

Research Bank

Journal article

How does family support facilitate job satisfaction? Investigating the chain mediating effects of work–family enrichment and job-related well-being

Chan, Xi Wen, Kalliath, Parveen, Chan, Christopher and Kalliath, Thomas

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Chan, X. W., Kalliath, P., Chan, C. and Kalliath, T. (2020). How does family support facilitate job satisfaction? Investigating the chain mediating effects of work–family enrichment and job-related well-being. *Stress and Health*, 36(1), pp. 97-104, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2918>.

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited

How does family support facilitate job satisfaction? Investigating the chain mediating effects of work–family enrichment and job-related well-being



Xi Wen Chan

School of Management, College of Business, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Parveen Kalliath

*School of Allied Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, Australian Catholic University,
Canberra, Australia*

Christopher Chan

*School of Human Resource Management, Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies,
York University*

*Centre for Sustainable HRM and Wellbeing, Faculty of Law and Business, Australian
Catholic University*

Institut de Gestion de Rennes, Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, France

Thomas Kalliath

*Research School of Management, College of Business and Economics, The Australian
National University, Canberra, Australia*

Corresponding Author: Xi Wen Chan, School of Management, College of Business,
RMIT University, Level 3, Building 88, 440 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000,
Australia. Telephone: +61 3 9925 8709 and Email: carys.chan@rmit.edu.au

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/smi.2918

Abstract

While a direct relationship between family support and job satisfaction has received empirical support, few work–family studies have examined *how* family support leads to job satisfaction. Drawing on the work–home resources model, we investigate the chain mediating roles of work-to-family enrichment (WFE), family-to-work enrichment (FWE), and job-related well-being on the relationship between family support and job satisfaction. Based on data collected from 439 social workers across Australia, structural equation modeling results revealed that the chain mediating effects of WFE and job-related well-being were supported. Our findings emphasize the important combination of work–family enrichment and job-related well-being in helping employees to harness support from their family members to achieve job satisfaction. We discuss both the theoretical and practical implications of the WFE, FWE, and job-related well-being mechanisms underlying the family support–job satisfaction relationship.

Keywords: family support, work-to-family enrichment, family-to-work enrichment, job-related well-being, job satisfaction, work–home resources model

How does family support facilitate job satisfaction? Investigating the chain mediating effects of work–family enrichment and job-related well-being

Introduction

Employees who experience a high level of job satisfaction are more productive, happier, healthier, less likely to be absent from work or leave the organization, and more satisfied with their lives (Kwok, Cheng, & Wong, 2015). Given the importance of job satisfaction for employee outcomes, it is not surprising that numerous studies have examined the antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction. However, these studies have focused primarily on work- and stress-related antecedents of job satisfaction (e.g., burnout, work engagement, role overload, leadership, and organizational culture), with less attention given to family-related antecedents such as family support (Li, Butler, & Bagger, 2018; Zhang, Foley, Li, & Zhu, 2018). Family support buffers job stress from negative work-related outcomes such as burnout, and fosters positive affect and well-being (Kwok et al., 2015). While prior studies have established a positive correlation between family support and job satisfaction, the mechanisms underlying this relationship have not been adequately explored (Bagger & Li, 2014). The motivation for our study was to test the tenets of ten Brummelhuis and Bakker's (2012) work–home resources (W-HR) model as a plausible explanation for the relationship between work–family enrichment and job-related well-being as mediating mechanisms in the relationship between family support and job satisfaction.

While there is ample literature highlighting the stressful conditions under which social workers practice, often for much lower salaries and less than optimal working conditions (Collins & Parry-Jones, 2000; Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002), little attention has been given to the many rewards that are inherent in social work (Collins, 2008). Despite the complexities of social work practice, it cannot be discounted that social work is a rewarding profession for many drawn to this profession. Often, the challenges experienced by social

workers are compensated by other rewards such as satisfaction from helping and involvement with people in meaningful ways (Jones, 2001). Against this contextual backdrop, we investigate the roles of work-to-family enrichment (WFE), family-to-work enrichment (FWE), and job-related well-being (JRWB) in the relationship between family support and job satisfaction.

We examine work–family enrichment as one of two mediators linking family support to job satisfaction. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) defined work–family enrichment as “the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role” (p. 73). Positive experiences in the work domain can influence or enrich the family domain (i.e., WFE) and vice versa (i.e., FWE). Despite Greenhaus and Powell’s (2006) call for more investigation into the potential antecedents, mediators and outcomes of work–family enrichment, there is a noticeable lack of empirical evidence regarding the mediating roles played by WFE and FWE. Therefore, drawing on ten Brummelhuis and Bakker’s (2012) W-HR model, we study the mediating effects of WFE and FWE on the relationship between family support and job satisfaction. Family support, a contextual resource, is one such resource that facilitates WFE and FWE, which in turn help individuals to achieve JRWB, and subsequently, job satisfaction. We contribute to the work–family literature in two ways. First, it helps us to understand how family support leads to job satisfaction. Although multiple work–family studies have examined family support and job satisfaction, family support is typically investigated as a moderator of the antecedent relationships leading to job satisfaction. Only a handful of studies (e.g., Bagger & Li, 2014; Kwok et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2018) have considered the underlying mediating mechanisms leading from family support to job satisfaction. Secondly, we draw on the W-HR model which has been contextualized to understand work and family resource gain processes. Based on the W-HR model, enrichment is described as a process of resource accumulation: Work and family resources increase

personal resources, which, in turn, are utilized to improve family and work outcomes (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). In so doing, we contribute to the pool of prior studies (e.g., Bagger & Li, 2014; Hakanen, Peeters, & Perhoniemi, 2011; Nicklin & McNall, 2013; Zhang et al., 2018) examining social support and work and family outcomes which has drawn primarily on social exchange theory and conservation of resources (COR) theory to uncover the underlying mediating mechanisms. The W-HR model is more apposite to our study because it provides an integrated theoretical framework to understand specific causes, linking mechanisms, and consequences in the work–family interface.

The W-HR model (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012) applies COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989) to the work–family interface and attempts to explain the resource loss and gain processes which diminish or enhance the work and family domains. ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) also distinguished the types of resources. Contextual resources (e.g., family support) are external to the self and can be found in the social contexts of the individual, while personal resources (e.g., resilience and health) are proximate to the self and usually found within the individual. These distinctions assist us to understand how employees gain and utilize resources in their work and family environments to achieve their desired life outcomes such as job and family satisfaction (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). According to the W-HR model, contextual resources initiate the WFE and FWE processes. Consistent with the idea of “gain spirals” (Hakanen et al., 2011), individuals are more likely to gain resources if they have a larger resource pool. Contextual resources are the enablers of enrichment, and personal resources link the work and family domains (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

Family support has been shown to alleviate work demands and challenges (Li et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018). This support can come from the work domain (i.e., organizational or supervisor support), such as family-friendly policies and practices, supervisor providing

Accepted Article

support for family-related needs (e.g., flexible work arrangements and compressed work week), and extension of organizational benefits to family members (Bagger & Li, 2014; Lapierre et al., 2017; Wayne, Randel, & Stevens, 2006). Another form stems from the family (i.e., family support), such as listening to a spouse's experiences at work or stepping in with household chores (Gayathri & Karthikeyan, 2016). Employees who receive family support are better able to focus on work demands, which in turn improves their job satisfaction (Zhang et al., 2018). The direct relationship between family support and job satisfaction has received empirical support. For example, in Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer's (2007) meta-analysis examining work- and family-related sources of social support, stressors, involvement, and work- and family-related satisfaction, family support was significantly and positively related to job satisfaction.

However, the mediating, cross-domain effects linking family support to job satisfaction remain understudied (Zhang et al., 2018). An implicit assumption underlying the W-HR model is that employees utilize resources (i.e., family support) available to them to accumulate other resources (e.g., sharing household and childcare responsibilities), and achieve high levels of functioning in their work and family domains. One operationalization of the cross-domain enrichment mechanism is WFE and FWE. In a study of Chinese hospital workers by Siu et al. (2010), family support was not related to WFE but was related to FWE. Similarly, Wayne et al. (2006) study of insurance workers in the United States did not find any evidence for a relationship between family support and WFE but found support for a relationship between family support and FWE. However, in another study involving Finnish dentists, Hakanen et al. (2011) did not find support for a relationship between family support and FWE. Nevertheless, Gayathri and Karthikeyan (2016) found that family support was positively related to WFE and FWE in a sample comprising various occupations in India. Likewise, Zhang et al. (2018) found that family support was related to work-family balance

through the cross-domain effect of family support reaching beyond the family domain to influence employees' work–family balance.

Social support provided by family members can provide buffering effects such that employees can focus on job-related tasks when necessary and perform better as a result, leading to FWE (Siu et al., 2015). Likewise, emotional support from family members can reduce work-related stress and promote psychological well-being, leading to FWE (Kwok et al., 2015; Siu et al., 2015). Given that both work and family domains are strongly intertwined such that FWE is likely to lead to WFE and vice versa (Siu et al., 2015), family support has the potential to facilitate both WFE and FWE. Enrichment transpires as resources generated in one domain transfer and contribute to the other domain in the form of developmental, affective, capital, or efficiency gains (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006). Hence, we examine all six dimensions of work–family enrichment (WFE-Development, WFE-Affect, WFE-Capital, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect, and FWE-Efficiency) since family support provides both emotional and instrumental support. Additionally, family support may play an extrinsic motivational role by providing instrumental advice and affective resources to help employees in achieving their work goals (Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), giving rise to WFE. Furthermore, family support may come from the work domain in the form of family-friendly policies and practices, and perceptions of family-supportive organizational culture (Wayne et al., 2006). For example, certain family-friendly benefits offered by employers (e.g., health insurance for employees and their families, and paid paternity or maternity leave) are essentially providing family support to employees, which enable them to focus on and perform better at work, leading to WFE.

The second mediator linking family support to job satisfaction is JRWB. While JRWB refers to both positive and negative affect pertaining to the job, job satisfaction refers to an overall satisfaction with one's job or specific areas of one's job (Warr, 1990; Wilks & Neto,

2013). Further, Warr (2011) argued that “JRWB is more exclusively influenced by features in the job domain alone” (p. 147). Thus, instead of focusing on psychological well-being or general well-being, JRWB is context-specific and thus a more robust predictor of work outcomes such as job satisfaction. Although some studies have shown that family support positively affects family well-being (Hakanen et al., 2011), there has been a lack of empirical studies exploring the family support–JRWB relationship. Arguably, there is a positive relationship between family support and JRWB for the following reasons. First, family support has been shown to alleviate work-related stress and burnout, as employees are able to seek emotional support from their family members and share coping strategies (Kwok et al., 2015). Second, family support in the form of sharing childcare and household responsibilities can help employees to focus on their work demands (Gayathri & Karthikeyan, 2016), which positively influences their JRWB. According to the W-HR model, there might also be a positive spillover of family support on JRWB through the various FWE mechanisms (e.g., FWE-Development, FWE-Affect, and FWE-Efficiency) (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). A small number of studies (e.g., O’Neill & Sevastos, 2013) have also found a positive relationship between JRWB and job satisfaction.

Taken together, we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1. Family support is positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2a. WFE dimensions (development, affect, and capital) and JRWB will mediate the positive relationship between family support and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2b. FWE dimensions (development, affect, and efficiency) and JRWB will mediate the positive relationship between family support and job satisfaction.

Method

Sample and Procedure

Cross-sectional data were collected by an online survey from members of the

Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) who were in paid employment. The AASW forwarded a uniform resource locator (URL) embedded in an e-mail invitation on behalf of the researcher to approximately 2,000 social workers in Australia. A total of 439 usable responses was obtained, representing a response rate of 22.0%. Most participants (83.2%) were female. The average age of the participants was 44.1 years old ($SD = 10.6$). In terms of educational level, the majority (77.3%) held a bachelor's degree, 10.0% held a master's degree, 1.8% held a doctorate degree, and the remaining 10.9% held other qualifications (e.g., graduate diploma in social work). Most participants (70.0%) were living with a partner. The average number of years of social work experience was 15.4 ($SD = 9.9$). The average number of hours worked per week was 36.7 ($SD = 9.8$). Just over half of the participants (53.0%) looked after one or more dependent.

Measures

Family support. We used Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harison, and Pinneau's (1980) four-item scale to measure family support. A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used to rate the items. A sample item is "My family members go out of their way to make my life easier" ($\alpha = .90$).

WFE and FWE. The 18-item work-family enrichment scale (Carlson et al., 2006) was used to assess WFE (development, affect, and capital) and FWE (development, affect, and efficiency). A five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) was used to rate the items. Sample items are "My involvement in my work helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me to be a better family member" and "My involvement in my family helps me gain knowledge and this helps me to be a better worker" (FWE-Development, $\alpha = .92$; FWE-Affect, $\alpha = .96$; FWE-Efficiency, $\alpha = .93$; WFE-Development, $\alpha = .95$; WFE-Affect, $\alpha = .94$; WFE-Capital, $\alpha = .95$).

JRWB. Warr's (1990) job-related depression-enthusiasm and job-related anxiety-

contentment scales were used to measure JRWB. Respondents reflected on how their jobs had made them feel in the previous three months. A six-point frequency scale (1 = never; 6 = all of the time) was used to rate the 15 items. Sample items include “tense”, “calm”, and “cheerful.” All the negative adjectives were removed as a result of poor item–total correlation (i.e., less than .35) ($\alpha = .94$).

Job satisfaction. A three-item scale from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983) was used to measure job satisfaction. A five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) was used to rate the items. A sample item is “I enjoy what I do in my job” ($\alpha = .92$).

Based on previous work–family studies (Wilks & Neto, 2013; Zhang et al., 2018), we included the following demographic variables as controls: gender (0 = female; 1 = male), age (number of years), educational level (1 = Bachelor; 2 = Master’s; 3 = Doctorate; 4 = others), marital status (0 = alone; 1 = partner), years of working experience (number of years), number of hours worked per week, and caring for dependents (0 = no; 1 = yes).

Analyses

Correlational analyses, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM) were carried out using SPSS and AMOS (version 25.0). First, we conducted correctional analyses to determine if our variables are significantly correlated in the right directions. Then, we conducted CFA to assess the nine-factor model (representative of our hypothesized theoretical model), which had a good fit to the data (see Table 1). All the standardized factor loadings (ranging from .75 to .98) were also significant ($p < .001$).

Alternative confirmatory models were also tested. For example, in Model 2, a second-order variable was created for JRWB and job satisfaction because of the high and significant correlation between the two variables. In Model 3, WFE and FWE were treated as second-order variables. In Model 4, all the items for WFE and FWE were loaded onto a single factor.

Accepted Article

Finally, in Model 5, the common latent factor test was performed (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Model 1 fitted the data better than the other three models. Chi-square differences test further revealed that Model 1 had the best fit in comparison with other models (see Table 1). Also, in Model 5, the common standardized loading was .55, which indicates a common variance of 0.3025 (i.e., 30.25%; square of .55). Therefore, there is no evidence of serious common method variance in our study (Fuller, Simmering, Atinc, & Babin, 2015).

----- Insert Table 1 about here -----

SEM was subsequently conducted to test the hypotheses. As suggested by Preacher and Hayes (2008), 5,000 bootstrap samples were specified to test the significance of the indirect effects based on 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence. The controls for job satisfaction included gender ($\beta = -.02, p > .05$), age ($\beta = -.04, p > .05$), educational level ($\beta = -.02, p > .05$), marital status ($\beta = .13, p < .001$), years of experience ($\beta = .01, p > .05$), number of paid working hours per week ($\beta = .07, p > .05$), and dependent care responsibility ($\beta = -.06, p > .05$). The fit indices suggested a good model fit (normed $\chi^2 = 2.33$, CFI = .94, NFI = .90, TLI = .93, and RMSEA = .06). We also tested the direct effects between family support and job satisfaction, as well as the indirect mediating effects of WFE, FWE, and JRWB.

Results

Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the variables examined. Family support was positively related to the WFE dimensions, FWE dimensions, JRWB, and job satisfaction. The WFE and FWE dimensions were also positively related to JRWB and job satisfaction. JRWB was positively related to job satisfaction. Therefore, a preliminary check of the relationships revealed that they were all significantly correlated and in the expected directions. Hypothesis 1 was thus supported. Figure 1 shows the direct effects of the chain mediation model. Family support continued to have significant direct

relationships with WFE, FWE, JRWB and job satisfaction, but all FWE dimensions did not.

----- Insert Table 2 and Figure 1 about here -----

A closer examination of the indirect effects of the chain mediation model revealed that WFE-Development ($\beta = .20, SE = .11, 95\% CI = [.13; .28]$), WFE-Affect ($\beta = .16, SE = .09, 95\% CI = [.09; .24]$), WFE-Capital ($\beta = -.09, SE = .109, 95\% CI = [-.16; -.02]$), and JRWB ($\beta = .87, SE = .11, 95\% CI = [.13; .28]$) mediated the relationship between family support and job satisfaction. However, FWE-Development ($\beta = .01, SE = .02, 95\% CI = [-.06; .08]$), FWE-Affect ($\beta = .03, SE = .09, 95\% CI = [-.04; .10]$), and FWE-Efficiency ($\beta = -.03, SE = .09, 95\% CI = [-.10; .03]$) did not mediate the relationship between family support and job satisfaction. The indirect effect of family support on job satisfaction (through WFE, FWE, and JRWB) was also significant and positive ($\beta = .24, SE = .10, 95\% CI = [.15; .33]$). Thus, while Hypothesis 2a was supported, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

Discussion

Heeding Greenhaus and Powell's (2006) call for more research on work-family enrichment, our findings suggest that supportive family members enrich social workers' work-family interface, JRWB, and job satisfaction. It is possible that family support helps social workers to concentrate on work-related activities strengthened by the knowledge that their family supports the sacrifices implicit in such efforts (Baral & Bhargava, 2011), as the social workers in our study experienced WFE-Development, WFE-Affect and WFE-Capital after receiving family support. Our results also indicated that WFE-Development and WFE-Affect were particularly effective in helping social workers to achieve JRWB and job satisfaction. In particular, our study supported the chain mediating mechanism of family support \rightarrow WFE-Development and WFE-Affect \rightarrow JRWB \rightarrow job satisfaction, indicating that WFE-Development (e.g., intellectual and personal development) and WFE-Affect (e.g., positive mood and attitude) were key elements in linking family support to job satisfaction.

Family support was shown to provide both instrumental and affective support, which positively influenced social workers' life at work.

Surprisingly, we found that while WFE-Development and WFE-Affect led to increased JRWB and job satisfaction, WFE-Capital had negative direct and indirect effects on JRWB and job satisfaction, and none of the FWE dimensions were significantly associated with JRWB and job satisfaction. We first reason that WFE-Capital is indirectly and negatively related to JRWB and job satisfaction possibly because JRWB and job satisfaction are derived from the appraisal of one's job experiences and are thus affective in nature, whereas WFE-Capital (e.g., accomplishment and self-esteem) is more instrumental. Also, WFE-Capital resources such as individual accomplishments, self-esteem and confidence may backfire in organizations which encourage team performance and discourage individual achievements (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), potentially reducing JRWB and job satisfaction as a consequence.

Secondly, we reason that the FWE dimensions were not significantly related to both JRWB and job satisfaction because in line with McNall, Nicklin, and Masuda (2010), social workers are likely to attribute their positive job-related experiences to the work domain (i.e., WFE), and positive family experiences (e.g., family satisfaction) to the family domain (i.e., FWE). Since WFE involves the transfer of benefits from the work to family domain, and FWE involves the transfer of benefits from the family to work domain, it is likely that the social workers in our sample attributed their JRWB and job satisfaction to WFE rather than FWE. Another plausible explanation for the significant chain mediating mechanism of family support \rightarrow WFE-Development and WFE-Affect \rightarrow JRWB \rightarrow job satisfaction is that family support may also be received in the form of family-friendly benefits, family supportive supervisor behaviors (FSSB) and family supportive organizational culture from the work domain, which, in turn, generate resources and benefits at work that contribute to the family,

leading to WFE rather than FWE (Wayne et al., 2006).

While WFE and FWE are closely intertwined (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), our study findings also indicate that they are distinct constructs and “enrichment does not necessarily occur the same in both directions” (Carlson et al., 2006, p. 160). While WFE served as the linking mechanism between family support and job satisfaction in our study, FWE did not mediate the family support–job satisfaction relationship, even though: (1) we would typically expect family support to give rise to FWE since family support is a contextual resource originating from the family domain (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012); (2) WFE did occur, so we would expect FWE to occur as well since one usually leads to the other (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). We thus call upon work–family scholars to further examine the distinct roles of WFE and FWE to contribute to deeper understanding of the enrichment processes in the W-HR model.

Lastly, the nature of the relationship between family support and job satisfaction also warrants further discussion. While correlation analysis showed that a positive and significant relationship existed between the two variables ($r = .10, p < .05$), when the mediators (WFE, FWE, and JRWB) were added, family support became significantly and negatively associated with job satisfaction. It is plausible that job satisfaction, in turn, influenced WFE and JRWB, such that family support no longer contributes to further job satisfaction. Another possible explanation for this finding is that in the presence of WFE and JRWB, social workers feel supported at work such that any more family support is not as valued and may in fact add pressure to social workers in the form of family expectations.

Although no direct empirical evidence can be attributed to the impact of family-friendly policies and practices (FFPP) on work outcomes in this study, other studies in the extant literature have shown direct influence of FFPP on work outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover intentions (Chen, Zhang, Sanders, & Xu 2018; Ryan & Kossek,

2008; Shockley & Allen, 2007). Hence, at the organizational level, social work organizations are encouraged to provide FFPP so that social workers receive additional family support and can experience WFE. . Also, organizations need to provide a voice for employees to provide feedback so that mutually beneficial strategies can be discussed. Given that JRWB mediates the family support–job satisfaction relationship, social work organizations should explore ways to ensure high levels of well-being through cultivating coping strategies in social workers. Organizations could also provide mentors to guide and support social workers in managing challenging cases so that they do not feel overwhelmed. There needs to be effective communication to clarify work and family expectations within the family domain. Second, it may be necessary to discuss how roles could be better shared at home since a major source of family support comes from the employee’s family members. Third, social workers’ spouses and family members might need to consider ways to provide support via lending an ear and demonstrating an understanding of challenges in social work. Finally, the key implication of our findings is for every social worker to know that family members can provide support to influence their level of JRWB and job satisfaction. Thus, they should draw on this resource when the need arises. Also, social workers need to be cognizant of their JRWB and take necessary corrective steps against chronic negative emotions that may lead to severe resource losses (ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012).

Our study should be interpreted with some limitations in mind. First, we used self-reported, single source, and cross-sectional data. Single source data are often a concern because of common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Thus, we call upon future studies to incorporate a longitudinal design. Second, we tested only family support as a contextual resource in our model. Scholars should test the efficacies of other contextual resources such as supervisor, co-worker, and organizational support to advance knowledge about the work–family experiences of social workers. Third, our sample was limited to social workers

operating within Australia. Social workers in other countries may have different organizational, societal and cultural experiences that could potentially influence the results. A cross-cultural design could further add to knowledge and practice about the applicability and stability of the W-HR model in different cultural contexts. Finally, there may be other variables that are worth exploring. For example, does self-efficacy (a key personal resource) play a mediating or moderating role in a similar context? Outcomes such as workplace deviance and organizational citizenship behavior could also be investigated as part of the work–family nomological network. In summary, our study makes important theoretical contributions in demonstrating the use of the W-HR model and chain mediating mechanisms in understanding how employees gain and utilize resources in their work and family environments to achieve their desired life outcomes such as job and family satisfaction.

References

- Bagger, J., & Li, A. (2014). How does supervisory family support influence employees' attitudes and behaviors? A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Management*, *40*, 1123–1150. doi: 10.1177/0149206311413922
- Baral, R., & Bhargava, S. (2011). Examining the moderating influence of gender on the relationships between work-family antecedents work-family enrichment. *Gender in Management*, *26*, 122–147. doi: 10.1108/17542411111116545
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1983). Assessing the attitudes and perceptions of organizational members. In S. Seashore, E. Lawler, P. Mirvis, & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Assessing organizational change: A guide to methods, measures and practices* (pp. 71–138). New York: Wiley.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Van Harison, R., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980). *Job demands and worker health*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Social Research.
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H., & Grzywacz, J. G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work–family interface: Development and validation of a work–family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*, 131–164. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002
- Chen, W., Zhang, Y., Sanders, K., & Xu, S. (2018). Family-friendly work practices and their outcomes in China: the mediating role of work-to-family enrichment and the moderating role of gender. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *29*, 7, 1307–1329. doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1195424
- Collins, S. (2008). Statutory social workers: Stress, job satisfaction, coping, social support and individual differences. *British Journal of Social Work*, *38*, 1173–1193. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcy022
- Collins, S., & Parry-Jones, B. (2000). Stress: the perceptions of social work lecturers in

- Britain. *British Journal of Social Work*, 30, 769-794. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/30.6.769
- Ford, M. T., Heinen, B. A., & Langkamer, K. L. (2007). Work and family satisfaction and conflict: A meta-analysis of cross-domain relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 57–80. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.57
- Fuller, C. M., Simmering, M. J., Atinc, G., Atinc, Y. and Babin, B. J. (2016). Common methods variance detection in business research. *Journal of Business Research*, 69, 3192-3198. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.12.008
- Gayathri, N., & Karthikeyan, P. (2016). The role of self-efficacy and social support in improving life satisfaction: The mediating role of work–family enrichment. *Journal of Psychology*, 224, 25–33. doi: 10.1027/2151-2604/a000235
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Powell, G. N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work–family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 72–92. doi: 10.5465/amr.2006.19379625
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Marks, N. F. (2000). Reconceptualizing the work–family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(1), 111-126. doi: 10.1037/1076-8998.5.1.111
- Hakanen, J. J., Peeters, M. C. W., & Perhoniemi, R. (2011). Enrichment processes and gain spirals at work and at home: A 3-year cross-lagged panel study. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 84, 8–30. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.2010.02014.x
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44, 513–524. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513
- Jones, C. (2001). Voices from the front line: State social workers and New Labour. *British Journal of Social Work*, 31, 547-563. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/31.4.547

- Kwok, S. Y. C. L., Cheng, L., & Wong, D. F. K. (2015). Family emotional support, positive psychological capital and job satisfaction among Chinese white-collar workers. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *16*, 561–582. doi: 10.1007/s10902-014-9522-7
- Lapierre, L. M., Li, Y., Kwan, H. K., Greenhaus, J. H., DiRenzo, M. S., & Shao, P. (2017). A meta-analysis of the antecedents of work–family enrichment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*, 385-401. doi: 10.1002/job.2234
- Li, A., Butler, A., & Bagger, J. (2018). Depletion or expansion? Understanding the effects of support policy use on employee work and family outcomes. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *28*, 216-234. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12174
- Lloyd, C., King, R., & Chenoweth, L. (2002). Social work, stress and burnout: A review. *Journal of Mental Health*, *11*, 255-265. doi: 10.1080/09638230020023642
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M., & Masuda, A. D. (2010). A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work–family enrichment. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, *25*, 381–396. doi: 10.1007/s10869-009-9141-1
- Nicklin, J. M., & McNall, L. A. (2013). Work–family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *22*, 67–77. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2011.616652
- O’Neill, P., & Sevastos, P. (2013). The development and validation of a new multidimensional job insecurity measure (JIM): An inductive methodology. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*, 338–349. doi: 10.1037/a0033114
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 879–903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing

and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 879–891. doi: 10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

Ryan, A. M., & Kossek, E. E. (2008). Work–life policy implementation: Breaking down or creating barriers to inclusiveness? *Human Resource Management*, 47, 295–310. doi: 10.1002/hrm.20213

Shockley, K. M., & Allen, T. D. (2007). When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71, 479–493. doi: j.jvb.2007.08.006

Siu, O. L., Bakker, A. B., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Wang, H., Kalliath, T., O’Driscoll, M., Lu, J. F., & Timms, C. (2015). A three-wave study of antecedents of work–family enrichment: The roles of social resources and affect. *Stress and Health*, 31, 306–314. doi: 10.1002/smi.2556

Siu, O. L., Lu, J. F., Brough, P., Lu, C. Q., Bakker, A. B., Kalliath, T., O’Driscoll, M., Phillips, D. R., Chen, W. Q., Lo, D., Sit, C., & Shi, K. (2010). Role resources and work–family enrichment: The role of work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 470–480. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.007

ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work–home interface: The work–home resources model. *American Psychologist*, 67, 545–556. doi: 10.1037/a0027974

Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 193–210. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x

Warr, P. (2011). *Work, happiness, and unhappiness*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E., & Stevens, J. (2006). The role of identity and work–family support in work–family enrichment and its work-related consequences. *Journal of*

Vocational Behavior, 69, 445–462. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.002

Wilks, D. C., & Neto, F. (2013). Workplace well-being, gender and age: Examining the “double jeopardy” effect. *Social Indicators Research*, 114, 875–890. doi: 10.1007/s1205-012-0177-7

Zhang, M., Foley, S., Li, H., & Zhu, J. (2018). Social support, work-family balance and satisfaction among Chinese middle- and upper-level managers: Testing cross-domain and within-domain effects. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/09585192.2018.1464490

Accepted Article

Table 1

Results of confirmatory factor analysis

Model	df	χ^2	$\Delta\chi^2$	CFI	NFI	TLI	RMSEA
Model 1. 9-factor model	459	1,148.92	-	.95	.92	.94	.06
Model 2. 8-factor model ^a	465	1,175.88	26.96 ^{***}	.95	.92	.95	.06
Model 3. 5-factor model ^b	485	4,422.67	3,273.75 ^{***}	.73	.71	.69	.14
Model 4. 4-four-factor model ^c	489	5,977.46	4,828.54 ^{***}	.76	.60	.57	.16
Model 5. Common latent factor model	494	1,689.83	540.91 ^{***}	.92	.89	.91	.07

Notes. $\Delta\chi^2$ denote differences between the 9-factor model and other models; CFI = comparative fit index; NFI = normed fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation;

^a This model combines job-related well-being and job satisfaction into a second-order factor.

^b This model combines the items for WFE and FWE into two factors;

^c This model combines all the items for WFE and FWE into one factor;

^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics and correlations among variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Gender	0.17	0.37															
2. Age	44.05	10.55	.12**														
3. Education	1.46	.96	-.02	.16***													
4. Marital	0.70	0.46	.06	.04	.08												
5. Years of experience	15.39	9.87	.05	.48***	.24***	.16***											
6. Hours of work	36.72	9.80	.06	.00	.01	-.16***	-.08										
7. Dependent	0.53	0.50	.05	.09	-.02	.18***	.03	-.12**									
8. Family support	3.76	0.88	.01	-.04	.04	.19***	.04	-.09	.02								
9. WFE-Development	3.76	0.89	-.10*	.05	.03	.20***	.08	-.14**	.03	.28***							
10. WFE-Affect	3.17	0.86	-.03	.09	.00	.09	.06	-.15**	.01	.22***	.68***						
11. WFE-Capital	3.84	0.74	-.06	.03	-.03	.10*	-.02	-.03	-.02	.25***	.63***	.52***					
12. FWE-Development	3.78	0.78	-.04	.04	-.02	.13**	.01	-.09	.18***	.30***	.41***	.38***	.42***				
13. FWE-Affect	3.75	0.82	-.13**	-.08	.02	.17***	-.05	-.11*	.06	.52***	.44***	.39***	.41***	.52***			
14. FWE-Efficiency	3.48	0.86	-.10*	-.05	-.04	.18***	-.02	-.17***	.20***	.35***	.38***	.40***	.33***	.59***	.58***		
15. Job-related well-being	3.77	1.01	.01	.08	.04	.07	.09	-.08	.06	.28***	.54***	.49***	.28***	.29***	.34***	.25***	
16. Job satisfaction	5.14	1.40	-.02	.02	.02	.15**	.07	-.02	-.06	.10*	.50***	.46***	.28***	.15**	.19***	.10*	.60***

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

