member can affect the equilibrium and therefore affect the psychological state of other

family members. Within this open-system approach, employment situations of both spouses affect the family as a whole as well as the psychological health of each member, including the employee. When a psychological strain such as distress, depression, burnout or work–family conflict is experienced by one person, it can affect the level of strain of another person in the same social environment (Bolger et al., 1989; Westman, Vinokur, Hamilton & Roziner, 2004; Hammer, Bauer & Grandey, 2003; Westman, 2001). Therefore employees whose spouses are also employed, especially full-time, may be more likely to experience multiple role stress as both partners may increasingly need to share parenting and home responsibilities.

Hypothesis 3: *Employees with spouses employed full-time will experience the greatest role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance.*

Person and Context Considerations in Work–Family Perceptions

Increasingly, the challenge of creating a family-friendly workplace is to develop a culture or climate that shares vales and norms that advance rather than thwart the development and effectiveness of work–family programmes (Starrels, 1992; Murphy & Zagorski, 2005). Thompson et al. (1999) found that supportive climates were related to higher affective commitment, reduced turnover and lower self-reported levels of work–family conflict. A number of other studies identified organisational climates as critical in enhancing the employee's ability to balance work and family responsibilities (e.g. Allen, 2001; Bailyn, 1997; Bond, Galinsky & Swanberg, 1998). An 'overtime culture' (Fried, 1998) and work devotion (Blair-Loy & Wharton, 2002) reflect the often unspoken norms within work-focused, family-unsupportive organisations. Within these organisations the road to career advancement is by working long hours and using impression management strategies which involve little employee disclosure of family issues at work.

Although there is evidence of the main effects for person (gender, spousal employment status) and organisational climate on work/non-work outcomes, we know little about whether the perceived work climate has more or less of an effect on men or women or in

families where the spouse works full-time, part-time or not outside the home. Therefore our final two hypothesised relationships are exploratory in nature. Drawing from the gender role and work-family literatures, we hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 4a: *Gender will interact with perceived organisational climate (e.g. organisational performance expectations and perceived organisational time demands) such that there will be a greater difference in ratings of role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance among women between climates that reflect high and low performance expectations than for men.*

Hypothesis 4b: *Perceived organisational climate (e.g. organisational performance expectation and perceived organisational time demands) will show additive effects beyond gender in predicting role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance.*

The contagion literature suggests that couples who work more hours outside the home may experience greater multiple role conflicts than when the spouse is at home full-time (Bolger et al., 1989).

Hypothesis 5a: *Spousal employment will interact with perceived organisational climate (e.g. organisational performance expectations and organisational time demands) such that there will be greater differences in ratings of role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance among employees whose spouses work full-time or part-time rather than not at all outside the home between climates that reflect high rather than low performance expectations.*

Hypothesis 5b: *Perceived organisational climate (e.g. organisational performance expectations and organisational time demands) will have additive effects beyond spousal employment to predict ratings of role conflict, WFC, FWC and time–energy imbalance.*

METHOD

Participants
The survey was completed by eighty-one participants (fifty-six male and twenty-four female), for a response rate of 16 per cent.

The average age of participants was forty-seven years. A total of sixty-seven participants were married or living with a partner and thirty-nine had one or more children under the age of eighteen.

Procedure and Measures
A random sample of 500 employees was generated from a list of all faculties at an eastern university in the USA. The survey was then e-mailed to the sample. The survey included questions about a variety of factors associated with work and family experiences in which the individual is employed. Participants anonymously completed and submitted the survey on-line.

Demographic Information
Demographic information was collected from participants. They were asked to indicate gender, department in the university, hours worked per week, marital status, number of children, spousal employment and tenure grade. Gender was coded as a dummy variable (male = 1 and female = 2). Hours worked per week were reported as the number of hours spent at work (primary job and any additional jobs), spent on work-related matters at home and spent commuting to and from work. Marital status was measured with a 5-item scale (single = 1, married/partner at home = 2, divorced/single = 3, divorced/remarried = 4, and separated = 5). Spousal employment status was measured with a 4-item scale (my spouse/partner is not employed = 1, my spouse/partner is employed part-time = 2, my spouse/partner is employed full-time = 3, not applicable = 4).

Role Conflict
Role conflict was measured with seven items developed by Bohen and Viveros-Long (1981) and previously used by Clark (2001). These items measured the extent to which work roles conflict with other life roles. An example item is 'I feel I have to rush to get everything done each day'. Items were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was reliable at .88.

Work–Family Conflict
Work–family conflict was measured with a 5-item scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). Items measure the extent to which work

interferes with family life. An example item is 'the demands of my work interfere with my home and family life'. Items were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was reliable at .92.

Family–Work Conflict

Family–work conflict was measured with a 5-item scale developed by Netemeyer et al. (1996). Items measure the extent to which family interferes with work life. An example item is 'I have to put off things at work because of the demands on my time at home'. Items were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was reliable at .89.

Time–Energy Imbalance

Time–energy imbalance was assessed using a 24-item scale based on a scale developed by Kofodimos to measure the extent to which the amount of time and energy spent on work and non-work roles is equal or imbalanced. Three items from the original scale were omitted since they were not appropriate for the present sample. Items were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example items include, 'I bring work home on the weekends' and 'I don't have enough time to stay on a consistent exercise program'. Coefficient alpha was reliable at .80.

Organisational Work Expectations

Organisational work expectations were measured with fourteen items developed by Kofodimos (1995). These items measure the demands or expectations placed on individuals by the organisation. Example items include, 'my department values and rewards working at home on a regular basis' and 'my department values and rewards taking my full vacation allotment' (reverse scored). Agreement with the items was measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha was .84.

Organisational Time Demands

Organisational time demands were measured with a 4-item scale developed by Thompson et al. (1999) in order to measure work–family culture. This scale measures the extent to which the

organisation expects individuals to devote time and energy to the workplace above family. An example item is 'to be viewed favorably by administration, employees in this department must constantly put their jobs ahead of their families or personal lives'. Agreement with the items was measured with a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alpha for this scale was .85.

RESULTS

Table 10.1 shows study means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations. Hypothesis 1a predicted that women would report higher levels of role conflict than men. A one sample *t*-test revealed that women did, in fact, report higher levels of role conflict (M_{Female} = 5.74 vs. M_{Male} = 4.90, $t(75)$ = 2.69, $p < .01$). In addition

Table 10.1: Means and Intercorrelations among Variables in the Study

Variable	Mean/ s.d.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Gender	—	—							
2. Spousal Employment	—	.06	—						
3. Org. Expectations	4.20 (.89)	.20	−.06	—					
4. Org. Time Demands	19.14 (5.72)	.26*	−.03	.65**	—				
5. Role Conflict	5.15 (1.31)	.30**	−.01	.38**	.47**	—			
6. Work–Family Conflict	4.78 (1.42)	.27*	.08	.45**	.54**	.67**	—		
7. Family–Work Conflict	3.13 (1.35)	−.13	.03	−.01	−.05	.14	.28*	—	
8. Time–Energy Imbalance	4.14 (.75)	−.04	.07	.32*	.34**	.58**	.72**	.37**	—

Note: r is significant *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$
Gender: 1 = male, 2 = female
Spousal Employment: 1 = full-time, 2 = part-time, 3 = not employed

to role conflict, women were also predicted to report higher levels of work–family conflict (Hypothesis 1a). This prediction was supported. Women ($M = 5.39$) reported significantly higher levels of work–family conflict than men ($M = 4.55$), $t(73) = 2.37$, $p < .05$. Contrary to our prediction, women did not report significantly higher levels of time–energy imbalance than men (4.15 vs. 4.08, $t(60) = .33$, $p =$ ns). Thus Hypothesis 1a was partially supported. Finally, we suggested that men would report significantly higher levels of family–work conflict than women (Hypothesis 1b). While means were in the predicted direction [$M_{Males} = 3.24$ vs. $M_{Females} = 2.85$], a test of mean differences revealed no significant difference $t(72) = 1.13$, $p =$ ns.

Consistent with Hypothesis 2, Table 10.1 reveals that positive, significant correlations were observed between individuals' perceived organisational work demands (conceptualised as organisational expectations as well as organisational time demands) and their perceived levels of role conflict, work–family conflict and time–energy imbalance. There was no significant correlation between family-to-work conflict and the perceived organisational work demands. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Contrary to Hypothesis 3, employees whose spouses were employed full-time did not experience significantly higher levels of either role or work–family conflict. For role conflict, a one-way analysis of variance showed no significant differences in the level of role conflict reported by employees whose spouses were employed full-time ($M = 5.13$) as compared to those whose spouses were employed part-time ($M = 5.37$) or not employed at all ($M = 4.79$), $F(2,68) = .87$, $p =$ ns. Similarly, there were no significant differences in the work–family conflict levels of those employees whose spouses were employed full-time ($M = 4.63$), part-time ($M = 4.94$) or not at all *(M = 4.82)*, $F(2,67) = .29$, $p =$ ns. In fact, it is interesting to note that employees with spouses employed full-time actually experienced the *lowest* levels of work–family conflict.

We also predicted that employees with spouses employed full-time would experience higher levels of family-to-work conflict and time–energy imbalance. No support was found for these predictions. With regard to family-to-work conflict, there were no significant differences between employees whose spouses worked

full-time (M = 2.97), part-time (M = 3.33) or not at all (M = 3.33), $F(3,734) = .59$, p = ns. Employees whose spouses were employed full-time (M = 4.06) versus part-time (M = 4.23) or not at all (M = 4.13) did not report higher time–energy imbalance, $F(3,62) = .25$, p = ns.

Hypothesis 4a predicted that both perceived organisational expectations and perceived organisational time demands would interact with employee gender to influence respondents' levels of role conflict, work–family conflict, family–work conflict and time–energy imbalance. Contrary to expectations, neither perceived organisational expectations nor perceived organisational time demands interacted with employee gender to predict role, work–family or family–work conflict (see Tables 10.2 and 10.3). As shown in Table 10.2, a significant interaction was noted between gender and organisational expectations on time–energy imbalance, however between employee gender and organisational time expectations did not significantly predict ratings of time–energy imbalance.

In addition, perceived organisational performance expectations and perceived organisational time demands showed additive effects in predicting role conflict, work–family conflict, and time–energy imbalance, but not family–work conflict (see Tables 10.2 and 10.3) beyond the effects attributed to employee gender . Thus, we found partial support for Hypothesis 4b.

We also hypothesised that spousal employment would interact with both perceived organisational performance expectations and perceived organisational time demands to predict role conflict, work–family conflict, family–work conflict and time–energy imbalance (Hypothesis 5a). In partial support of Hypothesis 5a, hierarchical regression analyses revealed that spousal employment interacted with perceived organisational expectations to predict work–family conflict, family–work conflict and time–energy imbalance (see Table 10.4). Spousal employment also interacted with perceived organisational time demands to predict time–energy imbalance (see Table 10.5). Finally, we found partial support for Hypothesis 5b. More specifically, perceived organisational performance expectations and perceived organisational time demands showed additive effects beyond spousal employment in predicting role conflict, work–family conflict and time–energy imbalance but not family–work conflict (see Tables 10.4 and 10.5).

Table 10.2: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Conflict as Predicted by Organisational Expectations and Employee Gender (n=57–67)

	Role Conflict			Work–Family Conflict			Family–Work Conflict			Time–Energy Imbalance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Gender	.30	.24	.76	.26	.20	.42	−.24	−.25	.50	−.04	−.11	1.14
Org. Expectations		.33	.67		.43	.56		.04	.52		.34	1.17
Gender X Org. Expectations			−.68			−.27			−.98			−1.66
R²	.09	.20	.21	.07	.25	.25	.06	.06	.08	.00	.11	.19
R²Δ	.09*	.11**	.01	.07	.18***	.00	.06†	.00	.02	.00	.11*	.08*

†*p* < .01
p < .05
**p* < .01
***p* < .001

Table 10.3: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Conflict as Predicted by Organisational Time Demands and Employee Gender (n=61–76)

	Role Conflict			Work–Family Conflict			Family–Work Conflict			Time–Energy Imbalance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Gender	.29	.18	.42	.26	.15	.12	–.13	–.13	–.76	–.06	–.17	.16
Org. Time Demands		.42	.62		.51	.48		–.02	–.56		.38	.62
Gender X Org. Time Demands			–.35			.04			.94			–.46
R^2	.08	.25	.26	.07	.31	.31	.02	.02	.05	.00	.14	.15
$R^2\Delta$	.08*	.17**	.01	.07*	.24***	.00	.02	.00	.03	.00	.14**	.01

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Table 10.4: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Conflict as Predicted by Organisational Expectations and Spousal Employment (n=61–76)

	Role Conflict			Work–Family Conflict			Family–Work Conflict			Time–Energy Imbalance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Spousal Employment	.02	.04	.79	.14	.15	1.30	.09	.09	1.66	.05	.06	1.49
Org. Expectations		.38	.66		.46	.91		-.01	.61		.32	.93
Spousal Employment X Org. Expectations			-.80			-1.25			-1.72			-1.57
R^2	.00	.14	.17	.02	.23	.29	.01	.01	.11	.00	.10	.20
$R^2\Delta$	.00	.14**	.03	.02	.21***	.06*	.01	.00	.10*	.00	.10*	.10*

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

244 *The Role of Person, Spouse and Organisational Climate*

Table 10.5: Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Conflict as Predicted by Organisational Time Demands and Spousal Employment (n = 61–76)

	Role Conflict			Work–Family Conflict			Family–Work Conflict			Time–Energy Imbalance		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Spousal Employment	−.03	−.04	−.05	.06	.02	.43	.03	.03	.49	.04	.03	1.09
Org. Time Demands		.47	.46		.54	.73		−.05	.17		.33	.85
Spousal Employment X Org. Time Demands			.01			−.47			−.54			−1.23
R²	.00	.22	.22	.00	.29	.30	.00	.00	.02	.00	.11	.17
R²Δ	.00	.22***	.00	.00	.29***	.01	.00	.00	.02	.00	.11**	.06*

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

DISCUSSION

The present study extended previous research on gender and work–family conflict. In addition, the study provided unique contributions in two ways by developing our understanding of: (1) the role of organisational climate in perceptions of role conflict, work–family conflict, family work conflict and time–energy imbalance (well-being) and (2) the role that spousal employment has jointly with organisational climate in predicting role conflict, work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict and time–energy imbalance.

Using faculty participants, we found that women perceived significantly greater role conflict and work-to-family conflict than men. Similar to Gutek et al. (1991), men reported greater family-to-work conflict than women. In light of these findings, we urge researchers to continue examining the relationships among men and women and work and non-work interfaces. Although we found gender main effects, we believe that often these relationships are not simple or straightforward; they may vary based on occupation, marital status, spousal employment, number and ages of children and so forth.

We predicted that employees whose spouses worked full-time would report greater role conflict, work-family conflict and time–energy imbalance than employees whose spouses worked part-time or not at all. This was not supported. One reason could be that self-selection may be operating among couples such that dual-earner couples have developed greater self-efficacy and work–family coping skills than couples where the spouse is not employed (Barnett, 2005). Also it may be that more traditional couples and dual-earner couples vary in terms of career and family identity. Specifically, dual-earner couples may be better able to share multiple roles and the career and family identities of each spouse may be more similar in such couples. Further, our sample was composed largely of male employees; few female employees reported having spouses who worked either part-time or not at all. We encourage more research that examines a greater number of female employees whose spouses are not employed (by choice or forced), part-time or full-time.

The results of the current study underscore the importance of perceptions of organisational climate in understanding work–family interfaces. Allen (2001) has shown that organisational climate rather than the objective presence of work–family friendly programmes

predicts the uptake or utilisation of such programmes. Consistent with this research, both indicators of organisational climate were significantly related to role conflict, work-to-family conflict and time–energy imbalance. When organisational time demands or performance expectations for employees were high, employees reported greater role conflict, work–family conflict and time–energy imbalance than when such organisational climate perceptions were low.

The importance of organisational climate was assessed further by examining both additive and interactive contributions to ratings or organisational climate beyond gender and spousal employment. The effect of organisational performance expectations on time–energy imbalance was greater among men than women. Although there was one interactive effect, regression analyses revealed that organisational climate had strong additive effects beyond gender in ratings of role conflict, work–family conflict and time–energy imbalance. For each of these findings, organisational climate contributed greater unique variance in ratings than did gender.

The additive and interactive effects of organisational climate were stronger and more consistent with spousal employment. There were significant interactive effects for work-to-family conflict, family-to-work conflict and time–energy imbalance. When organisational performance expectations were low, there was a greater difference in ratings of work-to-family conflict and family-to-work conflict among full-time, part-time and not employed spouses. In addition, among employees whose spouses were employed full-time, there were the greatest differences in rating of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. For work-to-family conflict, in organisations with low performance expectations, employees with spouses employed full-time reported significantly lower work-to-family conflict than employees with spouses employed part-time or not at all. A different interaction pattern emerged using ratings of time–energy imbalance. There were larger differences in ratings of time–energy imbalance between low and high organisational performance expectations among employees whose spouses were employed full-time. Therefore, having a spouse who is employed full-time amplified the effects of organisational performance expectations on time–energy imbalance. In addition, among employees

whose spouses were not employed, employees reported less time–energy imbalance in high performance expectations organisations than in low performance expectations organisations. Further there was a significant interactive effect between organisational time demands and spousal employment and on ratings of time–energy imbalance. The pattern of this interaction was similar to the one found using organisational performance expectations. Finally, there were additive effects of organisational performance expectations (beyond spousal employment) for ratings of role conflict, work–family conflict and time–energy imbalance.

Evidence from this study suggests that organisational climate may be one of the most critical factors in shaping the family friendliness (or unfriendliness) of an organisation. Many organisations today operate as if men continue to be the sole breadwinner for the family with a full-time spouse at home. The belief that work and family are two separate domains or spheres continues to be deeply ingrained within our society. With increasing numbers of women in the workforce and technological advances allowing work to be performed at home, it is clear that the two spheres are not distinct (Thompson, Beauvais & Allen, 2005). Yet often organisations require employees to invest significant time and energy in work. As Williams (2000) describes, the 'ideal worker' is one who will work long hours per week, to an inflexible and demanding work schedule, with an unpredictable work routine and within a greedy organisational climate. Within our highly educated professional sample, women continue to experience greater work-to-family conflict than their male counterparts. This finding occurs within a setting where, although working hours may be long, it is believed that employee flexibility and control over those working hours is high compared to non-academic or more traditional organisational settings.

By itself spousal employment apparently has little effect on perceptions of work and non-work conflict. Yet, perceptions of organisational performance expectations (and time demands) both singly and jointly with spousal employment are a critical factor in perceptions of conflict and time–energy imbalance. Employee perceptions of the work context appear to play a greater role shaping our work/non-work perceptions than individual difference variables like gender or marital status.

Few studies are without their limitations. We were unable to examine more complex relationships or interactions among variables. It would have been interesting to assess whether or not male and female faculty in situations where one's spouse is employed full-time, part-time or not at all vary in perceptions of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict. There were such small numbers of female faculty whose spouses worked part-time or not at all that we were unable to assess these relationships. In addition, few single male or female parents are represented in this population. This leads us to consider the possibility that academia may be informally, via organisational expectations and time demands, screening out a segment of our society.

On the other hand, there is reason to believe that the characteristics of work within university settings have a number of desirable features that not only may enhance the quality of one's family life, but also provide some flexibility and discretion for faculty in navigating among work and family domains. Due to the length of our survey, we did not examine the potential for work and family facilitation or positive spillover. In addition, there is a need to link perceptions of conflict and climate to work-related attitudes, behaviour and performance.

What do the results of the present study suggest? Similar to other areas within industrial and organisational psychology (e.g. honesty in the work place, Murphy, 1993), researchers who attempt to understand work and family issues may have very different goals (Sackett & DeVore, 2001). Various theoretical perspectives on work and family may focus more on individual differences (e.g. type A, negative affectivity or gender) as antecedents of work–family conflict while other perspectives may focus more on situational character-istics (e.g. long work hours). Perspectives that focus on persons clearly utilise the individual level of analysis (Sackett & DeVore, 2001). On the other hand, the focus upon situation variables as antecedents can reflect either individual level or aggregated levels of analyses (hours, job characteristics vs. organisational policies). Further, Sackett and DeVore (2001) identify a second dimension that can influence research questions, designs and objectives which reflects the time-frame in which data is collected. Although Sackett and DeVore applied these two dimensions to counterproductive

work behaviours, they can be discussed in terms of work and family research as well.

Results from the present study suggest that the situation perspective is a meaningful avenue for work and family researchers to pursue. It is important to focus more upon both the proximal and distal context factors that either enhance or inhibit the occurrence and perceptions of work–family conflict. Further, researchers and practitioners would gain significant insights into the developmental nature of work and family interchanges by examining employees and their families across the lifespan as their family and work lives are initiated, develop and grow.

REFERENCES

Allen, T.D. (2001) 'Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions', *The Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 414–435.

Bailyn, L. (1997) 'The impact of corporate culture on work–family integration' in S. Parasuraman and J.H. Greenhaus (eds) (1997) *Integrating Work and Family: Challenges and Choices for a Changing World*, Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Barnett, R. (2005) 'Dual-earner couples: Good/bad for her and/ or him?' in D.F. Halpern and S.E. Murphy (eds) (2005) *From Work–Family Balance to Work–Family Interaction: Changing the Metaphor*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Blair-Loy, M. and Wharton, A.S. (2002) 'Employees' use of work–family policies and the workplace social context', *Social Forces*, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp. 813–845.

Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R.C. and Schilling, E.A. (1989) 'Effects of daily stress on negative mood', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 57, No. 5, pp. 808–818.

Bond, J.T., Galinsky, E. and Swanberg, J.E. (1998) *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workplace*, New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.

Brett, J.M., Stroh, L.K. and Reilly, A.H. (1992) 'What is it like being a dual career manager in the 1990s?' in S. Zedeck (ed) (1992) *Work, Families, and Organizations*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

250 *The Role of Person, Spouse and Organisational Climate*

Burke, R. (2000) 'Effects of sex, parental status, and spouse work involvement in dual-career couples', *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 87 (February), pp. 919–927.

Clark, S.C. (2001) 'Work cultures and work/family balance', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 348–365.

Cleveland, J.N. (2005) 'What is success? Who defines it?: Perspectives on the criterion problem as it relates to work and family' in E. E. Kossek and S. J. Lambert (eds) (2005) *Work and Life Integration: Organizational, Cultural, and Individual Perspectives*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Crouter, A.C. (1984) 'Spillover from family to work: The neglected side of the work–family interface', *Human Relations*, Vol. 37, No. 6, pp. 425–442.

Crouter, A.C. and Helms-Erikson, H. (1997) 'Work and family from a dyadic perspective: Variations in inequality' in S. Duck (ed) (1997) *Handbook of Personal Relationships: Theory, Research and Interventions*, New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Crouter, A.C., Bumpus, M.F., Maguire, M.C. and McHale, S.M. (1999) 'Linking parents' work pressure and adolescents' well-being: Insights into dynamics in dual-earner families', *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 25, No. 6, pp. 1453–1461.

Eagle, B.W., Miles, E.W. and Icenogle, M.L. (1997) 'Interrole conflicts and the permeability of work and family domains: Are there gender differences?', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 168–184.

Fried, M. (1998) *Taking Time: Parental Leave Policy and Corporate Culture*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Frone, M.R. (2003) 'Work–Family Balance' in J.C. Quick and L.E. Tetrick (eds) (2003) *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Frone, M.R., Russell, M. and Cooper, M.L. (1992) 'Antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict: Testing a model of the work–family interface', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 1, pp. 65–78.

Garies, D.C., Barnett, R.C. and Brennan, R.T. (2003) 'Individual and crossover effects of work schedule fit: A within-couple analysis', *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 1041–1054.

Gutek, B.A., Searle, S. and Klepa, L. (1991) 'Rational versus gender role explanations for work–family conflict', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 76, No. 4, pp. 560–568.

Hammer, L.B., Allen, E. and Grigsby, T.D. (1997) 'Work–family conflict in dual-earner couples: Within-individual and crossover effects of work and family', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 185–203.

Hammer, L., Bauer, T. and Grandey, A. (2003) 'Work–Family Conflict and Work-Related Withdrawal Behaviors', *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 419–436.

Hochschild, A. (1989) *The Second Shift*, New York, NY: Avon Books.

James, L.R. and James, L.A. (1989) 'Integrating work environment perceptions: Explorations into the measurement of meaning', *Journal of Applied Psychology,* Vol. 74, No. 5, pp. 739–751.

James, L.R., James, L.A. and Ash, D.K. (1990) 'The meaning of organizations: The roles of cognition and values' in B. Schneider (ed) (1990) *Organizational Climate and Culture*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, F. and Fletcher, B.C. (1993) 'An empirical study of occupational stress transmission in working couples', *Human Relations*, Vol. 46, No. 7, pp. 881–903.

Kinnunen, U. and Mauno, S. (1998) 'Antecedents and outcomes of work–family conflict among employed women and men in Finland', *Human Relations*, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 125–177.

Kofodimos, J.R. (1995) *Beyond Work–Family Programs: Confronting and Resolving the Underlying Causes of Work–Personal Life Conflict*, Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lyness, K.S., Judiesch, M.K., Thompson, C.A. and Beauvais, L. (2001) 'Influence of work-family culture, benefits, and perceived organizational characteristics on turnover intentions', Paper presented at the Academy of Management conference, Washington, DC.

Major, D.A. and Cleveland, J.N. (2005) 'Psychological perspectives on the work–family interface' in S.M. Bianchi, L.M. Casper and R.B. King (eds) (2005) *Work, Family, Health, and Well-Being*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mathieu, J.E., Hofmann, D.A. and Farr, J. (1993) 'Job perception–job satisfaction relations: An empirical comparison of three competing theories', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 370–387.

Murphy, K.R. (1993) *Honesty in the Workplace*, Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Murphy, S.E. and Zagorski, D.A. (2005) *Enhancing Work–Family and Work–Life Interaction: The Role of Management*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MacDermid, S.M. and Crouter, A.C. (1995) 'Midlife, adolescence, and parental employment in family systems', *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 29–54.

Neal, A., West, M. and Patterson, M. (2000) *An Examination of Interactions between Organizational Climate and Human Resource Management Practices in Manufacturing Organizations*, Birmingham: Aston Business School, Aston University.

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S. and McMurrian, R. (1996) 'Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 4, pp. 400–410.

Neubauer, P.J. (1992) 'The impact of stress, hardiness, home and work environment on job satisfaction, illness, and absenteeism in critical care nurses', *Medical Psychotherapy: An International Journal*, Vol. 5, pp. 109–122.

Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y.S., Godshalk, V.M. and Beutell, N. (1996) 'Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success and psychological well-being', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 275–300.

Piotrkowski, C.S. (1978) *Work and the Family System: A Naturalistic Study of Working-Class and Lower-Middle-Class Families*, New York, NY: Free Press.

Quinn, R.E. and Rohrbaugh, J. (1983) 'A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis', *Management Science*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 363–377.

Reichers, A.E. and Schneider, B. (1999) 'Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs', in B. Schneider (ed) (1999) *Organizational Climate and Culture*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Repetti, R.L. (1987) 'Individual and common components of the social environment at work and psychological well-being', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 710–720.

Sackett, P.R. and DeVore, C.J. (2001) 'Counterproductive behaviors at work' in N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil and C. Viswesvaran (eds) (2001) *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*, Volume 1, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Staines, G.L. (1980) 'Spillover versus compensation: A review of the literature on the relationship between work and nonwork', *Human Relations*, Vol. 33, No. 2, pp. 111–129.

Starrels, M.E. (1992) 'The evolution of workplace family policy research', *Journal of Family Issues*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 259–278.

Thompson, C.A., Beauvais, L.L. and Lyness, K.S. (1999) 'When work–family benefits are not enough: The influences of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 392–415.

Westman, M. (2001) 'Stress and strain crossover', *Human Relations*, Vol. 54, No. 6, pp. 717–752.

Westman, M., Vinokur, A.D., Hamilton, V.L and Roziner, I. (2004) 'Crossover of marital dissatisfaction during military downsizing among Russian army officers and their spouses', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, No. 5, pp. 769–779.