Linking Work–Family Enrichment to Job Satisfaction through Job Well-Being and Family Support: A Moderated Mediation Analysis of Social Workers across India

5

Parveen Kalliath^{1,*}, Thomas Kalliath², Xi Wen Chan³ and Christopher Chan^{4,5,6}

¹*School of Allied Health, Australian Catholic University, Canberra, Australia*

²*Research School of Management, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia*

10

³*School of Management, College of Business, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia*

⁴*School of Human Resource Management, York University, Toronto, Canada*

⁵*Faculty of Law & Business, Australian Catholic University, New South Wales, Australia (Honorary)*

⁶*Institut de Gestion de Rennes, Université de Rennes 1, Rennes, Cedex 7, France*

15

*Correspondence to Dr Parveen Kalliath, School of Allied Health, Australian Catholic University, Canberra, Australia. E-mail: parveen.kalliath@acu.edu.au

Abstract

Social workers often experience stress from competing work and family demands, which negatively affects their job well-being and subsequently their job satisfaction. Yet, social workers can experience enrichment from participating in both work and family roles, which positively influences their job well-being and job satisfaction. The present study aimed to examine the mediating role of job well-being on the relationship between work–family enrichment and job satisfaction, and the moderating role of family support on the relationship between work–family enrichment and job well-being, and subsequently on job satisfaction for social workers. Data were collected from professional social workers employed in various governmental and non-governmental agencies across fifteen states and territories ($n = 428$) in India using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire. We found that social workers who experienced work–family enrichment also experienced job well-being and subsequently job satisfaction, particularly at higher levels of family support. These findings highlight the importance of the synergistic combination of work and family resources such as family support, work–family enrichment and job well-being to enhance the job satisfaction of social workers. We discuss the implications of these findings for social service organisations and recommend ways in which work–family enrichment can be enhanced.

Keywords: Work–family enrichment, job satisfaction, job well-being, family support, social workers

Accepted: February 2018

Introduction

The work and family domain ‘constitutes the backbone of human existence’ (Aryee *et al.*, 1999, p. 497). Yet, only a few studies (e.g. Baum, 2016; Kalliath, 2014) have explored social workers’ work–family enrichment experiences and their influence on job satisfaction. Work–family enrichment refers to ‘the extent to which experiences in one role improve the quality of life in the other role’ (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006, p. 72). It is conceptualised as bi-directional: work-to-family enrichment (WFE) occurs when resources acquired through participation in work roles facilitates fulfilment of family roles and family-to-work enrichment (FWE) occurs when resources acquired from participation in family roles enhances work performance. Resources acquired may be material (e.g. money), skills (e.g. inter-personal skills), physical and/or psychological resources (e.g. health and self-esteem) and social-capital resources (e.g. networks). Job satisfaction, which refers to a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job experiences (Locke, 1976), has ignited much debate in the social work literature because it affects retention and turnover of social workers (Collins, 2008). Empirical evidence suggests that social workers who experience job satisfaction are more likely to stay in their job and provide quality services to their clients (Kalliath and Kalliath, 2015).

Using Fredrickson’s (2001) broaden-and-build theory, we examined job well-being as a mediator linking both WFE and FWE to job satisfaction. Job well-being is a broader concept that encompasses work-related affect and psychological health (Sonnentag, 2001). Job well-being is critical because it helps organisations achieve ethical work practices and gain competitive advantage (Shier and Graham, 2013). We also examined family support as a moderator of the relationship between work–family enrichment and job well-being.

Family support refers to formal services (e.g. childcare) or informal services (e.g. advice) provided by family members that help individuals to deal with their everyday problems and ‘function as productive and responsible employees’ (Friesen *et al.*, 2008, p. 35). Examining the work–family experiences of social workers in India contributes to the existing research undertaken mainly in Western contexts, thereby providing richer insights into the human services sector that tends to vary across countries (Cooke and Bartram, 2015).

Theoretical framework and development of hypotheses

Work–family enrichment

Social work concerns itself with people who are disadvantaged, marginalised and oppressed (Hare, 2004). Despite their demanding work, social workers can potentially experience work–family enrichment. There is now increasing evidence to show that resources generated from participation in work and family roles can enhance the quality of life in both domains (Baum, 2016; Kalliath, 2014; Chan *et al.*, 2016). Additionally, resources thus generated can be used to enhance performance in these roles either directly (*instrumental* path, when resources gained from one role impact the performance in another role) or indirectly (*affective* path, when resources gained from one role indirectly impact the performance in another role through positive emotions).

Carlson *et al.* (2006) developed a six-dimensional work–family enrichment scale to include: (1) WFE-Development and (2) FWE-Development referring to skills and knowledge acquired in one role that can enhance the intellectual and personal development in another role; (3) WFE-Affect and (4) FWE-Affect, which refer to positive moods and attitudes in one role that are used to benefit another role; (5) WFE-Capital, which refers to resources (e.g. sense of accomplishment and self-esteem) that are acquired from participation in the workplace and used to enhance performance in the family; and (6) FWE-Efficiency, which refers to benefits gained from involvement in familial responsibilities that can be used to enhance performance at work. Although these subscales have allowed researchers to assess the relationships between work–family enrichment and its outcomes, few studies have examined each dimension of WFE and FWE (Nicklin and McNall, 2013; Timms *et al.*, 2015), which this study proposes to do.

Work–family enrichment and job satisfaction

Existing studies on social workers' job satisfaction have focused on negative work-related outcomes, such as stress and emotional disengagement, without exploring the positive outcomes that enable social workers to thrive and flourish (Collins, 2008). The examination of positive outcomes, such as job satisfaction, requires a focus on positive states and dynamics, away from negative and undesirable states (Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008). Job satisfaction is often considered 'the most focal employee attitude' (Saari and Judge, 2004, p. 396) and is a significant predictor of workplace behaviours such as absenteeism, turnover and job performance. Kalliath's (2014) study found that participation in work and family roles reduced social workers' psychological strain and WFE

reduced the negative impact of work–family conflict on mental health, while FWE led to decreased depressive symptoms at work. Other studies using non-social worker samples (e.g. McNall *et al.*, 2010; Chan *et al.*, 2016) found that both WFE and FWE contributed to positive outcomes such as job and family satisfaction. Although the theory of work–family enrichment is useful in explaining the WFE and FWE dynamics, it does not explain how they relate to their outcomes. Therefore, drawing on Fredrickson’s (2001) broaden-and-build theory, we examined how WFE and FWE foster social workers’ job satisfaction. 5

Broaden-and-build theory posits that positive emotions (e.g. joy and contentment) and the contextual circumstances that elicit positive emotions widen people’s thought-action repertoire. This subsequently builds a variety of personal resources, such as physical (e.g. health), social (e.g. support network), intellectual (e.g. knowledge) and psychological (e.g. mental resilience) resources (Fredrickson *et al.*, 2008). Positive emotions also facilitate coping with adversity, thereby enhancing employees’ emotional well-being and psychological resilience (Dollard and Bakker, 2010). Given the nature of social work, social workers’ positive perceptions of their work can be a powerful motivator. Social workers who find meaning in their work are also more likely to overcome adverse events and view these as opportunities to learn and refocus their cognitive efforts (Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004). 10 15 20

Work–family enrichment is the process through which performance in work and family domains is facilitated through contextual resources from both domains, which leads to the development of personal resources (ten Brummelhuis and Bakker, 2012). For example, a work environment that provides social workers with personal development opportunities (WFE-Development) supports them to achieve their work and personal goals (WFE-Capital) and allows them to experience positive affect at work (WFE-Affect) that increases their work engagement and ultimately their job satisfaction (Dollard and Bakker, 2010). In a longitudinal study by Hammer *et al.* (2005), employees who experienced positive emotions in their family domain exhibited increased positive emotions at work, thereby leading to FWE-Affect. Similarly, social workers who manage household tasks may acquire valuable time-management skills that are useful at work, thereby leading to FWE-Efficiency. Social workers may also engage in leisure reading at home, which expands their knowledge, contributing to FWE-Development. When involvement in the family roles enriches work-role performance, then work attitudes and behaviours should improve so that job satisfaction is increased (Frone *et al.*, 1997). Correspondingly, we hypothesised that: 25 30 35 40

Hypothesis 1a. The WFE dimensions are positively related to job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1b. The FWE dimensions are positively related to job satisfaction.

Mediating role of job well-being

The accumulation of resources through WFE and FWE is associated with positive feelings about the workplace (Friedman and Greenhaus, 2000), which subsequently expand individuals' emotional set points and resources (Fredrickson *et al.*, 2008) leading to job well-being. Job well-being is distinct from job satisfaction because it captures the subtleties, complexities and variation of employees' cognitive and affective experiences (both positive and negative affect) at work (Daniels, 2000). Thus, job well-being is more comprehensive and context-specific (Shier and Graham, 2013), while job satisfaction refers to the overall satisfaction with one's job (Warr, 1990). When WFE and FWE occur, individuals experience an accumulation of resources that leads to job well-being, as they are better able to deal with stressful encounters (McNall *et al.*, 2010). Job well-being involves the simultaneous experience of high positive job affect and low negative job affect, which expands social workers' thought-action repertoires and assists them in resource building (Wright *et al.*, 2007). This sense of job well-being subsequently facilitates job satisfaction, as employees develop positive feelings toward their job. Furthermore, a few studies (e.g. Şimşek *et al.*, 2012; O'Neill and Sevastos, 2013) that have explored job well-being and job satisfaction found a strong, positive relationship between both variables. Therefore, we hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 2a. Job well-being will mediate the relationships between the WFE dimensions and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2b. Job well-being will mediate the relationships between the FWE dimensions and job satisfaction.

Moderating role of family support

Research investigating social support has repeatedly shown that it leads to better health and well-being (Friesen *et al.*, 2008). Social support can come from work and non-work sources. Support from non-work sources (e.g. family support) has received less attention. Family members can provide psychological support, emotional support and material support (Collins, 2008). Family support may also come from the work domain, such as family-friendly policies or the extension of organisational benefits to social workers' family members (Wayne *et al.*, 2006). Thus, family support can act as a buffer against any interference between work and

Figure 1 Hypothesised moderated mediation model.

family and promote synergies between work and family (Wayne *et al.*, 2006). Correspondingly, we hypothesised that:

Hypothesis 3a. Family support interacts with the WFE dimensions to predict job well-being and subsequently job satisfaction, such that the effects will be stronger when there is a higher level of family support.

Hypothesis 3b. Family support interacts with the FWE dimensions to predict job well-being and subsequently job satisfaction, such that the effects will be stronger when there is a higher level of family support.

The hypotheses tested in the present study are depicted in Figure 1.

Method

Sample and demographics

Data for the study were collected in collaboration with Matru Sewa Sangh (MSS) Institute of Social Work, Nagpur, India. Ethics approval was granted by the Board of Research Resource Centre, MSS Institute of Social Work and the Human Research Ethics Committee, Australian Catholic University. The participants were qualified social workers working either in governmental or non-governmental organisations in fifteen Indian states/territories. Local social workers were recruited as research assistants who approached various organisations to survey the participants. Approximately 770 questionnaires were distributed to social workers who had consented to their participation. Four hundred and fifty completed

questionnaires were returned (58.4 per cent response rate), of which 428 (55.6 per cent) yielded usable data. Twenty-two questionnaires (2.8 per cent) were excluded from analyses due to substantial missing data.

Slightly more than half of the participants (54.0 per cent) were female, and the mean age for all participants was 35.6 years (range 22.0–69.0 years). The majority of participants were in a partnered relationship (80.0 per cent), with 19.6 per cent being single, separated, divorced or widowed. Forty-seven per cent of the participants had no children. Among those with children, the mean age of the children was 12.3 years. Eighty-four per cent of the participants held a Master of Social Work degree. Ninety-six per cent of the participants worked full-time for an average of 44.0 hours per week. Twenty-seven per cent of the participants were in direct social work practice, while 44.7 per cent were in managerial roles and 9.3 per cent were in tertiary education roles. The participants spent an average of 8.4 hours travelling to and from work weekly, and 51.7 per cent reported providing care to between one and three extended family members. Slightly more than half (57.0 per cent) of the participants had partners in full-time employment.

Measures

Work–family enrichment

Carlson *et al.*'s (2006) eighteen-item work–family enrichment scale was used. Sample items for WFE included: my involvement in my work 'helps me to understand different viewpoints and this helps me be a better family member' (WFE-Capital), 'puts me in a good mood and this helps me be a better family member' (WFE-Affect) and 'provides me with a sense of success and this helps me be a better family member' (WFE-Development). Sample items for FWE included: my involvement in my family 'helps me to gain knowledge and this helps me be a better worker' (FWE-Development), 'makes me cheerful and this helps me be a better worker' (FWE-Affect) and 'causes me to be more focused at work and this helps me be a better worker' (FWE-Efficiency). Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1='strongly disagree' to 5='strongly agree'. The internal consistencies for WFE-Development, WFE-Affect, WFE-Capital, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect and FWE-Efficiency were 0.90, 0.88, 0.87, 0.89, 0.86 and 0.88, respectively.

Family support

Caplan *et al.*'s (1980) four-item perceived family support scale was used. A sample item included 'My family members go out of their way to

make my life easier’. Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’. The internal consistency of the scale was 0.85.

Job well-being

Warr’s (1990) job-related depression-enthusiasm and job-related anxiety-contentment scales were used. Respondents reflected on how their jobs made them feel in the past three months. Sample items included ‘tense’, ‘calm’, and ‘cheerful’. Responses were measured on a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘never’ to 6 = ‘all of the time’. The internal consistency of the scale was 0.87.

Job satisfaction

Three items from the Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire (Seashore et al., 1982) were used. A sample item included ‘In general, I feel happy with how things are going in my job’. Responses to the items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 7 = ‘strongly agree’. The internal consistency of the scale was 0.88.

Control variables

We considered several potentially relevant control variables, including sex (0 = female; 1 = male), age (in number of years), marital status (0 = living alone; 1 = living with a partner), years of work experience (in number of years) and number of dependants (in whole numbers). Examination of the bivariate correlations found in Table 1 indicates that most of the non-focal demographic variables, particularly age, marital status and years of experience, significantly correlated with some of the study variables. Thus, we controlled for all five demographic variables, as they influenced work and family role experiences in previous work-family studies (e.g. McNall et al., 2010; Chan et al., 2016).

Results

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities and correlation coefficients among the demographics WFE-Development, WFE-Affect, WFE-Capital, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect, FWE-Efficiency, family support, job well-being and job satisfaction. All six WFE and FWE dimensions were significantly and positively correlated with family support, job well-being and job satisfaction. Job well-being

Table 1 Means, standard deviations, scale reliabilities and correlation coefficients among the variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Sex	0.46	0.50													
2. Age	35.78	8.33	0.03												
3. Marital status	0.81	0.39	−0.01	0.35***											
4. Years of experience	10.30	7.46	−0.04	0.77***	0.30***										
5. Dependents	0.25	0.43	−0.01	−0.19***	−0.35***	−0.21***									
6. WFE-Development	3.91	0.77	0.00	0.16**	0.14**	0.13**	0.07	(0.90)							
7. WFE-Affect	3.83	0.80	0.04	0.19***	0.12*	0.15**	0.07	0.79***	(0.88)						
8. WFE-Capital	3.99	0.73	−0.02	0.19***	0.05	0.18***	0.09	0.67***	0.68***	(0.87)					
9. FWE-Development	3.94	0.77	−0.11*	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.55***	0.58***	0.51***	(0.89)				
10. FWE-Affect	3.94	0.70	0.01	0.12*	0.14**	0.08	0.08	0.66***	0.65***	0.56***	0.66***	(0.86)			
11. FWE-Efficiency	4.15	0.73	−0.01	0.14**	0.12*	0.15**	0.02	0.55***	0.56***	0.48***	0.57***	0.73***	(0.88)		
12. Family support	5.87	0.80	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.05	0.10*	0.39***	0.38***	0.43***	0.37***	0.46***	0.39***	(0.85)	
13. Job well-being	4.19	1.14	−0.03	0.10*	−0.00	0.11*	0.07	0.35***	0.27***	0.19***	0.18***	0.30***	0.18***	0.30***	(0.87)
14. Job satisfaction	5.60	1.36	−0.02	0.14**	0.12*	0.09	−0.02	0.26***	0.24***	0.23***	0.15**	0.24***	0.21***	0.23***	0.35*** (0.88)

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < .001$.

was significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction. Family support was also significantly and positively correlated with job well-being and job satisfaction. All variables were checked for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factor (VIF). A high VIF would suggest that the independent variables were highly correlated with one another, which makes it difficult to determine the extent to which each of these variables predicted the dependent variable (Hair *et al.*, 2010). Given that all VIF values were significantly below 10.0, multicollinearity was not an issue in this study. 5

We performed an analysis of variance of all variables by 'primary job' categories using the Tukey and Scheffe test. There was no significant difference between job categories (i.e. those in managerial, direct practice, education roles), suggesting that, even though the sample contained a large proportion of social workers in managerial positions, their assessments of WFE, FWE, family support, job-related well-being and job satisfaction were similar to those in other roles. 10 15

The mediation and moderated mediation models were tested using the PROCESS macro developed by Hayes (2013) in SPSS (version 23.0). We first tested the direct effects between work-family enrichment and job satisfaction. WFE-Development ($B = 0.23$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 2.68$, $p < 0.01$), WFE-Affect ($B = 0.24$, $SE = 0.08$, $t = 2.92$, $p < 0.01$), WFE-Capital ($B = 0.30$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 3.46$, $p < 0.001$), FWE-Affect ($B = 0.24$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 2.60$, $p < 0.01$) and FWE-Efficiency ($B = 0.26$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 3.01$, $p < 0.01$) were significantly and positively related to job satisfaction. FWE-Development ($B = 0.14$, $SE = 0.08$, $t = 1.71$, $p > 0.05$) was not significantly related to job satisfaction. Therefore, Hypothesis 1a was fully supported and Hypothesis 1b was partially supported, suggesting that all three WFE dimensions (Development, Affect and Capital) and two of the three FWE dimensions (Affect and Efficiency) improved job satisfaction. Although there was no direct relationship between FWE-Development and job satisfaction, mediation may still occur according to a newer approach of testing mediation effects developed by Preacher and Hayes (2008). 20 25 30

As recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008), 5,000 bootstrap samples were specified to test the indirect effects using 95 per cent bias-corrected confidence intervals (CIs). All the predictors were mean-entered before analyses. Using Model 4 in the PROCESS macro, and after controlling for sex, age, marital status, number of years of work experience and number of dependants, the mediator (job well-being) was added to each of the predictors (WFE-Development, WFE-Affect, WFE-Capital, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect and FWE-Efficiency), one at a time, to predict job satisfaction. WFE-Development ($B = 0.51$, $SE = 0.07$, $t = 7.40$, $p < 0.001$) and job well-being ($B = 0.36$, $SE = 0.06$, $t = 6.25$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. WFE-Affect ($B = 0.37$, $SE = 0.07$, $t = 5.41$, $p < 0.001$) and job well-being ($B = 0.37$, $SE = 0.06$, 35 40 45

$t = 6.62$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. WFE-Capital ($B = 0.30$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 6.99$, $p < 0.001$) and job well-being ($B = 0.38$, $SE = 0.05$, $t = 6.99$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. Given that the three WFE dimensions remained positively and significantly related to job satisfaction after adding the mediator into the models, it suggests that job well-being partially mediated the relationships between the WFE dimensions and job satisfaction. FWE-Development ($B = 0.14$, $SE = 0.08$, $t = 1.71$, $p > 0.05$) did not predict job satisfaction, yet job well-being ($B = 0.39$, $SE = 0.05$, $t = 7.18$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. Since FWE-Development was not significantly related to job satisfaction after adding job well-being, there is evidence that job well-being fully mediated the relationship between FWE-Development and job satisfaction. FWE-Affect ($B = 0.24$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 2.60$, $p < 0.01$) and job well-being ($B = 0.37$, $SE = 0.06$, $t = 6.53$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. FWE-Efficiency ($B = 0.26$, $SE = 0.09$, $t = 3.01$, $p < 0.01$) and job well-being ($B = 0.38$, $SE = 0.05$, $t = 7.03$, $p < 0.001$) predicted job satisfaction. Thus, job well-being partially mediated the FWE-Affect-job satisfaction and FWE-Efficiency-job satisfaction relationships because the independent variables and the mediator were positive and significant.

The bootstrapping results showed that the overall indirect effects were significant for WFE-Development ($B = 0.18$, Boot $SE = 0.04$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.117; 0.272)$), WFE-Affect ($B = 0.14$, Boot $SE = 0.03$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.080; 0.215)$), WFE-Capital ($B = 0.10$, Boot $SE = 0.03$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.041; 0.176)$), FWE-Development ($B = 0.10$, Boot $SE = 0.03$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.039; 0.168)$), FWE-Affect ($B = 0.17$, Boot $SE = 0.04$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.106; 0.275)$) and FWE-Efficiency ($B = 0.10$, Boot $SE = 0.03$, 95 per cent $CI = (0.040; 0.174)$) and job satisfaction. Thus, we found further evidence of mostly partial mediations (i.e. the three WFE dimensions $\rightarrow$ job well-being $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction, FWE-Affect $\rightarrow$ job well-being $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction and FWE-Efficiency $\rightarrow$ job well-being $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction), except for the FWE-Development $\rightarrow$ job well-being $\rightarrow$ job satisfaction relationship, where there was full mediation. Hence, Hypotheses 2a and 2b were partially supported.

We chose Model 7 in the PROCESS macro to determine the conditional indirect effects at low and high values for family support. This technique looked at what happens when family support interacts with the WFE and FWE dimensions to predict job well-being and job satisfaction. We entered sex, age, marital status, number of years of work experience and number of dependants into the models as controls. Table 2 shows the results of the moderated mediation models involving the WFE dimensions (WFE-Development, WFE-Affect and WFE-Capital) and Table 3 shows the results of the moderated mediation models involving the FWE dimensions (FWE-Development, FWE-Affect and FWE-Efficiency). In the first part, we set the mediator (job well-being) as the dependent variable. WFE-Development ($B = 0.83$,

Table 2 Moderated mediation models with WFE-development, WFE-affect and WFE-capital

Variable	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3			
	B	SE	T	p	B	SE	t	p	B	SE	t	p
<i>Job well-being as the dependent variable</i>												
Constant	4.68	0.31	15.22	< 0.001	4.76	0.31	15.10	< 0.001	4.67	0.32	14.66	< 0.001
Sex	-0.07	0.10	-0.71	ns	-0.08	0.10	-0.81	ns	-0.06	0.10	-0.60	ns
Age	0.00	0.01	0.31	ns	0.00	0.01	0.18	ns	0.01	0.01	0.55	ns
Marital status	-0.16	0.15	-1.08	ns	-0.09	0.15	-0.59	ns	-0.06	0.15	-0.43	ns
Years of experience	0.01	0.01	0.70	ns	0.01	0.01	0.85	ns	0.01	0.01	0.77	ns
Dependants	0.05	0.13	0.43	ns	0.09	0.13	0.72	ns	0.11	0.13	0.88	ns
WFE-Development	0.83	0.14	5.87	< 0.001								
WFE-Affect					0.66	0.14	4.77	< 0.001				
WFE-Capital									0.51	0.15	3.30	< 0.01
Family support	0.34	0.07	4.79	< 0.001	0.41	0.08	5.56	< 0.001	0.45	0.07	6.03	< 0.001
WFE-Development × family support	0.23	0.06	3.57	< 0.001								
WFE-Affect × family support					0.23	0.07	3.51	< 0.001				
WFE-Capital × family support									0.21	0.06	3.29	< 0.01
R ²											0.13	
F-value			0.19				0.16				7.90***	
			12.30***				9.64***					
<i>Job satisfaction as the dependent variable</i>												
Constant	3.32	0.42	7.90	< 0.001	3.32	0.42	7.98	< 0.001	3.25	0.41	8.04	< 0.001
Sex	-0.04	0.12	-0.36	ns	-0.06	0.12	-0.46	ns	-0.04	0.12	-0.29	ns
Age	0.02	0.01	1.74	ns	0.02	0.01	1.63	ns	0.02	0.01	1.66	ns
Marital status	0.27	0.18	1.55	ns	0.28	0.18	1.62	ns	0.32	0.17	1.87	ns
Years of experience	-0.01	0.01	-1.11	ns	-0.01	0.01	-1.10	ns	-0.02	0.01	-1.31	ns
Dependants	-0.03	0.15	-0.20	ns	-0.04	0.15	-0.24	ns	-0.05	0.15	-0.34	ns
WFE-Development	0.23	0.09	2.68	< 0.01								
WFE-Affect					0.24	0.08	2.92	< 0.01				
WFE-Capital									0.30	0.09	3.46	< 0.001
Job well-being	0.36	0.06	6.25	< 0.001	0.37	0.06	6.62	< 0.001	0.38	0.05	6.99	< 0.001
R ²			0.16				0.16				0.17	
F-value			11.34***				11.56***				12.14***	

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

Table 3 Moderated mediation models with FWE-development, FWE-affect and FWE-efficiency

Variable	Model 4				Model 5				Model 6			
	B	SE	t	p	B	SE	t	p	B	SE	t	p
<i>Job well-being as the dependent variable</i>												
Constant	4.60	0.32	14.28	< 0.001	4.65	0.31	14.77	< 0.001	4.65	0.32	14.48	< 0.001
Sex	-0.04	0.11	-0.35	ns	-0.06	0.10	-0.57	ns	-0.05	0.11	-0.51	ns
Age	0.01	0.01	0.58	ns	0.00	0.01	0.26	ns	0.01	0.01	0.58	ns
Marital status	-0.08	0.15	-0.56	ns	-0.15	0.15	-0.99	ns	-0.09	0.15	-0.60	ns
Years of experience	0.01	0.01	0.88	ns	0.01	0.01	1.04	ns	0.01	0.01	0.78	ns
Dependants	0.12	0.13	0.97	ns	0.08	0.13	0.63	ns	0.12	0.13	0.97	ns
FWE-Development	0.36	0.15	2.38	< 0.05								
FWE-Affect					0.73	0.07	4.66	< 0.001	0.43	0.16	2.65	< 0.01
FWE-Efficiency									0.43	0.07	5.8311	< 0.001
Family support	0.42	0.07	5.76	< 0.001	0.35	0.07	4.66	< 0.001				
FWE-Development × family support	0.14	0.07	1.98	< 0.05								
FWE-Affect × family support					0.21	0.07	2.88	< 0.01				
FWE-Efficiency × family support									0.17	0.07	5.83	< 0.001
R ²												
F-value			0.12				0.15				0.12	
			7.07***				9.50***				7.25***	
<i>Job satisfaction as the dependent variable</i>												
Constant	3.06	0.40	7.57	< 0.001	3.27	0.42	7.87	< 0.001	3.16	0.40	7.85	< 0.001
Sex	-0.02	0.12	-0.15	ns	-0.05	0.12	-0.37	ns	-0.04	0.12	-0.34	ns
Age	0.02	0.01	1.87	ns	0.02	0.01	1.72	ns	0.02	0.01	1.89	ns
Marital status	0.31	0.18	1.79	ns	0.27	0.18	1.52	ns	0.28	0.17	1.63	ns
Years of experience	-0.01	0.01	-1.10	ns	-0.01	0.01	-0.99	ns	-0.02	0.01	-1.31	ns
Dependants	-0.00	0.15	-0.01	ns	-0.03	0.15	-0.22	ns	-0.02	0.15	-0.12	ns
FWE-Development	0.14	0.08	1.71	ns								
FWE-Affect					0.24	0.09	2.60	< 0.01				
FWE-Efficiency									0.26	0.09	3.01	< 0.01
Job well-being	0.39	0.08	7.18	< 0.001	0.37	0.06	6.53	< 0.001	0.38	0.05	7.03	< 0.001
R ²			0.15				0.16				0.16	
F-value			10.63***				11.26***				11.66***	

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

SE = 0.14, $t = 5.87$, $p < 0.001$), WFE-Affect ($B = 0.66$, SE = 0.14, $t = 4.77$, $p < 0.001$), WFE-Capital ($B = 0.51$, SE = 0.15, $t = 3.30$, $p < 0.01$), FWE-Development ($B = 0.36$, SE = 0.15, $t = 2.38$, $p < 0.05$), FWE-Affect ($B = 0.73$, SE = 0.07, $t = 4.66$, $p < 0.001$) and FWE-Efficiency ($B = 0.43$, SE = 0.16, $t = 2.65$, $p < 0.01$) significantly predicted job well-being. This finding provides evidence that an increase in all dimensions of WFE and FWE contributes to a simultaneous increase in social workers' job well-being.

Similarly, as seen in Figures 2–7, the interaction between family support and WFE-Development ($B = 0.23$, SE = 0.06, $t = 3.57$, $p < 0.001$), WFE-Affect ($B = 0.23$, SE = 0.07, $t = 3.51$, $p < 0.001$), WFE-Capital

Figure 2 Interactions between WFE-Development and family support in predicting job well-being.

Figure 3 Interactions between WFE-Affect and family support in predicting job well-being.

Figure 4 Interactions between WFE-Capital and family support in predicting job well-being.

Figure 5 Interactions between FWE-Development and family support in predicting job well-being.

Figure 6 Interactions between FWE-Affect and family support in predicting job well-being.

Figure 7 Interactions between FWE-Efficiency and family support in predicting job well-being.

Table 4 Conditional indirect effects of independent variables on job satisfaction

	Value of family support	Estimates	Boot SE	95% CI
WFE-Development → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	0.09	0.04	[0.029; 0.175]
	High	0.22	0.05	[0.134; 0.342]
WFE-Affect → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	0.03	0.04	[-0.037; 0.106]
	High	0.17	0.05	[0.091; 0.274]
WFE-Capital → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	-0.00	0.04	[-0.071; 0.067]
	High	0.12	0.05	[0.046; 0.228]
FWE-Development → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	0.01	0.04	[-0.067; 0.083]
	High	0.09	0.04	[0.015; 0.197]
FWE-Affect → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	0.08	0.04	[0.007; 0.168]
	High	0.20	0.06	[0.106; 0.338]
FWE-Efficiency → job well-being → job satisfaction	Low	0.00	0.04	[-0.079; 0.075]
	High	0.10	0.05	[0.026; 0.211]

n = 428; bootstrap sample size = 5,000; based on unstandardised estimates.

(*B* = 0.21, *SE* = 0.06, *t* = 3.29, *p* < 0.01), FWE-Development (*B* = 0.14, *SE* = 0.07, *t* = 1.98, *p* < 0.05), FWE-Affect (*B* = 0.73, *SE* = 0.17, *t* = 4.43, *p* < 0.001) and FWE-Efficiency (*B* = 0.26, *SE* = 0.08, *t* = 3.40, *p* < 0.001) predicted job well-being. The significant positive interactions to predict job well-being suggest that family support can enhance WFE and FWE to improve job well-being.

Table 4 shows the results of the moderated mediation effects at the lower and higher levels of family support. More specifically, it shows whether the interaction effect of family support on WFE and FWE dimensions predicts job well-being and job satisfaction. Significance exists if the value of 0 falls outside the range of CIs (95 per cent). WFE-

5

10

Development, WFE-Affect and WFE-Capital had positive indirect effects on job satisfaction through job well-being. All three WFE dimensions predicted job well-being and job satisfaction at higher levels of family support. However, the relationship was also significant for WFE-Development → job well-being → job satisfaction at the lower level of family support. Similarly, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect and FWE-Efficiency had positive indirect effects on job satisfaction through job well-being at higher levels of family support. The relationship for FWE-Affect → job well-being → job satisfaction was also significant at the lower level of family support. Therefore, Hypotheses 3a and 3b were fully supported.

Discussion

This study examined the mediating role of job well-being on the relationship between WFE, FWE and job satisfaction, and the moderating role of family support on the relationship between WFE, FWE and job well-being, and subsequently on job satisfaction of social workers in India. Our study found evidence that job well-being partially mediated the relationships between most dimensions of work–family enrichment and job satisfaction, suggesting that job well-being helps facilitate job satisfaction by capturing the resources generated by WFE-Development, WFE-Affect, WFE-Capital, FWE-Development, FWE-Affect and FWE-Efficiency. Family support strengthened the mediating effects of job well-being on the relationships between work–family enrichment and job satisfaction, particularly for WFE-Development, WFE-Affect and FWE-Affect, again emphasising the importance of family in social workers' lives. These findings indicate that, beyond reducing negative experiences (Wayne *et al.*, 2006), higher levels of family support can also positively influence social workers' work lives. Family support is also shown to be integral to Indian social workers' work and life experiences, which is consistent with Coffey *et al.*'s (2014) study, where family support was a primary source of social support for Indian social work students.

Our findings also indicate that job well-being, while conceptualised as a comprehensive construct that encompasses work-related affect, cognitive processes and psychological health, is primarily an affective mechanism that captures the affective resources of work–family enrichment most effectively to promote job satisfaction. This is consistent with many work–family studies that have found that work and family experiences are primarily affect-laden, and that affective experiences are an essential component of daily life (Eby *et al.*, 2010). Positive affect can improve attention span, increase creativity and resilience, and enhance mental and

physical health (Fredrickson *et al.*, 2008). Through their affective mechanisms, both family support and job well-being positively influence job satisfaction, thereby providing support for the key tenets of broaden-and-build theory in a non-Western setting.

In their work-home resources model, ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) suggested that structural personal resources (e.g. abilities and knowledge) take more time to develop, which could explain why WFE-Capital and FWE-Development were not as strongly associated with job well-being and job satisfaction. Other potential moderators, such as co-worker support, may also affect the relationships between work-family enrichment, job well-being and job satisfaction, since social workers experience satisfaction from teamwork (Collins, 2008).

Implications for human-resource practices in the social work sector

Our findings provide evidence that WFE and FWE among social workers can contribute to job well-being and job satisfaction. We therefore recommend that organisations must explore both formal and informal ways of enhancing work-family enrichment among social workers through policies and practices such as: (i) alternative work arrangements (e.g. flexible working arrangements or compressed work schedules) and family-friendly benefits that can be accessed by social workers and (ii) supportive work-family organisational culture that makes social workers feel supported and cared for. Researchers (e.g. Friedman and Greenhaus, 2000) note that supportive work environments that provide employees with professional development opportunities enhance emotional gratification, which motivates them to contribute meaningfully to their work and non-work domains.

Broaden-and-build theory underpins the practical recommendations made in this section. The affective mechanisms linking the positive relationships among work-family enrichment, job well-being, family support and job satisfaction emphasise the importance of generating positive affect at work. Alongside the provision of essential resources such as monetary benefits and safe work environments and ensuring manageable workloads, organisations should consider strategies that value and enhance positive affect. Based on our findings, one way to do so would be to value family lives, as it is an important source of social support for job well-being and satisfaction. Hence, social workers can be encouraged to draw on support from family, colleagues and the wider organisation through induction training or stress-management workshops to enhance their psychological and emotional well-being.

Strengths and limitations

This study has several notable strengths and limitations. Our study employed a cross-sectional design; hence, we could not establish causal relations. However, the large and diverse sample of social workers across India lends confidence and robustness to the results. Additionally, single-source data can contribute to potential common method bias (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). To overcome this, we used a mix of four-, five-, six- and seven-point Likert response scales with different anchors to minimise common method bias (Podsakoff *et al.*, 2003). Coupled with the use of theoretical knowledge to explain the underlying moderated mediation mechanisms, our study lays the foundation for more comprehensive studies on social workers' work and family experiences. Given the paucity of longitudinal studies in the work–family literature, future studies using longitudinal designs are warranted. Finally, future studies can collect information on the distribution of time social work managers spend between managerial duties and direct social work practice to enable nuanced analyses of results.

Conclusion

This study explored the relationship linking work–family enrichment to job satisfaction through the mediating effect of job well-being and moderating effect of family support. Drawing on broaden-and-build theory, the hypothesised moderated mediation model demonstrated that social workers who experience WFE and FWE also experience job well-being and subsequently job satisfaction, particularly at higher levels of family support. The findings emphasise the importance of contextual and affective resources (enrichment, well-being and support), as well as work and family resources that facilitate social workers' attainment of job satisfaction. Through building knowledge about these factors that contribute to social workers' job satisfaction, this study contributes to organisational policies and practices that can be leveraged to encourage the flourishing of social workers and the human services sector as a whole.

Funding

This study was supported by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Early Career Research Grant, Australian Catholic University.

Conflict of interest statement. None declared.

References

- Aryee, S., Fields, D. and Luk, V. (1999) 'A cross-cultural test of a model of the work-family interface', *Journal of Management*, **25**(4), pp. 491–511.
- Bakker, A. B. and Schaufeli, W. B. (2008) 'Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, **29**(2), pp. 147–54. 5
- Baum, N. (2016) 'Work-family conflict among social workers, managers and policy makers in times of disaster', *British Journal of Social Work*, **46**(1), pp. 222–38.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Van Harrison, R. and Pinneau, S. R. (1980) *Job Demands and Worker Health*, Ann Arbor, MI, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan. 10
- Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Wayne, J. H. and 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**(1), pp. 131–64.
- Chan, X. W., Kalliath, T., Brough, P., Siu, O. L., O'Driscoll, M. P. and Timms, C. (2016) 'Work-family enrichment and satisfaction: The mediating role of self-efficacy and work-life balance', *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, **27**(15), pp. 1755–76. 15
- Coffey, M., Samuel, U., Collins, S. and Morris, L. (2014) 'A comparative study of social work students in India and the UK: Stress, support and well-being', *British Journal of Social Work*, **44**(1), pp. 163–80. 20
- Collins, S. (2008) 'Statutory social workers: Stress, job satisfaction, coping, social support and individual differences', *British Journal of Social Work*, **38**(6), pp. 1173–93.
- Cooke, F. L. and Bartram, T. (2015) 'Guest editors' introduction: Human resource management in health care and elderly care: Current challenges and toward a research agenda', *Human Resource Management*, **54**(5), pp. 711–35. 25
- Daniels, K. (2000) 'Measures of five aspects of affective wellbeing at work', *Human Relations*, **53**(2), pp. 275–94.
- Dollard, M. F. and Bakker, A. B. (2010) 'Psychosocial safety climate as a precursor to conducive work environments, psychological health problems, and employee engagement', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, **83**(3), pp. 579–99. 30
- Eby, L. T., Maher, C. P. and Butts, M. M. (2010) 'The intersection of work and family life: The role of affect', *Annual Review of Psychology*, **61**(1), pp. 599–622. 35
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001) 'The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions', *American Psychologist*, **56**(3), pp. 218–26.
- Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J. and Finkel, S. M. (2008) 'Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **95**(5), pp. 1045–62. 40
- Friedman, S. D. and Greenhaus, J. H. (2000) *Work and Family—Allies or Enemies? What Happens When Business Professionals Confront Life Choices*, New York, NY, Oxford University Press. 45

- Friesen, B. J., Brennan, E. M. and Penn, M. (2008) ‘Family supports needed by working parents’, in Rosenzweig, J. M. and Brennan, E. M. (eds), *Work, Life, and the Mental Health System of Care*, Baltimore, Paul H. Brookes, pp. 27–56.
- Frone, M. R., Yardley, J. K. and Markel, K. S. (1997) ‘Developing and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface’, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 5 50(2), pp. 145–67.
- Greenhaus, J. H. and Powell, G. N. (2006) ‘When work and family are allies: A theory of work–family enrichment’, *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), pp. 72–92.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. and Anderson, R. E. (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th edn, Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Hammer, L. B., Cullen, J. C., Neal, M. B., Sinclair, R. R. and Shafiro, M. V. (2005) ‘The longitudinal effects of work–family conflict and positive spillover on depressive symptoms among dual-earner couples’, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(2), pp. 138–54.
- Hare, I. (2004) ‘Defining social work for the 21st century: The International Federation of Social Workers’, *International Social Work*, 47(3), pp. 407–24.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013) *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*, New York, Guildford Press.
- Kalliath, P. (2014) ‘Is work–family enrichment an antidote to experiences of psychological strain Among Australian social workers? An empirical study’, *Australian Social Work*, 67(3), pp. 332–47.
- Kalliath, P. and Kalliath, T. (2015) ‘Work–family conflict and its impact on job satisfaction of social workers’, *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(1), pp. 241–59.
- Locke, E. A. (1976) ‘The nature and causes of job satisfaction’, in Dunnette M. D. (ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Chicago, IL, Rand McNally.
- McNall, L. A., Nicklin, J. M. and Masuda, A. D. (2010) ‘A meta-analytic review of the consequences associated with work–family enrichment’, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), pp. 381–96.
- Nicklin, J. M. and McNall, L. A. (2013) ‘Work–family enrichment, support, and satisfaction: A test of mediation’, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(1), pp. 67–77.
- O’Neill, P. and Sevastos, P. (2013) ‘The development and validation of a new multidimensional job insecurity measure (JIM): An inductive methodology’, *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(3), pp. 338–49.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. and Podsakoff, N. P. (2003) ‘Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies’, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), pp. 879–903.
- Preacher, K. J. and Hayes, A. F. (2008) ‘Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models’, *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), pp. 879–91.
- Saari, L. M. and Judge, T. A. (2004) ‘Employee attitudes and job satisfaction’, *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), pp. 395–407.
- Seashore, L., Lawler, E., Marvis, P. and Cammann, C. (1982) *Observing and Measuring Organizational Change: A Guide to Field Practice*, New York, NY, Wiley.
- Shier, M. L. and Graham, J. R. (2013) ‘Organizations and social worker wellbeing: The intra-organizational context of practice and its impact on a practitioner’s

- subjective wellbeing', *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, **36**(1), pp. 61–105.
- Şimşek, Ö. F., Günlü, E. and Erkus, A. (2012) 'Occupation as a personal project system: Application of the ontological wellbeing concept to workplace', *Journal of Happiness Studies*, **13**(2), pp. 203–23. 5
- Sonnentag, S. (2001) 'Work, recovery activities, and individual wellbeing: A diary study', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, **6**(3), pp. 196–210.
- ten Brummelhuis, L. L. and Bakker, A. B. (2012) 'A resource perspective on the work–home interface: The work–home resources model', *American Psychologist*, **67**(7), pp. 545–56. 10
- Timms, C., Brough, P., O'Driscoll, M., Kalliath, T., Siu, O.-L., Sit, C. and Lo, D. (2015) 'Positive pathways to engaging workers: Work-family enrichment as a predictor of work engagement', *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, **53**(4), pp. 490–510.
- Tugade, M. M. and Fredrickson, B. L. (2004) 'Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, **86**(2), pp. 320–33. 15
- Warr, P. (1990) 'The measurement of wellbeing and other aspects of mental health', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, **63**(3), pp. 193–210.
- Wayne, J. H., Randel, A. E. and 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**(3), pp. 445–62. 20
- Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R. and Bonett, D. G. (2007) 'The moderating role of employee positive well being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, **12**(2), pp. 93–104. 25